

the iafor

journal of literature & librarianship

Volume 4 – Issue 1 – Autumn 2015

Editor: Richard Donovan



ISSN: 2187-0608

iafor

The IAFOR Journal of Literature and Librarianship
Volume 4 – Issue – I

IAFOR Publications

Executive Editor:

Joseph Haldane

The International Academic Forum

The IAFOR Journal of Literature & Librarianship

Editor

Richard Donovan, Doshisha University, Japan

Editorial Board

Myles Chilton, Nihon University, Japan

Published by the International Academic Forum (IAFOR), Japan

Executive Editor, IAFOR Publications: Joseph Haldane

Editorial Assistance: Rachel Dyer

IAFOR Publications, Sakae 1-16-26-201, Naka-ward, Aichi, Japan 460-0008

The IAFOR Journal of Literature & Librarianship

Volume 4 – Issue 1 – Autumn 2015

IAFOR Publications © Copyright 2015

ISSN: 2187-0608

Online: iafor.org/publications/iafor-journals/iafor-journal-of-literature-and-librarianship

Cover image: Pixabay/PublicDomainPictures

The IAFOR Journal of Literature & Librarianship
Volume 4 – Issue 1 – Autumn 2015

Edited by Richard Donovan

Table of Contents

Notes on Contributors	1
Introduction Richard Donovan	3
Writing Multicultural America: The Powers of Canon and Ethnicity A. Robert Lee	5
Power in Modernization of Language and Literature in Eighteenth-century Britain and Modern Japan Noriyuki Harada	20
“Go and Teach All Nations”: A British Missionary’s Narrative on China in the 1840s Paul C. Corrigan	32
Narratives of the Literary Island: European Poetics of the Social System After 1945 Ioana Andreescu	44
The Power of Fiction: <i>The Nameless Book</i> and the Birth of Literary Criticism in Japan Joseph T. Sorensen	55
Consumerism and the Possibility of an Authentic Self in Haruki Murakami’s <i>Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World</i> Burcu Genç	71
About the Journal; Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement	80

Notes on Contributors

A. Robert Lee, formerly of the University of Kent at Canterbury, UK, until 2011 was Professor of American Literature at Nihon University, Tokyo. He has held visiting US appointments at Princeton, the University of Virginia, Bryn Mawr College, Northwestern University, the University of Colorado, and Berkeley. His thirty or so book publications include *Designs of Blackness: Mappings in The Literature and Culture of Afro-America* (1998), *Postindian Conversations*, with Gerald Vizenor (1999); *Multicultural American Literature: Comparative Black, Native, Latino/a and Asian American Fictions* (2003), which won the 2004 American Book Award; *United States: Re-Viewing American Multicultural Literature* (2009); *Gothic to Multicultural: Idioms of Imagining in American Literary Fiction* (2009) and *Modern American Counter Writing: Beats, Outriders, Ethnics* (2010). His creative work includes *Japan Textures: Sight and Word* (2007), *Tokyo Commute* (2011), and the verse collections *Ars Geographica* (2012), *Portrait and Landscape: Further Geographies* (2012), *Imaginarium: Sightings, Galleries, Sightlines* (2013), *Americas: Selected Verse and Vignette* (2015) and *Off Course: Roundabouts and Deviations* (2016).

Noriyuki Harada, Ph.D., Professor of English at Tokyo Woman's Christian University and Vice President of the English Literary Society of Japan, focuses on eighteenth-century English literature and culture. His interest also extends to comparative literary studies and the history of books and print culture. He has published many books and articles both in English and Japanese and translated Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (2004), James Cook's *Voyages* (2006–07), Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the English Poets* (2009), and Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* (2012) into Japanese. His recent publications include "Translation and Transformation of Jonathan Swift's Works in Japan" in *"The First Wit of the Age": Essays on Swift and His Contemporaries in Honour of Hermann J. Real* (Peter Lang, 2013), *A Full Annotation of Gulliver's Travels* (in Japanese, Iwanami, 2013), and "Teaching Eighteenth-Century English Literature in Japan: Purposes, Curricula, and Syllabi" (*Lit Matters*, 2014).

Dr. Paul Corrigan joined City University of Hong Kong in 1994. He has taught in different academic units as well as worked on education development. His teaching has mostly been in the areas of English for Specific Purposes, English literature, and teacher education. Dr. Corrigan has also taught at universities in Japan and the United States and has published in areas including ESL, EMI, EFMI, CLIL, research ethics in education, and the teaching of literature. He holds advanced degrees in English, TESOL, and Education from universities in the US, the UK, and China.

Ioana Andreescu is conducting doctoral research at the School for High Studies in Social Sciences (EHESS, Paris), carrying out a double degree in literature and politics. Interested in European postwar narratives, her analyses focus on the rewritings of the myth of Robinson Crusoe and the desert island, conceived as a device for collective memory of an in-the-making social and cultural European system. She has conducted her studies in Rome, Budapest, Munich, Bucharest, Paris and Berlin. Her first book, published in 2014, deals with the role of cultural institutes abroad in the creation of national values and identities. She is also a consultant at the Artistic Department of the Centre for Fine Arts (BOZAR) in Brussels.

Joseph T. Sorensen is Associate Professor of Japanese at the University of California, Davis, where he teaches a range of Japanese film, literature, poetry, drama, and advanced reading courses. After post-graduate study at Kyushu University and Tokyo University, he earned his Ph.D. from the University of California, Berkeley. He is the director of the Japan Children's Home Internship Program, serves on the executive board for the International Society of Ikebana Studies, and is the faculty leader for an annual study-abroad program in Kyoto. He is the author of *Optical Allusions: Screens, Painting, and Poetry in Classical Japan* (Brill, 2012), as well as several articles on the relationship between the visual and verbal arts in pre-modern Japan. His current research focuses on the role of *monogatari* fiction in the composition of court poetry in the Heian and Kamakura periods.

At present, **Burcu Genç** is a Ph.D. student at the University of Tokyo. She is majoring in Comparative Literature and Culture. Her research focuses on Japanese author Haruki Murakami and his fiction in relation to Jean Baudrillard's theory of consumerism. She is also interested in Japanese political economy and post-war history as well as contemporary literature.

Editor

Richard Donovan is a tenured lecturer in comparative literature and translation studies in the Faculty of Letters at Kansai University. He has also worked as a translator at the Kyoto City International Relations Office. He obtained a Ph.D. in literary translation studies at Victoria University of Wellington in 2012. The title of his thesis was *Dances with Words: Issues in the Translation of Japanese Literature into English*. His other areas of interest include Japanese media subculture and environmental technology.

Introduction to the Issue

Issues of “Power: Text and Context” were central to The Fifth Asian Conference on Literature and Librarianship 2015 (LibrAsia2015), comprising, among others, questions about the power of language in relation to that inherent in contemporary political, social, intellectual and academic currents. This issue of the *IAFOR Journal of Literature and Librarianship* is in its own way a potent contribution to the discussions—a veritable powerhouse of talent—with its six wide-ranging papers making this the most prolific issue under my editorship. We are again lucky enough to be a forum for two of the keynote speakers at the conference, whose insightful scholarship sets the tone for the issue; as usual, however, we also introduce fresh new voices to the conversation.

First the distinguished academic and multidisciplinary, multicultural expert **A. Robert Lee** leads us on an exhilarating traverse of the American literary landscape, challenging the hegemony of the ‘authorised’ with a plurivocality of societal and cultural identities in the opening paper, **Writing Multicultural America: The Powers of Canon and Ethnicity**. His deftly pivoting elliptical prose amounts to a master class in compiling a meaningful conspectus of modern American writers, both in poetry and prose. Though focused mainly on linguistic issues, **Noriyuki Harada**’s paper **Power in Modernization of Language and Literature in Eighteenth-century Britain and Modern Japan** also highlights the significant role of private voices, here in advocating for and directing linguistic change, in contrast with the slower-moving state itself. He demonstrates how innovative individuals were responsible for initiating many of the standardisations of written language, such as orthography, on which relies the modern civilisation enjoyed in both countries.

Postcolonialism, touched upon in the first paper, is at the forefront of the examination of literary power relations in the next two papers. In **“Go and Teach All Nations”: A British Missionary’s Narrative on China in the 1840s**, **Paul C. Corrigan** explores how the travel writing of the Rev. George Smith served to reinforce a narrative convenient to the Anglican church and the imperialist ideology prevalent in the Great Britain of the nineteenth century. While written much earlier, in 1719, the influence of Defoe’s novel *Robinson Crusoe* has stretched into postwar European literature. **Ioana Andreescu** investigates the continuing reframing of the Crusoe myth in two twentieth-century novels in **Narratives of the Literary Island: European Poetics of the Social System After 1945**.

The final two papers centre on Japanese literature, spanning the 800 years from the classical origins of literary analysis to the postmodern fiction of the late twentieth

century. **Joseph T. Sorensen** focuses on a critical work that was among the first to assert the rightful place of narrative prose alongside *waka* poetry in Japan in his paper **The Power of Fiction: *The Nameless Book* and the Birth of Literary Criticism in Japan**, in so doing reconfirming the literary authority of the female writers of the period. In present times, meanwhile, though Murakami Haruki has sometimes been criticised for his ready appropriation of Western consumerist icons, **Burcu Genç** reframes the analysis as a Baudrillardian power struggle that has implications for all individuals' attempts at living authentically in present-day society. Her paper **Consumerism and the Possibility of an Authentic Self in Haruki Murakami's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*** brings this issue of the Journal to a close for 2015. I hope readers find themselves empowered and intellectually enlivened by the various perspectives found herein. Once again, it has been my privilege to bring them to a wider audience online. Finally, I'd like to thank all those who gave their time to peer review the papers. Your contribution is, as always, much appreciated.

