

# [特集]

## アタナシウス・キルヒャー

2014年3月8日に新潟大学で「アタナシウス・キルヒャー Athanasius Kircher シンポジウム」を開催した。そのときの発表をもとに今回の特集は組まれている。キルヒャーシンポジウムは長らく計画されていながら、博学無双といわれたキルヒャーは対象としてあまりにも大き過ぎ、なかなか実現できなかったものである。それ故喜びも一入である。

日本では洪澤龍彦、種村季弘、中野美代子、荒俣宏といった錚々たる人々によってキルヒャーは紹介されてきた。しかしながら管見するに日本の研究者はこの17世紀の知の巨人に興味を示すことが極端に薄いように感じられる。17世紀という近代科学の黎明期にあって「普遍学」を標榜したキルヒャーは毀誉褒貶激しく、学の対象にするには巨大すぎると同時にある種の危うさが感じられるのであろう。

昨年のシンポジウムおよび今回の特集において、私たちは、イエズス会の中心で世界中の情報に接することができたキルヒャーに新しい知のモデル（つなぐ知）を見ようとする欧米の研究関心をも前提としつつ、この知の巨人の一端を明らかにしようと考えている。もとより関心を共にしながらもいわゆる専門家ではない私たちのシンポジウム・特集なので問題を深く掘り下げるよりはキルヒャーの思想的背景の一端を解明し（桑原論文と坂本論文）、彼の知的関心の広がり（自然現象一般と時空間の拡大に対する関心：キルヒャーのエジプトマニアを明らかにする伊藤論文）を例示し、それを表現するのにキルヒャーが用いた「図像的思考」を「可視化」する（可視性のメディア：クンストカマー／図版集：前田論文）ことができたのが今回のシンポジウム・特集の成果であると考えている。大方のご高評を仰ぎたい。

（文責：桑原 聡）

---

◇

## Feature: Athanasius Kircher

This feature is the result of the symposium on Athanasius Kircher which we held at Niigata University on 8th March 2014. We were very pleased to organize the meeting, because it took a long time to accomplish it. It was obviously not easy to tackle the subject such as Kircher, who was called the “last man who knew everything”. On the symposium four speakers grappled with him. The titles of their papers were “Kircher and Egyptomania”, “Isis and Kircher”, “Kircher and visible Media” and “Kircher and Kunstkammer”. Although it is true to say that our contributions are far behind our wish to depict every important aspect of Kircher, we are content to have marked a fresh beginning of Kircher research in Japan where he has been introduced solely by ‘poetae docti’ such as Tatsuhiko SHIBUSAWA, Suehiro TANEMURA, and Hiroshi ARAMATA.

As it is well-known, Athanasius Kircher (1602 – 1680) lived in the epoch of the Scientific Revolution. With this revolution began slowly the transition from the Kunst- and Wunderkammer to a museum as a scientific and public institution. Kircher’s collection in Collegio Romano in Rome, called “Musaeum Kircherianum”, was one of the most enriched and marvelous Kunstkammer and attracted every intellectually curious visitor. Its objects were assembled through a network of Jesuit missions. The collection was based on an ancient thought of the correspondence of microcosmos and macrocosmos, which was also influenced by mysticism in the form of hermeticism, cabala and ars combinatoria by R. Lullus. In this sense Kircher’s collection followed the tradition of Kunstkammer of the Renaissance. The article of Takashi SAKAMOTO (Prisca theologia et nova cosmologia: Athanasius Kircher’s Ideas of panspermia rerum and Isis sinensium) elucidates Kircher’s mysticism and Satoshi KUWAHARA (Athanasius Kircher and His Kunstkammer) tries to give a picture of his world of Kunstkammer.

On the other hand the seventeenth century witnessed magnificent results of the Age of Discovery and of the beginning of the Scientific Revolution. Kircher was interested in the historical origin of cultures as well as in the expansion of the world so that his attention was also paid to countries like Egypt and China of which he wrote books such as *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, *China Monumentis Illustrata*. These were a consequence of the Age of Discovery. The contribution of Hiroaki ITO (Kircher and Obelisk) is concerned with Kircher’s great interest in Egypt.

Kircher was also curious to know how the subterranean world and the cosmos looked like. His curiosity in nature came to fruition in *Mundus Subterraneus*, *Itinerarium Extaticum*, *Magnes*, *Ars Magna Lucis et Umbrae* and so on. However, his works could not satisfy requirements of the rising new science so that he was criticized as a “charlatan” even while in his lifetime.

Since the 1990s where the intellectual stalemate caused by extreme specialization in science studies was keenly perceived, Kircher and his thought have been generally reevaluated. Network thinking as it is represented by Kircher himself suits probably most to the time of computers. Though his *Kunstammer* doesn't exist any longer, his fully illustrated books can be regarded as a faithful representation of his thought and an expression of the topos ‘Book of Nature’. Exactly this partiality for visualization of Kircher is what Ryozo MAEDA (*Athanasius Kircher and Media of Visuality*) attempts to demonstrate from the perspective of media studies.

Any comment and criticism are welcome.

(文責 : Satoshi Kuwahara)