Richard Donovan

Editor

Writing Multicultural America: The Powers of Canon and Ethnicity

A. Robert Lee

Abstract

America has long and vigorously been taken up with the issue of cultural identity, the one and the many. Its literary authorship, Puritans to Postmoderns, has been no less so engaged. Who gets to say what writing best speaks for the culture? Has there been a preemptive strike in which a largely white, male, protestant body of voice is taken to preside? With the 1960s and the culture-wars the terms of debate radically altered. A whole-scale revision of who speaks, who writes, who is to be listened to, and who (and what) is to be taught, has been talking place. The language, often warring, has been that of canon and multiculturalism, mainstream and periphery, a one 'agreed' hierarchy of imaginative expression as against a huge and actually long ethnic plurality of idiom and memory. The differing claimants have been many and vociferous. This essay addresses the issues in some fullness. It looks again at the various working terms of reference, and then at what in the past has gone into the formation of the American literary canon. There follows a selective analysis of four multicultural arenas—Native America, Afro-America, Latino/a America and Asian America.

Keywords: multicultural, canon, ethnicity, whiteness, native, African American, Latino/a, Asian American, transnational, pluralism

Multicultural America. Canon. Ethnicity. Together they constitute no small mouthful. Each comes freighted in offence and defence, embattlement, and in few greater contexts than the American 1960s as change-era with, in its turn, the ensuing so-called Culture Wars. The cry had gone up. Identity politics was to have its long-overdue redress, ethnic, feminist, gay, disabled: no pre-emptive one America but multi-America. To tackle even selectively the literary authorship involved, the extraordinary surge and interlace of narrative, verse, theatre, life and discursive writing, and popular culture, requires both general compass and necessary particularity of voice. No small challenge.

It is hardly a historical secret that from the outset America has been taken up with national-cultural identity, the one and the many. Its literary roster, Puritans to the Postmoderns, together with those who set up working judgements, has been wholly implicated in the process. Who gets to say what writing best speaks for the culture? What most determines canon formation? How did it come about that a supposed ascendancy was taken to have emerged, largely Anglo-white, male, and/or protestant, an as-of-right WASP hegemony? Counter-reckoning, and accompanying ideology, has increasingly taken upon itself to unpick this order of things. In play have been issues of inclusion and exclusion, who has hitherto not been heard or distributed, and never least, who is to be included in the college and classroom syllabus.

The language in play indeed turns on canon and multiculturalism, mainstream and periphery, a one 'agreed' hierarchy of imaginative expression as against America's huge and actually long-historic ethnic plurality of idiom and memory. The different claimants have been urgent, uninhibited, to include questioning the actual necessity for any single determinative canon. Have the bulwarks, the very sinew, of expressive American culture come under threat or is a new dispensation long overdue with time called on elitism, self-privileging cultural status? The polemic has gone back and forth, perhaps as symptomatically as anywhere in a pairing like Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), with its lament for threatened High Culture, as against Lawrence W. Levine's *The Opening of The American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History* (1996), with its call to embrace cultural width and plurality.

Other contextual cross-argument can look to, say, Dinesh D'Souza's *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* (1999), conservative misgivings at alleged cultural balkanization and pc, and at a counter-reach, Desmond King's *Making Americans: Immigration, Race, and the Origins of Diverse Democracy* (2000), the case for salutation of transnational cultural America. As to 'writing multicultural America', the measures have been equally many, whether Henry Louis Gates's *Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars* (1992) as working *tour d'horizon*, or Ishmael Reed's *Multi-America: Essays on Cultural Wars and Cultural Peace* (1998), an anthology given over to a changed and still-changing America's literary-cultural regimen.

As useful a point of departure as any might well be is the term America itself. The nomenclature has long settled into canonical usage. It signifies the United States of America, North America, the US, a once-and-for-all register for territory that had earlier been apportioned into *New England*, *Nouvelle France*, *Nueva España*. Quickly enough, and allowing for every nuance in the process, there emerges what in his *Public Opinion* (1922) Walter Lippman termed "the manufacture of consent". That is: there would be an agreed or institutional America, compositely Anglo, English-speaking, Christian, hetero, and whatever the romance of a frontier and farm also a nation replete in nuclear family and the comforts of suburb and consumer goods. Frequently enough 'America' is taken to incorporate Canada (it would be intriguing to imagine

the reverse) though not the wider hemisphere of the Americas, both Latin or South America and the Caribbean.

This, inevitably, brings up the issue of whiteness, not simply as hue or coloration, but as cultural quantity, yet-more-vexed terrain in the canon–multiculture axis. A useful coordinate as to the whiteness at issue can be met with in Valerie Babb's *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness* (1998):

Whiteness is a created identity ... sustained through hegemony, a complex network of cultural relations including, among other things, literature, museums, popular culture, and movies. (1998, 4-5)

This succinct formulation easily finds support and embodiment. Think of the 'face' of America, be it the founding patriarchs, or First Families from George and Martha Washington to, say, the Bushes, father and sons. Summon the outward visage, and the shelves of position and class behind each, of the Daughters of the American Revolution or the Daughters of the American Confederacy. Give eye to Hollywood, from charismatic John Wayne cowboy to Jean Harlow (the original 'Blond Bombshell') and Marilyn Monroe as Bodies Beautiful, or step back yet further to the white-race Klan zealotry of D.W. Griffith's *Birth of a Nation* (1915) with its footfall in the film version of *Gone with the Wind* (1939). Leading TV presenters, news or late night, have until relatively recently shown a single coloration. Latterly movements like *English Only* and *Official English* supply reminders that there needs be a 'white' English uncontaminated by Spanish (albeit that the USA is variously estimated as the second- or fifth-largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world), or Black English, or code-switching.

This supposedly presiding version slides easily over Native America, African America, Hispano-America, Asian America, mixed-ethnic America, not to mention much of Gay, LBGT, Transgender, and even child America. It also does not reflect, or address, the massive plurality or multiplicity of white ethnicities, from the WASP upper reaches to the suburban middle class to so-called white-trash/trailer-trash versions, be the latter inner-city poor or dirt-scrabble Appalachian rural hill communities. Does 'white' do duty for all conjugations, Jewish, Scandinavian, German, white-Latino/a, or Mediterranean? In this connection it comes to mind that the Irish (think Huck Finn's father) and the Italians and Greeks were once considered not white, or not white enough. A requisite bibliography has built up, symptomatically Theodore Allen's conspectus in *The Invention of the White Race* (1994), and case-specific studies like Matthew Frye Jacobson's anatomy of Jewish America in *Whiteness of a Different Color* (1999), Noel Ignatiev's *How the Irish became White* (1995) and Fred Gadarrhé's *Italian Signs, Italian Streets* (1996). There is also more than passing relevance in the controversy stirred by Shelley Fisher Fishkin in *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African American Voices* (1993) over the likelihood that the voice of iconic American boyhood was actually speaking an English rooted in African American vernacular.

The link to issues of American literary canon arises readily enough. In the eras since the 1960s we have begun to think differently. Where more so than in the best known of US literary anthologies, the Norton anthologies, the transition from virtually all-white authorship to multicultural inclusions. Two sightlines give a further bearing. *Time Magazine*, with its WASP patriarchal and matriarchal ancestry in Henry Luce and Claire Booth Luce, found itself taking note of the changes. A review of Amy Tan's *The Joy Luck Club* (1989), if a touch condescendingly, was able to observe:

Growing up ethnic is surely the liveliest theme to appear in the American novel since the closing of the frontier. (John Skow, *Time Magazine*, 27 March, 1989)

Eric Liu, Chinese American autobiographer and essayist, and in an echo of James Baldwin's landmark *Notes of a Native Son* (1955), offers a laconic comment in *The Accidental Asian: Notes of a Native Speaker* (1998) as he attacks "Model Minority" patronage by the assumed cultural High Command:

Times have changed, and I suppose you would call it progress that a Chinaman, too, may now aspire to whiteness. (1998, 35)

Canonicity in American literature looks to a complex lineage, so a sexual reference adds more than a touch of spice. Where more so than within the wonderful japery of John Donne's metaphysical classic "To His Mistress Going to Bed":

Licence my roving hands, and let them go,
Before, behind, above, between, below.
O my America! My new-found-land....

The erotica, sadly, for present purposes must take second place to that resonant phrase "new-found-land". There the marker points to exceptionalism, America as inaugurating a new dispensation of self and society, a world to make its own providential and nothing-if-not-unique cultural desiderata and rules. Other equally celebrated touchstones add their weight, from John Winthrop's City upon a Hill ("the eyes of all people are upon us") in his *Model of Christian Charity* (1630), to Emerson's "original relation to the universe" in *Nature* (1836), to Fitzgerald's "fresh green breast of the new world" so lyrically memorialized at the close of *The Great Gatsby* (1925). The implication is one of millennial prospect, with a literature conceived to match.

But any due or established canon did not come easily. There would be the Rev. Sydney Smith, founder of the *Edinburgh Review*, asking in 1820 "[i]n the four corners of the globe who reads an American book?". Henry James in his *Hawthorne* (1879) would speak of "the absent things in American life" ("no literature, no novels, no pictures, no political society"), even if the novelist William Dean Howells responded that all that remained was America. Which is not to doubt that America looked to a species of national or pageant texts, prime among them Benjamin Franklin's *Autobiography* (1771–90) as American self-help credo, Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) as abolitionist banner, and, over time, Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn* (1894) with the arterial Mississippi river as backdrop to the nation's boyhood classic. But only from the 1920s onward can it be said that a working canon came to be fully canvassed and then more or less installed, the upshot of key polemical texts like Lewis Mumford's *The Golden Day: A Study in American Experience and Culture* (1926), Van Wyck Brooks's *The Flowering of New England, 1815–1865* (1936), and perhaps the most seminally, F.O. Matthiessen's *The American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (1941).

The names summoned are now wholly familiar: Emerson, Whitman, Thoreau, Melville and Hawthorne. Each, rightly enough, bears a strong signature, a duly celebrated force of imagination. Others, of shared chronology, assume their respective place, whether Fennimore

Cooper in the Leatherstocking saga as frontier external space or Poe in “Usher” and like storytelling as custodian of psyche, splits, ratiocination and internal space. Subsequent canonicity has been frequent. The 1920s bestow a near-magical power on Fitzgerald, Hemingway and Faulkner. The drama has its prerequisite names in O’Neill, Miller and O’Neill. Poetry’s modernist canon invokes Pound and Eliot, Stevens and Carlos Williams, Marianne Moore and H.D. The South, beyond Faulkner, summons a line to include O’Connor and McCullers, Styron and Capote. A Jewish pantheon invariably gives recognition to Bellow, Malamud and Roth. None of this authorship deserves other than a garland, a working hurrah.

But, no fault of its own, it is a reckoning that also leaves out manifold other tiers and claims. Whether on account of market taste, academia, class, and gender-preferential treatment, there remains virtually the whole of multicultural American literary tradition, which, until comparatively recently, embraces the writing unveiled, for example, in David Reynold’s *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville* (1988), or literary-cultural movements like the Harlem and Native American Renaissance both in their antecedents and after-sway, or a vast feminist repertoire spanning Kate Chopin and Gertrude Stein to subsequent moderns and contemporaries. The present account settles upon the four creative arenas already mentioned if not quite as counter-canon then redress, rites-of-passage which have had to contend against the one or other screen and barrier: Native America, Afro-America, Latino/a America and Asian America.

Vanishing Americans: however once-customary usage, especially at the turn of the twentieth century, the term bears little credence for the Native America to be met with today. Demographic tallies may vary but most speak of a population upward of four million with another million-plus in Canada. Inter-marriage and offspring complicate the extended picture. Whether ‘Indian’, with its footfall of Columbian misplaced geography, or the irony of the tribes being given American citizenship in 1924, or the ‘Red Power’ rise of the American Indian Movement (AIM) in the 1960s and the events at Wounded Knee and the Pine Ridge Reservation in 1973, or the phenomenon of Native Americans living in the cities as much as on the ‘rez’, there can be little doubt of an enduring Native presence in the makeup of the nation. That does not underplay past dips in population, poverty rates, alcohol and drug problems, or the different kind of displacements—to include much museumization of Native life and art. But it underlines survivance, be it the politics of tribal land and community sovereignty, the casino economies, ‘Indians’ with PhDs, or Native film and theatre. It also, crucially, reminds of Native access to a modernity not normally granted.

The sightlines en route to this modernity, and the literature to which it has given rise, are notable. The Mohegan William Apess, writing in *A Son of the Forest* (1829), avers “I could not find the word ‘Indian’ in the Bible and therefore concluded it was a word intended for the purpose of degrading us.” Luther Standing Bear, in *My People, The Sioux* (1928), wrote in consternation that “It is my desire that all people know the truth about the first Americans.” Vine Deloria, Sioux lawyer, had good reason to observe in his *Custer Died for Your Sins* (1970) that “To be an Indian in modern society is in a very real sense to be unreal and a-historical.” Gerald Vizenor, Anishinaabe (or Ojibway/Chippewa) leading novelist, offers the following synoptic perspective in his *Crossbloods: Bone Courts, Bingo, and Other Reports* (1990):

The use of the word ‘Indian’ is postmodern, a navigational conception, a colonial invention, a simulation, in sound and transcription. Tribal culture became nominal, diversities were twisted to the core, and oral stories were set in written languages.... More than a hundred million people, and hundreds of distinct

tribal cultures were simulated as Indians; an invented pantribal name, one sound, bears treaties, statutes, and seasons, but no tribal culture, language, religion, or landscape. (1990, xxiii–xxiv)

In his poem “A Discussion About Indian Affairs” (*Deer Hunting and Other Poems*, 1990) Geary Hobson (Cherokee-Quapaw-Chickasaw) ponders the ongoing gaps, the caesuras:

She was a white woman
 from some little town
 in one of the Dakotas
 “I’ve heard about Cherokees
 —everybody’s heard about Cherokees—
 but I always thought the Chickasaws
 were some made up tribe—
 one that never existed—
 invented by someone like Al Capp,
 word like “Kickapoo,” you know?”
 “There’s a Kickapoo tribe, too.”
 I said. “Oh,” she said,
 and having nothing more to say
 on the subject, said nothing.
 I wondered if we’d ever have
 anything to say to one another.

Shorthand must do to convey some of the barriers through which a Native American literary tradition, one that is written and scriptural as against the massive resources of oral legacy, has had to confront. Noble savagery vies with the devil mythus (Cotton Mather, that doughtiest of Puritans, would write in *The Wonders of the Invisible World* (1693)—“The New Englanders are a people of God settled in those which were once the devil’s territories”). How to escape the diorama of simulations? The Boston Tea Party of 1773 with New Englanders in Mohawk garb. The ‘Indian Warrior’ spectacle of the Cody circuses begun in 1883. The gallery of barbershop manikins. Red Man chewing tobacco. The Indian head nickel (actually a woman). Film from D.W. Griffith’s *The Red Man and Child* (1908) to *Dances with Wolves* (1990), the latter replete with white-woman rescue and Vanishing American ending. And always the Tonto of *The Lone Ranger* first as radio broadcast begun in 1933 and then ABC’s 1949–58 TV series. What cost, too, each sports naming, the Atlanta Braves with their Tomahawk Chop, the Kansas City Chiefs, and more egregiously still, the Washington Redskins? To which ‘canonical’ American literature adds its figures and stereotypes, from Twain’s Injun Joe in *Tom Sawyer* (1876) to Hemingway’s Indians to Ken Kesey’s Chief Bromden in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest* (1962)?

But few could doubt that a major shift occurred when N. Scott Momaday was awarded a Pulitzer in 1969 for *House Made of Dawn* (1968), the first Native text ever to be so honoured. Its portrait of World War II in the Pacific and Jemez pueblo Indian Country as respective combat-zones, and their personification in the figure of the Native-born Abel, yielded a massive, lyric, imaginative interplay of both history and fable. This circling, reflexive narrative, with its comparisons of calendar, belief system, memory, law, site, and languages, deploys a depth of image, a voicing, rare by any standards. What to suppose its place, then as now, in the canon of American literature?

That *House Made of Dawn* has assumed classic Native American status is irrefutable; it also has been taken to have ushered in the Native American Renaissance, however contentious the naming. Would an overall literary canon be advantaged or disadvantaged by inclusion of any or all of the following novels: James Welch's Blackfeet tour de force *Fools Crow* (1986) with its Native perspective on 'Indian wars' in Montana and the West, Gerald Vizenor's postmodern *Bearheart* (1978) as Pilgrim's Progress through a dystopian America as much out of petroleum as moral balance, or Leslie Marmon Silko's hemispheric chronicle of Americas both indigenous and Euro-American in *Almanac of the Dead* (1991)? The circuit readily extends to the fiction of Louise Erdrich, Thomas King, Sherman Alexie; the theatre of Hanay Geiogamah; and the poetry of Lucy Tapahonso, Simon Ortiz, Ray A. Youngbear, Jim Barnes and Diane Glancy. In Betty Louise Bell's *Faces in the Moon* (1994), about the put-upon lives of the two Oklahoma-Cherokee Evers sisters, Lucy Evers seeks out her family-tribal history at the Oklahoma Historical Society only to be met with a supercilious white male assistant. Her riposte speaks hugely—"I am your worst nightmare. I am an Indian with a pen." Canons might be said to rise and fall by implication.

Afro-America yields its own indispensable history and resources of literary voice over a span from the sale of "Twenty Negars" brought from West Africa via the Caribbean to Virginia in 1619 to the inauguration of President Barack Obama in January 2009. The stunning eventfulness of that history could hardly not invite en-wording. The benchmarks compel, from slaveholding and abolition to the Great Migration into Harlem and the northern cities, and from Dixie segregation to King's "I Have a Dream" and Malcolm X. Who could doubt the utter importance of Jazz, Blues, Soul, and Rock and Roll, together with all the different contours of black popular style in dress, foodways, sport, performance, and speech? More to the immediate point, who does not now look to African American authorship for a gallery as full as it is diverse in written voice? It would be almost perversely negligent to imagine a 'canonical' America that took little or no account of this cultural as much as political history.

The urge to voice has its own necessary lineage, no doubt born of slavery-time and won against the coercive voicelessness both of southern colour-line and northern metropolis. Frederick Douglass's *Narrative* (1845), its subtitle of *Written by Himself* itself a call to attention, speaks trenchantly of illiteracy as its own servitude and of command of the written word as "the pathway from slavery to freedom". Richard Wright, in whose *Native Son* (1945) twentieth-century Afro-fiction looks to one of its great neo-realist landmarks, offers a connecting thread in the Chicago section of his autobiography *American Hunger* (post. 1977), the follow-up to *Black Boy* (1945):

Each Saturday morning I assisted a young Jewish doctor in slitting the vocal cords of a fresh batch of dogs from the city pound. The object was to devocalize the dogs so that their howls would not disturb the patients in other parts of the hospital.... [T]hey would lift their heads to the ceiling and gape in a soundless wail. The sight became lodged in my imagination as a symbol of silent suffering. (1977, 48)

Freedom, voice, imagination: the terms give rubric to the vast literary articulation of black America. Denial of canonical access, however longstanding, could not last.

As in Native tradition, oral resource comes richly into play—folk legends, call and response, the dozens, and comedy stand-up to modern rap. Slave narrative, well more than a thousand recovered texts, offers a point of departure. But the tradition necessarily embraces the

New Negro or Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, with luminaries to include Langston Hughes, Jean Toomer, Claude McKay, Countee Cullen and Zora Neale Hurston, a subsequent line of poetry from Gwendolyn Brooks to Rita Dove, Wright himself and his fellow mid-century writers, and an activist discursive tradition from W.E.B. DuBois to Cornel West. The modern African American pantheon raises every further question as to canonical inclusion and exclusion.

Ralph Ellison's *Invisible Man* (1952) sets one standard, the South-to-Harlem peregrination of its unnamed narrator full of canny reflexive manoeuvre as to black word on the white page. The essays of James Baldwin, inaugurated with *Notes of a Native Son* (1955), bespeak rarest articulacy, typically "Stranger in the Village" ("This world is white no longer, and it never will be again"). Almost single-handedly LeRoi Jones/Imamu Amiri Baraka's *Dutchman* (1964), set in the circling Manhattan subway as "the flying underbelly of the nation", gave black theatre a version of slavery's Underground Railway updated, a symbolist, iconic portrait of 'race' in the US. In *The Color Purple* (1982), Alice Walker created her 'womanist' classic, the epistolary novel of black female autonomy enacted as both Africa and African American story. The Nobel laureateship conferred upon Toni Morrison left no doubt that in a novel like *Beloved* (1987), with its "haint" of slavery and en-ghosting of past-into-present, she had written one of America's wholly consequential fictions.

No one summary does justice overall, but Langston Hughes's "The Negro Speaks of Rivers" carries Afro-America as both spoken and written word, a vintage blues, into any due notion of literary canon:

I've known rivers:

I've known rivers ancient as the world and older than the
flow of human blood in human veins.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

I bathed in the Euphrates when dawns were young.
I built my hut near the Congo and it lulled me to sleep.
I looked upon the Nile and raised the pyramids above it.
I heard the singing of the Mississippi when Abe Lincoln
went down to New Orleans, and I've seen its muddy
bosom turn all golden in the sunset.

I've known rivers:

Ancient, dusk rivers.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

(First published in *Oasis Magazine*, 1921.)

How not to bring into the reckoning Latino/a North America? Whether or not, since estimates vary, it indeed ranks among the largest Spanish-speaking countries in the world, its cultural heft is not to be denied. The complex histories of colonialism, settlement, region, and language have meant that at 13% or so Hispanics constitute the US's largest 'minority'. Which raises the

always-pertinent question of whether a minority writes minority literature. Certainly Latino/a authorship, and to select only from Chicano/a, Puertorriqueño/a, Cuban American and Dominican American, affords ample witness.

Step towards the Chicano/a southwest—Texas (Tejas), California, Arizona, New Mexico (Nuevo Mejico) and Nevada—and the heritage is plait and mix: idioms and code-switches within the interaction of Spanish, English and Nahuatl, mythologies of La Raza and Aztlán, and always the issue of the border and the politics of documented and undocumented. If any one work has done signal literary duty it lies in *Bless Me, Ultima* (1972), Rudolfo Anaya's portrait of the artist as young man and as Joycean and lyric as that designation suggests. The rite of passage it inscribes, involving *curanderismo*, Christian dove, Aztec eagle and deific owl, poignantly calls up a one highly particular life brought to maturity amid the bandwidths of community memory.

The Puertorriqueño dispensation steers between two worlds, Caribbean island and citted New York and New Jersey. Judith Ortiz Cofer's *The Latin Deli and Other Stories* (1993) offers a finely turned case in point, island family memory as against "El Building" with its tenement dynasties. Cuban America has known few more exhilarating narratives than Oscar Hijuelos's *Mambo King Play Songs of Love* (1989), its portrait of the Cuban musician brothers César and Néstor Castillo who bring mambo and 'Latin' sexuality to New York as a kind of pre-Fidel period memory. Julia Alvarez's *How The García Girls Lost Their Accents* (1991) uses its family of sisters to refract in each different story the generational interactions of La República Dominicana and the US, a cautionary tale of Americanization and its gains and losses. These, and the huge roster of accompanying Latino/a texts, serve yet another kind of notice of the folly (not to say inattention) of being excised from any due literary reckoning.

The implications are shrewdly foreshadowed in Carlos Cumpián's poem "Cuento", to be found in *Coyote Sun* (1990):

Today I thought I'd call home
 So I got on the
 Telephone
 and said: "Operator please give me
 AZTLAN person to person"
 She replied: "Sorry sir, still checking"
 After two minutes –
 She asked me to spell it –
 So I did –
 A-Z-T-L-A-N
 She thought I said ICELAND
 At first but after the first spelling, she said
 What?!!
 AZTLAN!
 She said is this some
 Kind of joke
 I said, "No, you
 know where it is"
 She said – "Sir I cannot
 Take this call

But if you wish I'll
 Let you talk to
 My supervisor – "
 I said: "Fine
 Put 'em on
 I got time" –
 Well her supervisor got on the line –
 And I told her what
 I had said before
 All she could say was that
 was the first time she ever heard
 about it – I said, "You'll hear more
 about it soon!" – and hung up – (1990, 45)

Asian America. The composite term hides a multitude of historical lives and migrancies but not the salient fact that by 2050, predictions indicate, the Asian American population will emerge as the largest 'minority' in the US. Nor does it obscure the prospect that mid-century will see an end to any one presiding ethnic group. Once again a run of shorthand terms do duty for historical complexity: Yellow Peril, Orientalism, the 1882 Exclusion Act, Angel Island detention of Chinese, the Asia-phobic 1924 Immigration Act, Executive Order 9066, which in the wake of Pearl Harbor put 120,000 Japanese Americans into internment, together with the long corridors of stereotype, Charlie Chan to Tokyo Rose, pigtail laundryman to High Tech geek, Filipino maid to Korean groceryman. In his *Yellow: Race in America Beyond Black and White* (2002), Frank H. Wu confronts not only model minority notions of Asian America but "honorary whiteness":

People speak of "American" as if it means "white" and "minority" as if it means "black." In that semantic formula, Asian Americans, neither black nor white, consequently are neither American nor minority. (2002, 20)

Literature in all its forms has given answering voice. Chinese America found itself one benchmark in Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts* (1977), California 1960s as both Chinatown and campus radicalism mediated through a fiction-of-fact "Maxine". Amy Tan's *The Joy Luck Club* (1985), using the trope of *mah jong*, explores the lives, and languages, of four mother-daughter pairs to enter the time-space of the China behind Chinese America. Frank Chin's *Bulletproof Buddhists* (1998) takes New Journalist aim at what he perceives as damagingly false American images of China, kow-towing weaklings, sealed and passive sojourners. This roster has infinitely expanded: yet more American literary candidature.

Japanese America yields a span from the storytelling of Toshio Mori's *Yokohama, California* (1949), with its exquisite vignettes of community life, and Hisaye Yamamoto's *Seventeen Syllables* (1989), with its camp and farm-life parables, to a Big Tent novel like Karen Tei Yamashita's *I-Hotel* (2010), with its San Francisco canvas given over to the rise of 1960s Asian identity and activism. Korean America can invoke Chang Rae Lee's *Native Speaker* (1995), a challengingly subtle evocation set in Queens, New York, and under the guise of borough politics, of the very languages of ethnicity. In Jessica Hagedorn's *Dogeaters* (1990),

set in the Marcos years and with Imelda Marcos as Madame Galactica, the Philippines and its American diaspora are seen as playfield, fantasticality. Little wonder Hagedorn would entitle her 1993 anthology *Charlie Chan is Dead*. A greatly useful purchase on all these different imaginative skeins is to be found in the Indian-American memoir of Meena Alexander in her *The Shock of Arrival: Reflections on Postcolonial Experience* (1996):

I learn from Japanese Americans, Korean Americans, Chinese Americans, African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Jewish Americans, Arab Americans ... and my art-work reflects these lines of sense, these multiple anchorages. (1996, 128)

The ‘anchorages’ on offer, precisely, give the challenge to the one prevailing literary canon.

Negotiating so diverse a circuit risks giving into lists and too hasty a survey. But something of the kind becomes almost inevitable in the span of a single essay (as indicated in the references I have elsewhere tried to write at length on the issues and rosters involved). Three touchstones can serve as a means of aligning the arguments in play: an overlap of canonical name, early twentieth-century white-liberal radical, and contemporary African American multiculturalist.

Herman Melville’s *Redburn* (1849) sets out America as bracing human cartography:

You cannot spill a drop of American blood without spilling the blood of the whole world.... We are not a narrow tribe of men.... No, our blood is as the flood of the Amazon, made up of a thousand noble currents pouring into one.... Our ancestry is lost in the universal paternity, and Caesar and Alfred, Paul and Luther, Homer and Shakespeare are as much ours as Washington, who is as much the world’s as our own. (1849, 169).

Randolph Bourne’s “Transnational America” (*Atlantic Monthly* 1916) farsightedly pitches against a metronomic America:

America is a unique sociological fabric, and it bespeaks poverty of imagination not to be thrilled at the incalculable potentialities of so novel a union of men. To seek no other goal than the weary old nationalism, belligerent, exclusive, inbreeding, ... is to make patriotism a hollow sham.... It is for the Younger American to accept this cosmopolitanism and carry it along with self-conscious and fruitful purpose. (1916)

Ishmael Reed’s “Introduction” to *The Before Columbus Foundation Fiction and Anthology* (1992) and *The Before Columbus Foundation Poetry Anthology* (1992) neatly gives contemporary tease to one-note canonicity with its allusion to the multicultural as a form of Darwinian survival:

I began to realize that being black or Chicano or Native American, you are forced to see and be aware of disparate cultures. We had to become multicultural, and I think this will be a major factor in determining who finally survives in this country. It’s like evolution—if you have a limited viewpoint you are at a disadvantage. Those who have incorporated other perspectives and allowed their vision to embrace other ways of looking at the world have a better chance of surviving. (1992, 26–7)

All three writers bear the evidence of an America, and American authorship, as a nation of not one canon but multi-cans, a nation of not one but many multiculturalisms. And all the truly richer and better for it.

References

- Alexander, Meena, *The Shock of Arrival: Reflections on Postcolonial Experience*, Boston: South End Press, 1996.
- Allen, Theodore, *The Invention of the White Race, Vol. 1, Racial Oppression and Social Control*, Vol. 1. New York: New York and London: Verso, 1994.
- , *The Invention of the White Race: Vol. 2, The Origins of Racial Oppression in Anglo-America*, New York and London: Verso, 1997.
- Alvarez, Julia, *How The García Girls Lost Their Accents*, Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books, 1991.
- Anaya, Rudolfo, *Bless Me, Ultima*, Berkeley: Quinto Sol Publications, 1972.
- Apess, William, *A Son of the Forest: The Experience of William Apess*, self-published, 1829.
- Babb, Valerie, *Whiteness Visible: The Meaning of Whiteness in American Literature and Culture*, New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Baldwin, James, *Notes of a Native Son*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- Bell, Betty Louise, *Faces in the Moon*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1994.
- Bloom, Alan, *The Closing of the American Mind*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- Brooks, Van Wyck, *The Flowering of New England, 1815–1865*, New York: E.P. Dutton, 1936.
- Bourne, Randolph S., “Transnational America,” *Atlantic Monthly*, 97, 1916. Reprinted in Randolph S. Bourne, *War and the Intellectuals: Collected Essays 1915–1919*, New York: Harper, 1964.
- Chin, Frank, *Bulletproof Buddhists*, Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1998.
- Cofer, Judith Ortiz, *The Latin Deli: Poetry and Prose*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1993.
- Cumpían, Carlos, *Coyote Sun*, Chicago: MARCH/Abrazo Press, 1991.
- Deloria, Vine, *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*, New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Douglass, Frederick, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, An American Slave, Written by Himself*, Boston: The American Anti-Slavery Society, 1845.
- D’Sousa, Dinesh, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on the Campus*, New York: Maxwell, 1999.
- Ellison, Ralph, *Invisible Man*, New York: Random House, 1952.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher, *Was Huck Black? Mark Twain and African American Voices*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Fitzgerald, Scott, *The Great Gatsby*, New York: Scribner, 1925.
- Franklin, Benjamin, *Autobiography, 1771–90*, New York: Norton, 1986.
- Gadarphé, Fred L., *Italian Signs, American Streets: The Evolution of Italian American Literature*, Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1996.
- Gates, Henry Louis, Jr., *Loose Canons: Notes on the Culture Wars*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Hagedorn, Jessica, ed. *Charlie Chan is Dead: An Anthology of Contemporary Asian American Fiction*, New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- , *Dog eaters*, New York: Random House, 1990.
- Hijuelos, Oscar, *The Mambo Kings Play Songs of Love*, New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1989.
- Ignatiev, Noel, *How the Irish Became White*, New York: Routledge, 1995.
- James, Henry, *Hawthorne*, London: Macmillan, 1879.

- Jones, LeRoi/Imamu Amiri Baraka, *Dutchman* and *The Slave*, New York: William Morrow, 1964.
- Kesey, Ken, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, New York: Viking Press, 1962.
- King, Desmond, *Making Americans: Immigration, Race, and the Origins of Diverse Democracy*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Kingston, Maxine Hong, *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts*, New York: Vintage Books, 1977.
- Lee, Chang-rae, *Native Speaker*, New York: Riverhead Books, 1955.
- Lee, A. Robert, ed. *US Latino/a Writing*, Vols. I–IV, Introduction, 1–22. Chronology and Bibliography, i–cxv, London, New York and Tokyo, Routledge/Editions Synapse, 2014.
- , ed. *African American Writing*, Vols I–V, Introduction, 1–42. Chronology and Bibliography, i–clxxiii. London, New York and Tokyo: Routledge/Editions Synapse, 2013.
- , ed. *Native American Writing*, Vols. I–IV, Introduction, 1–23, Chronology and Bibliography, i–cx, London, New York and Tokyo: Routledge/Editions Synapse, 2011.
- , *Modern American Counter Writing: Beats, Outriders, Ethnics*, New York and London: Routledge, 2010.
- , *Multicultural American Literature: Comparative Black, Native, Latino/a and Asian American Fictions*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, and Jackson: University Press of Mississippi Press, 2003.
- , *Designs of Blackness: Mappings in the Literature and Culture of Afro-America*, London and Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press, 1998.
- Levine, Lawrence W., *The Opening of the American Mind: Canons, Culture, and History*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1996.
- Lippman, Walter, *Public Opinion*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1922.
- Liu, Eric, *The Accidental Asian: Notes of a Native Speaker*, New York: Random House, 1998.
- Matthiessen, F.O., *The American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1941.
- Melville, Herman, *Redburn*, New York: Harper, 1849. Chicago: Northwestern Newberry Edition, 1969, 169.
- Momaday, Scott, *House Made of Dawn*, New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Mori, Toshio, *Yokohama, California*, Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton 1949.
- Morrison, Toni, *Beloved*, New York: Knopf, 1987.
- Mumford, Lewis, *The Golden Day: A Study in American Experience and Culture*, New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.
- Reed Ishmael (ed.), *MultiAmerica: Essays on Cultural Wars and Cultural Peace*, New York: Penguin Books, 1996.
- (ed.) et al, *The Before Columbus Foundation Fiction Anthology: Selections from the American Book Awards, 1980–1990*, New York: Norton, 1992.
- (ed.) et al, *The Before Columbus Foundation Poetry Anthology: Selections from the American Book Awards, 1980–1990*, New York: Norton, 1992.
- Reynolds, David, *Beneath the American Renaissance: The Subversive Imagination in the Age of Emerson and Melville*, New York: Knopf, 1988.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon, *Almanac of the Dead*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.
- Standing Bear, Luther, *My People The Sioux*, 1928. Reprinted Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 1852. New York: Norton, 2007.

- Tan, Amy, *The Joy Luck Club*, New York: Random House, 1989.
- Twain, Mark, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, 1884. New York: Norton, 1977.
- Vizenor, Gerald, *Crossbloods: Bone Courts, Bingo, and Other Reports*, Hanover, New Hampshire: University of New England Press, 1990.
- , *Darkness in Saint Louis Bearheart*, Minneapolis: Truck Press, 1979. Revised as *Bearheart: The Heirship Chronicles*, Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Walker, Alice, *The Color Purple*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
- Welch, James, *Fools Crow*, New York: Viking, 1986.
- Wright, Richard, *American Hunger* (post.), New York: Harper, 1977.
- , *Black Boy*, New York: Harper, 1945.
- , *Native Son*, New York: Harper, 1945.
- Wu, Frank, *Yellow: Race in America Beyond Black and White*, New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Yamamoto, Hisaye, *Seventeen Syllables and Other Stories*, Latham, New York: Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press, 1988.

Contact A. Robert Lee: arobertlee@gol.com

Power in Modernization of Language and Literature in Eighteenth-century Britain and Modern Japan

Noriyuki Harada

Abstract

In the process of modernization, we can observe in general a shift of the written form of each language to adapt to the written culture of the new society. Both in eighteenth-century Britain and in nineteenth-century Japan, the initial phase of the shift was carried out by private individuals like authors, journalists and translators. Then, the written form invented by them became public and contributed to making canons through print culture and education. Examining comparatively the process of modernization and the shift of written language in both countries, this paper will discuss the transformation of the power of individual men of letters and some of the damage accompanying modernization of society and language, taking the post-modern situation of the twenty-first century into account.

Keywords: modernization, written language and culture, private and public spheres, eighteenth-century Britain, nineteenth-century Japan

In teaching classes of English language and literature in Japanese universities, I often refer to some characteristic aspects observed both in the history of the English language and that of Japanese, in order to encourage in students an objective view of their mother tongue. In particular, the shift of the written form of each language in the course of modernization is of special interest. Without the shift or improvement of the written form of language, the products of modern language—accurate documentation of political, economic, historical, or scientific events and phenomena, journalism, novels, biographies, and encyclopedias—that all feature in modern society would have been impossible to be effectively expressed, described, and accumulated. In this paper, I'd like to examine comparatively the shift in the written form of language in eighteenth-century Britain and that in mid-nineteenth-century Japan, and discuss the nature of the power of modernization of language and society, taking the post-modern situation of the twenty-first century into account.

1. The Power of Written Language—Modernization and Print Culture in Early Modern Britain

It was in the late seventeenth century that print culture obviously came to be influential in Britain after the revolutions. Certainly, as Keith Thomas states, “oral communication remained central” even in this period, “whether as speeches in parliament, pleadings in the lawcourts, teaching in the schools, or preaching and catechizing in church.” “Despite their reliance on the Bible and the Prayer Book,” he goes on, “the clergy still expected their flock to learn their article of belief by heart and to listen to spoken sermons” (1986, p. 113). The importance of orality in modern society is also mentioned by Jürgen Habermas in association with the concept of the “public sphere.” Tracing the progress of British print culture in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Habermas claims the importance of oral culture observed, for example, in coffeehouse discussion in early eighteenth-century London (1989, p. 42). However, the emergence of print culture was not so unnoticeable, nor was it so harmonious with “oral communication.” In fact, it should be noted that the Royal Society of London, founded in 1660, held up the improvement of written English as one of its most urgent tasks and intended to make a new written form. Thomas Sprat, a founding member of the society, records the society's enthusiasm:

And, in few words, I dare say; that of all the Studies of men, nothing may be sooner obtained, than this vicious abundance of *Phrase*, this trick of *Metaphors*, this volubility of *Tongue*, which makes so great a noise in the World. . . .

They [the members of the Royal Society] have therefore been most rigorous in putting in execution the

only Remedy that can be found for this *extravagance*: and that has been, a constant resolution, to reject all the amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style; to return back to the primitive purity, and shortness, when men deliver'd so many *things*, almost in an equal number of *words*. They have exacted from all their members, a close, naked, natural way of speaking; positive expressions; clear senses; a native easiness: bringing all things as near the Mathematical plainness as they can; and preferring the language of Artizans, Countrymen, and Merchants, before that, of Wits or Scholars. (1667, pp. 112–113)

Similar to Italian and French royal academies, the Royal Society of London was well aware of the necessity of improving written English. Without a written language that can bring “all things as near the Mathematical plainness as they can,” the basis of modernization—the progress and accumulation of knowledge in natural sciences as well as in social sciences—could not have been formed at all.

Unfortunately, however, the Royal Society suffered in the plague and the great fire of London in the 1660s, and the royal or national project died out. The task of the improvement was naturally given into the private hands of eighteenth-century British authors, journalists, scholars and lexicographers. This is one of the characteristic points observed in the process of the improvement of written English; different from the situation in France and Italy, written English was substantially improved by the strenuous efforts of individual talents.

2. Improvement of Written English—Power of Private Hands

So then, what problems did eighteenth-century British people commonly have with their written English? We can point out at least two serious difficulties. One of them is, as Thomas Sprat claims, the stylistic problem of “amplifications, digressions, and swellings” with which we can easily characterize the euphuistic prose in the seventeenth century. But the other was more serious in basic writing and communication: the chaotic situation of orthography. A story from *The Tatler*, one of the most popular periodicals at the origin of British journalism, well shows the situation:

Many a Man has lost his Way and his Dinner by this great Want of Skill in Orthography: For, considering that the Painters are usually so very bad, that you cannot know the Animal under whose Sign you are to live that Day, How must the Stranger be misled, if it be wrong spell'd, as well as ill painted? I have a Cousin now in Town, who has answer'd under *Batchellor* at *Queen's College*, whose Name is *Humphrey Mopstaff*. . . . This young Man going to see Relation in *Barbekin*, wander'd a whole Day by the Mistake of one Letter; for it was written, *This is the BEER*, instead of, *This is the BEAR*. He was set right at last, by enquiring for the House, of a Fellow who could not read, and knew the Place mechanically only by having

been often drunk there. (Vol. 1, pp. 145–146)

The author of this article is Richard Steel, a Whig statesman and essayist, and his narration is even humorous. But the problem was serious; without established orthography, we cannot communicate properly by written language. Written documents, records, journalism, novels and print culture are virtually impossible without orthography.

After the failure of the project of the Royal Society, the improvement of written English was finally left in the hands of individual authors and lexicographers. English dictionaries published in the early eighteenth century show that the problematic orthography was gradually settled; authors and journalists like Daniel Defoe, Jonathan Swift, Samuel Richardson and Henry Fielding were all trying hard to find a suitable style in their works. Different from France and Italy where prerogative authorities promulgated refined written forms of the language, modernization of written English owes much to the collective power of individual authors and scholars. And in this process, the language seems to have acquired diversity, flexibility, and popularity, different from prerogative-oriented standardization. Written English in private hands was now ready as the apt tool for written communication that was essential for modernization of the society.

3. Private to Public—Accumulation of Knowledge and Formation of Canon

Print culture based on the modernized, or improved, written English was now an important driving force for accumulation of knowledge in the collective forms of printed texts. The rapid development of written culture in eighteenth-century Britain took a unique route and helped to form the social and literary canons, having a great impact on the modernization of British society.

As mentioned above, we can regard *The Tatler* and *The Spectator*, both of which were published in early eighteenth-century London by Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, as the most important origins of British periodicals, or journalism.¹ Their neutrality of content and language, and their objective distance from the twists and turns of the actualities of society, attracted a wide readership. Interestingly, these qualities that *The Tatler* and *The Spectator* offered for journalistic publication were succeeded not by private hands but by a collective form of individual authors. *The Gentleman's Magazine*, published from 1731 to 1914, is one of the most typical periodicals that used such a collective form. Edward Cave, the founder of the monthly periodical, states in the preface to the first issue of the magazine that he dares to

¹ According to the *OED*, the word “journalism” does not seem to have been used in English until 1833, though the word was described as “sadly wanted” in its first example.

transform the meaning of the word “Magazine,” which originally meant a storehouse or a warehouse, into a repository, or a collection, of various subjects and information. And what Cave tried to do for the publication was not to write an enterprising article by himself, nor to imitate simply the neutrality and objective distance observed in Addison’s and Steele’s essays, but to collect the articles appearing in other periodicals, select, and edit them in a well-balanced way. Though it seems quite simple, Cave’s method substantially improved upon the merits of *Tatler* and *The Spectator*, and came to be the basis of the modern journalism on which John Walter’s *The Daily Universal Register* (later *The Times*) was based upon its first publication in 1785. We can observe here an interesting route for creation of knowledge in modern society—knowledge created by accumulation of information.

Needless to say, accumulation of knowledge can be observed in many other genres of eighteenth-century British print culture; among them were modern editions of Shakespeare’s plays which were published one after another from the early eighteenth century to the first variorum edition of 1821; Samuel Johnson’s *Dictionary*, which was, as mentioned above, considered to be an arbiter of the long controversy of English orthography; *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, whose first edition was published in 1771; and Alexander Chalmer’s famous anthologies of British essayists, novelists, and poets, which were published in the early nineteenth century. And what should be noted in those many examples is that the accumulation of knowledge gradually forms canons or criteria for knowledge, learning, and literary or aesthetic works. Samuel Johnson’s *Lives of the English Poets*, published from 1779 to 1781, is, for example, a production of Johnson’s idiosyncratic writing, but nevertheless is regarded as the first collection of critical biographies of English poets, and greatly helped to form English literary canons. Alvin Kernan says of this that “Johnson’s real achievements in *The Lives*” is to combine “the hitherto scattered pieces of English literary lore” and to work them “into a structure of biography, social history, and criticism sufficiently firm to constitute for the first time a history of English letters” (1987). And we should not forget that, in concurrence with the trend of publication of language dictionaries, literary anthologies, and encyclopedias, national, regional, private, or circulating libraries were built one after another; they well symbolized the importance of accumulation of knowledge and formation of canons. Now, the improvement of written English wrought by private hands or individual talents had a great influence on the public sphere.

4. Language and Modernization in Nineteenth-century Japan

The publication of collective forms thus became an influential direction taken by British society in the late eighteenth century and nineteenth century. Interestingly, Victorian Britain

was one of the important Western models that the people of a certain Far Eastern country tried to introduce in the process of modernization. Japan secluded itself from the world for more than two centuries, from 1639 to 1854, and it was when Japan reopened the country that its people really got involved in international contacts.

One of the biggest problems Japanese people faced when they tried to communicate with Western people and modernize the country in step with Western countries was undoubtedly the language. Japanese language is in many ways unlike every language of the Indo-European family; its vocabulary is different and the grammar is quite distinct. And yet, the improvement of the written form was the most urgent task in Japan at the time, as in early eighteenth-century Britain, because written language played a more important role in the explanation of a great variety of imports and documents.

Different from the confusion of orthography in early modern Britain, the most serious problem in written Japanese was to fill the gap between its written and spoken forms. The writing systems of Japanese language chiefly consist of *kanji* and *kana*, both of which were based on Chinese characters that came down to Japan in the early fifth century. There had been no substantial written system indigenous to Japan before the import of Chinese characters. As the Japanese language was quite different from Chinese in terms of pronunciation and grammar, Japanese people, first of all, needed to give their pronunciation to each Chinese character. Then, in the process of assimilation of the Chinese characters, Japanese people divided the function of the characters mainly into two parts: one for simply expressing Japanese pronunciation and the other for substantives of things and concepts. The characters for the former function gradually shifted into *kana* and those for the latter continued to be used as *kanji* in Japan as in China, though their pronunciation was different and their meanings were gradually Japanized over many centuries. Japan's close relationship with China of course continued after the introduction of Chinese characters; Buddhist scriptures, political systems, and many products of culture were imported from China. Throughout the relationship, *kanji* characters were convenient: Buddhist scriptures, for example, were directly introduced in the form of Chinese characters, and Japanese Buddhists simply gave them Japanese pronunciation and some grammatically supportive alterations in order to make them understandable for Japanese people.

Thus, until the middle of the nineteenth century, two writing systems had been used in Japan: *kanbun*, which mainly consists of *kanji* characters, and the *wabun* of *kana*. The former was used in the main in scriptures, philosophical (and mainly Confucian) writings, laws, edicts, official documents, and histories, and the grammar of *kanbun* was, though fairly Japanized, yet different from spoken Japanese. In other words, many people could read

kanbun, but sentences in *kanbun* were quite different from their spoken language. Some children learned famous passages of *kanbun* by heart to absorb highbrow culture, but the passages were spoken only as quotations in daily conversation. Therefore, *kanbun* was a typical written language and, in a sense, it was like Latin for modern Europeans. On the other hand, *wabun* was used as the written form for daily conversation and popular culture. What many children learned in academies was *wabun* that was enough for their daily life, and the number of children who moved up to the education of *kanbun* was limited. Of course, over many centuries, the two writing systems were gradually mixed, and in particular, from the early nineteenth century, popular stories written in the form of *wakan-konkōbun* (a mixed written form of *wabun* and *kanbun*) were successively published by popular novelists like Ikku Jippensha and Bakin Kyokutei.² And yet, *kanbun* still remained persistent at the time of the reopening. In fact, the language owed its enormous vocabulary of substantives, ideographic visibility, and the capacity to invent new words to *kanji* characters; *wabun* could not fully express the religious, philosophical, and political concepts and entities that had been highly dependent upon *kanji*.

However, the situation was clearly disadvantageous when Japanese people tried to absorb new sciences, technology, and culture of Western origin. It is certain that *kanji* has an excellent ability to invent new words for new concepts, making use of existing characters, but *kanbun* is different from spoken Japanese, and making *kanbun* for each newly imported event and thing was obviously inconvenient. *Kanbun* had been convenient partly because Japanese people could import the contents of Chinese books, keeping them intact. But the situation had now changed.

The most practical solution to the problem was to establish a new written form by harmonizing *kanbun* and *wabun* with reference to *wakan-konkōbun*, which was increasing its power among popular stories and the early stages of journalism. This movement is now called *Genbun-itchi-undō* (the movement for the harmonization of spoken and written language), and we should notice here that the movement was carried forward at least in its early phase not by governmental enforcement but in the private hands of individual authors, scholars, journalists, and translators. After the short period of frantic scrambling to imitate and adapt *wakan-konkōbun* before and after the reopening, Shōyō Tsubouchi, who was a novelist and translator and became a professor of Waseda University, newly founded in 1882, published *Shōsetsu-shinzui* (*The Essence of the Novel*, 1885–86) and showed the importance of a written language that reflected the daily conversation of the common people. Consulting with

² Ikku Jippensha published *Tōkaidōchū-hizakurige* (*Travels of Tōkaidō*) in 1802, and Bakin Kyokutei published *Nansō-satomi-hakkenden* (*The Adventures of the Eight Samurais of Nansō*) from 1814–1842. Both were called *gesaku* (popular novels) and spread widely among common readers.

Tsubouchi about possible Japanese written forms, Shimei Futabatei published *Ukigumo* (*Floating Clouds*, 1887–89) and other novels, referring especially to some spoken narratives of *rakugoka* (popular story tellers) like Enchō San'yūtei. Following Futabatei, Bimyō Yamada, Kōyō Ozaki, Ōgai Mori, Sōseki Natsume, and many others successively published novels and translations in a new written form and contributed to the establishment of the new written Japanese.

It is interesting to note here that, though written Japanese finally changed into a modern style, the route was complicated and filled with the twists and turns of individual authors and translators. For example, Samuel Johnson's *Rasselas* (1759), one of the popular stories read among the students of high schools and universities at the time, was translated into Japanese six times from its first translation in 1886 to the fairly readable version in 1905. In the progress of the translation, we can clearly observe that each translator groped for a suitable written form; old forms like *kanbun* and *wakan-konkōbun* were sometimes used, and other times strange new forms different from normative Japanese grammar appeared. The 1905 version is undoubtedly the result of every translator's desperate trial and error.³

After the initial stage of the *Genbun-itchi-undō* in private hands, new written language came to be used officially in the government and the authorized form was widely spread through the textbooks of primary education. In other words, the new written form became public, as in Britain.⁴ However, its amazingly rapid development contained some problems. As the new written Japanese was invented under the necessity of the quick absorption of the items, technology, and concepts of Western origin, it inevitably included some unnatural words newly invented for translation. Japanese people in general now use the word *jiyū*, which was newly invented in the process of the *Genbun-itchi-undō* for the English words "freedom" and "liberty," but they do not usually differentiate them. The concepts of Western "society" and "individual," too, were introduced in the middle of the nineteenth century and the equivalent Japanese words were hastily invented, but they were separated from traditional

³ For more detail, see Noriyuki Harada, "Translation and Transformation: Japanese Reception and Adaptation of Eighteenth-Century English Literature," in *Essays and Studies in British and American Literature* (Tokyo Woman's Christian University) 58 (2012), pp. 1–22.

⁴ It should not be overlooked that the swift change of printing style was helpful for the wide spread of the new written form. Although woodblock printing was popular before the reopening of the country, Japanese printers succeeded in changing their system to movable-type printing, accommodating many *kanji* characters. Woodblock printing had a limit to the number of copies printed by one typesetting; printers needed to repeat typesetting many times especially for bestsellers like popular novels and textbooks. In order to satisfy common readers' curiosity and desire for new knowledge and information of Western origin, printers now needed to print a large number of copies in one typesetting. As an example of the number of printed copies of a book, *Saigoku-risshihen* (1872), a translation of Samuel Smiles's *Self-Help* (1859) and one of the most popular books of the time, is often mentioned; it sold one million copies up until the end of the nineteenth century.

concepts in Japan. Certainly, these are examples of problems of Japanese vocabulary itself and not of the written form, but it is not too far from the truth to say that the Japanese modernization of written language caused serious simplification of vocabulary. Scientific inventions can be exhibited in general as the actual things; people can deliver things “almost in an equal number of words,” as the Royal Society of London thought in the late seventeenth century. But if we translate new ideas and concepts of society into a thoroughly different language, we cannot avoid simplification or substitution to some degree.

More serious for modern Japanese people was that the new written form involved separation from the long history and products of traditional written language. In fact, almost all Japanese classics, not only in *kanbun* but also *wakan-konkōbun*, produced before the modernization are now unintelligible for many people. It is certain that new knowledge was accumulated in numerous books, periodicals, and textbooks printed in the new written form, but such accumulation was made at the expense of traditional culture fostered by books and documents in the old written form. In particular, as the scientific aspect of modernization was instrumental in the *Genbun-itchi-undō*, the new written form was fatally defective in inheriting sentiments written in the old form. Mitsuo Nakamura, one of the twentieth century’s leading Japanese critics, criticizes the *Genbun-itchi-undō* and says that the movement “corrupts the tradition of the written Japanese itself” (1971, p. 17).

Changes in written language can be observed as common to many countries in the process of modernization. In particular, both in Britain and in Japan, a large number of private individuals took the initiative of the movement in its first phase, and then the new written form became public through print culture and education. However, the modernization of Japanese written language also caused damage to the language, partly because it was carried out under the necessity of Westernization and partly because of the exigencies of scientific and technological demands. Both of the causes might be due to the timing of the modernization of society: Britain achieved modernization comparatively earlier than other countries, while Japan was a latecomer. But before drawing such a hasty conclusion, we need to hear the voice of an early eighteenth-century Anglo-Irish author.

5. An Irony—The Power of Individuality in Modernization

In the modernization of written language in Britain and in Japan, one of the important points to note is that the product of the strenuous efforts of private individuals became public and formed a new canon. In other words, the diversity observed in making a new written form was finally brought together into an authoritative uniformity. Thus in the process of modernization, does the power of individual talents finally come down to that of its public manifestation?

Further, is the initial diversity produced by the power of private individuals forced to fade away?

Jonathan Swift, an author famous for his *Gulliver's Travels*, would answer “no” to these questions, for he was always critical about compelling the standardization of culture and society and hated the absurd rationalization, or integration, of various humane idiosyncrasies. In language, too, he loved diversity rather than uniformity, and made great satirical works with complicated allusions. In *Gulliver's Travels*, he severely criticizes the attempts of language professors at the academy of Balnibarbi, which obviously overlap with the advocacy of the Royal Society of London:

The first Project was to shorten Discourse by cutting Polysyllables into one, and leaving out Verbs and Participles; because in Reality all things imaginable are but Nouns.

The other, was a Scheme for entirely abolishing all Words whatsoever: And this was urged as a great Advantage in Point of Health as well as Brevity. For, it is plain, that every Word we speak is in some Degree a Diminution of our Lungs by Corrosion; and consequently contributes to the shortening of our Lives. An Expedient was therefore offered, that since Words are only Names for *Things*, it would be more convenient for all Men to carry about them, such *Things* as were necessary to express the particular Business they are to discourse on. . . .

Another great Advantage proposed by this Invention, was, that it would serve as an universal Language to be understood in all civilized Nations, whose Goods and Utensils are generally of the same Kind, or nearly resembling, so that their Uses might easily be comprehended. And thus, Embassadors would be qualified to treat with foreign Princes or Ministers of State, to whose Tongues they were utter Strangers. (2012, pp. 270–273)

But the new scheme of the professors of the academy was obviously unrealistic. Swift never forgets to describe its result derisively:

[The new Scheme of expressing themselves by Things] hath only this Inconvenience attending it; that if a Man's Business be very great, and of various Kinds, he must be obliged in Proportion to carry a greater Bundle of Things upon his Back, unless he can afford one or two strong Servants to attend him. (Ibid, p. 272)

The description is humorous, but Swift's skepticism toward the easy equation of language with things was deep. Of course, as a distinguished man of letters he disliked “amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style” in written English. But at the same time, he also disliked

standardization, or reduction, of the ample ambiguity that language can express. We have discussed the standardization of written language in the process of modernization and have observed that this standardization was advanced by private individuals and then became public and formed the basis of canons. But now we can hear an important objection from an author whose work has been beloved continually since from its first publication in the early eighteenth century. If the ending of *Gulliver's Travels*, Gulliver's expulsion from the Huyhnhnms' land, suggests the author's misanthropy, an ending foretelling a catastrophe, genocide, or collapse of human society after modernization, as some critics actually point out,⁵ diversity, rather than uniformity, was for Swift the real power, and the modernization observed in the standardization of language and culture was only a degradation of the power of individuals.

Swift's satire reminds us of early voices of skepticism about modernization of language. And yet, modernization in general advanced in spite of his fear, and Japan desperately tried to catch up with the modernized countries. In the process, Japanese people were impelled to harmonize their written and spoken language, or to simplify their written language, but the *Genbun-itchi-undō* came to damage the written language; in Swiftian terms, we may say, the damage was in the end one of the inevitable consequences of modernization itself. Thinking of Swift's satire in *Gulliver's Travels*, we need, first of all, to reexamine the complicated, and sometimes contradictory, relationship between the power of private individuals and that of public standardization in the process of modernization. An ideal form of power in the modernization of language and culture will be found in the harmonization of individual efforts and their effective organization, something to which the postmodern world should give careful consideration.

⁵ See, for example, Claude Rawson, *God, Gulliver and Genocide: Barbarism and the European Imagination, 1492–1945* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001).

References

- Habermas, Jürgen (1989), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. Originally published as *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit* in 1962.
- Kernan, Alvin (1987), *Printing Technology, Letters, and Samuel Johnson*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Nakamura, Mitsuo, *Kotoba no geijutsu [The Art of Language]* (1971). Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Sprat, Thomas (1667), *The History of the Royal Society of London, for the Improving of Natural Knowledge*. London.
- Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (2012), ed. David Womersley, *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift 16*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.
- The Tatler*, vol. 1 (1987), ed. Donald F. Bond. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Thomas, Keith (1986), "The Meaning of Literacy in Early Modern England", in *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition*, ed. Gerd Baumann. Oxford: Clarendon.

Contact Noriyuki Harada: nnharada@bd5.so-net.ne.jp

“Go and Teach All Nations”: A British Missionary’s Narrative on China in the 1840s

Paul C. Corrigan

Abstract

Texts in the genre of travel writing provide description and analysis of the author’s journeys and destinations. A variety of foci exists among texts in the genre, including accounts of explorations, personal narratives, or military memoirs. This article discusses Rev. George Smith’s *A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to Each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan, Church Missionary Society, In the Years 1844, 1845, 1846* as an example of a missionary narrative, a sub-genre of travel writing, embodying features of British imperial ideology.

Smith’s *Narrative* contributed to the discursive formation of China in the minds of people at the imperial center of London and probably other centers. His account and commentary of his travels to China in the early years of Hong Kong’s colonial history helped to foster the imperial meaning-making process. Written in a time of stable classifications of knowledge gleaned from the British imperial project, Smith’s travel writing affirms, consolidates, and incrementally expands features of the British imperialist ideology. Building on existing structures and employing the rhetorical and discursive strategy of binary oppositions, Smith’s *Narrative* depicted China as an inferior culture and Britain as superior to others and with a divine mission. Whereas China was dark and pagan, British civilization was enlightened and Christian. A hierarchy emerges where Britain is positioned above all others in terms of culture, religion, medicine, military technology, and law.

Keywords: travel writing, missionary narratives, China, British imperialism, ideology

Travel writing depicts and explains the journeys and destinations of an author. Texts in this literary genre include accounts of explorations, personal narratives, self-reflection, historical accounts of the places visited, missionary or military accounts, and comparisons with epic quests. Youngs (2013, p. 57) asserts that missionary writing in particular “may be seen as another subgenre of travel writing” and that the nineteenth century was “the age of the missionary narrative.” The production of these missionaries’ “profoundly hybrid genres” (Johnston, 2003, p. 32) presented a unique contribution to what Richards calls “the imperial archive” (1993, p. 7), a kind of complete “epistemological complex for representing a comprehensive knowledge within the domain of Empire” (ibid, p. 14). The “evangelical Protestant revival in Britain in the late eighteenth century” (ibid, p. 14) was articulated in the establishment of missionary societies like the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and the London Missionary Society (LMS), founded in 1799 and 1795 respectively (Youngs, 2013, p. 57), making possible this missionary activity and literary production and coinciding with the beginning of what Bayly (1998, p. 54) recounts as “the second British Empire of the period 1783–1869”. When Rev. George Smith travelled to China in the 1840s, it was a period of ascendancy for the second British Empire. In 36 chapters and more than 500 pages, Smith’s *A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to Each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan, Church Missionary Society, In the Years 1844, 1845, 1846* (1847; hereafter *Narrative*; unattributed page numbers refer to this work) synthesized imperialist travel writing and missionary narrative with discourse found in military memoirs. The high degree of integration of imperialist and missionary purposes expressed in his writing is evident, for example, when he states that

empire is closely connected with the diffusion of evangelical truth, a British Missionary feels jealous for the faithfulness of his country to her high vocation, and ‘rejoices with trembling’¹ at the extension of the colonial empire. (P. 506)

In addition, throughout his *Narrative* Smith repeats “Go and teach all nations,”² a New Testament verse which in his writing fuses the religious and imperialist impulses. The military capability which underpinned the British imperial project is also found in Smith, such as in his boast of British military prowess throughout his *Narrative* and in his explicitly military metaphor for missionary work: “The warfare must be carried into the enemy’s country. The battle of Christianity must be fought on the soil of China itself” (p. 521).

¹ Smith borrows this phrase from the Old Testament; see Psalms, 2:11.

² Smith borrows this phrase from the New Testament; see the Gospel of Matthew, 28:19

Smith's book is of particular interest for a couple of reasons. As his voyage covered the years immediately after the establishment of Hong Kong as a British Colony and the period when the so-called treaty ports on the China coast were first opened to European Powers, it is one of the earliest examples of this kind of travel writing in the colonial period of Hong Kong. It is also of interest as it was available as a template for subsequent travel writing. The enduring influence of some of its discourse may even prove to be discernable in the production of some of the travel guides for the 57 million persons UNWTO (2014) estimates visited China last year. And with its provision of empirical detail to a reading audience in want of such detail for this phase of the unfolding British imperial project, Smith's *Narrative* can be seen as serving a function which Smethurst (2009, p. 7) describes as existing "between the world of experience and accumulated knowledge—between the empirical and imperial." In turn, this 'accumulated knowledge' found in Smith's work and others constituted what Richards calls the 'imperial archive', a sort of "paper empire" (1993, p. 4), exhibiting Victorian confidence "that knowledge could be controlled and controlling" (ibid, p. 7). The frequent and straightforward classifications of that newly created knowledge as binary opposites in Smith's writing from this second wave of British Empire were consonant with what Richards (1993) says were attempts in the first half of the nineteenth century to neatly order information in taxonomies. By the second half of the nineteenth century, ordering new knowledge gleaned from the far reaches of the empire into taxonomies became recognized as unfeasible, and "by century's end 'classified' had come to mean knowledge placed under the special jurisdiction of the state" (ibid, p. 6). Straightforward comparisons by a writer such as Smith in the first decades of the nineteenth century became less tenable a few decades later; as Johnston notes, "[u]nfortunately for the missionaries, attitudes towards evangelising colonized people also changed during the nineteenth century", pointing to how the 1857 Indian Mutiny and 1865 Morant Bay Rebellion complicated earlier assumptions about the feasibility of conversion (2003, p. 18).

As Smith embarked on his travels, the first Opium War³ had just concluded and parts of China lay open to exploitation in a new chapter of British empire. Osterhammel (1998) notes the gradual extension of that empire through unequal treaties with China, while Porter points out that the "establishment of 'treaty ports' allowed missions for the first time to operate in China" (1998, p. 235). Smith appears to be one of the first British missionaries to have traveled to China after the first of the Opium Wars, visiting several treaty ports as well as the new British colony of Hong Kong, where he eventually would become the first Anglican bishop (Headland,

³ The first of the Opium Wars took place from 1839 to 1842 (Hanes & Sanello, 2002, p. xi).

1894). As missionary discourse it did not just reflect what lay before the eyes of the writer; as Hevia (1997, p. 114) explains, “missionary discursive practices” in particular “did shape reality”, providing readers with order and meaning. Smethurst (2009, p. 2), in summarizing Clark, Saïd and Pratt, similarly asserts that “[t]ravel writing was systematically involved in the imperial meaning-making process”; Smith’s travel writing can be viewed in this way and as contributing to the ‘imperial archive’. These discursive practices were rooted in British imperial ideology, which Armitage shows was characterized by a system of contrasts, in particular a “common Protestantism” depending upon a “common anti-Catholicism” (2000, p. 66).

Smith embodied elements of that British imperial ideology throughout his *Narrative*, and his writing can be seen against a backdrop of historical development of travel writing on China. Writing in highly descriptive prose, departing into commentary on the people he encountered, he was influenced by his own British upbringing, his Oxford education (Headlands, 1894), his role as an Anglican cleric, and his anticipation of the readership for his writing. While Osterhammel (1998) concludes that the missionaries failed as a whole in their venture in China in part due to cultural insensitivities, Ryan (2003) explains that some of the cultural arrogance was offset by a genuine interest in local people. Thomas goes a step further, implying that setting up contrasts was essential to the work of missionaries, quoting John Francis Goldie, who headed the Methodist mission in the Solomon Islands in the early twentieth century: “mission discourse must simultaneously emphasize savagery and signal the essential humanity and more positive features, of the islanders to be evangelized” (1994, p. 128). Such views can be seen existing in a complex if not contradictory manner in Smith’s travel writing. While Smith’s reliance on plain contrasts to classify his experiences is extensive, spaces of ambiguity do occur, as when discussing the opium trade or the industriousness of inhabitants of Fujian province. Complexity in travel writing on China grew to be so pronounced that by the time the quasi-botanist Fortune wrote of his travels a decade or two after Smith, China had become “an unstable category” (Mathers, 2010, p. 67); this was indicative of an emerging problem in categorizing knowledge, and an unhinging from previous successes at stabilizing aspects of the ‘paper empire’ through classification. This historical development from simple to complex has been charted by Sample (2008), who observes how the travel writer Anderson in the decades before Smith produced mainly descriptive writing. That style gave way to more complex writing, as seen in Barrow’s journal on his China travels, which often contained comparisons and critiques as well as “lengthy, scholarly digressions in the customs and manners of the Chinese” (Sample, 2008, p. 37). Campbell (2002) also notes discourse of an anthropological nature in much travel writing, with Ryan (2003) adding that travel writing was sometimes ethnographic in nature. While Johnston (2003, p. 32) also notes the incorporation of

“ethnography, linguistics, and geographical descriptions and surveys,” she urges a reading that goes beyond binary opposites and takes into account gender, class and mutual imbrication—i.e., the complex enactment of imperial philosophies and how that experience “profoundly altered imperial theories and policies” (ibid, p. 3).

As one of the first British clerics visiting China from Britain in the first decades of the nineteenth century, Smith in his writing presents us with discursive digressions of an anthropological or ethnographic nature, which helps to structure a hierarchic system of differentiations while expressing features of the British imperial ideology. His system suggests Orientalism, which Saïd defines as “a Western Style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (1979, p. 3). The discourse which Orientalism produced, such as travel writing, “was garnered and returned often haphazardly, to imperial centres, where it was refined, systemized, and used to inform further exploration and discovery” (Smethurst, 2009, p. 1). The audience for Smith’s book back in the imperial center London, the place of its publication, would have been influenced by class, gender education and other factors (Tsao, 2008), just as Smith’s own perspective, like other travel writers, would have been “shaped by the cultural context” (Bassnett, 2003, p. xi) from the which he arose. But as Saïd (1979, p. 336) wryly observed: “None of the Orientalists I write about seems ever to have intended an Oriental as a reader. The discourse of Orientalism, its internal consistency, and its rigorous procedures were all designed for readers and consumers in the metropolitan West.”

The founding membership in 1799 of the Church Missionary Society (CMS), Johnston notes, was largely middle class, with “merchants, bankers and brokers” (2003, p. 16) comprising a third of its membership. CMS was Smith’s primary readership for his *Narrative*; these kinds of societies “relied heavily upon donations from British congregations” (Johnston, 2003, p. 15) and consequently competition for funds for their work was an additional challenge faced by missionaries. One might not only conclude that Smith was successful in obtaining funding for his journey prior to departure,⁴ but infer as well that the publication of the *Narrative* of that journey did no harm to his career since he was consecrated as Bishop in 1849 and took up his new post in 1850 in Hong Kong (Headland, 1894).

A system of contrasts is prevalent throughout Smith’s *Narrative*. The anti-Catholicism which Armitage (2002) says fostered a unifying British identity by the eighteenth century is also evident in Smith’s *Narrative* discourse. Smith used the existing framework of anti-Catholicism in reproducing and then expanding that discourse for a new audience and a new

⁴ His journey was financed through a £6,000 gift to CMS (Smith, 1847, p. ii).

context. In referring to Catholic laymen and Catholic clergy in his travel writing, for example, he is pejorative in his choice of words and phrases. Smith uses phrases such as “a Popish priesthood, intimately connected with a local government” (p. 69) when referring to Catholic priests in Macao. Catholic laymen, too, are not Christians but members of “Popish flocks” (p. 141). Catholic priests who in past centuries had liberty to preach the Gospel in China are referred to as “Romanists, [who] in former ages, not only had access to the country but also enjoyed a fair measure of toleration in their missionary work” (p. 144), though they had now become diminished: in his present day, he observes the “unpopularity of the Romanist Missionaries” (p. 158). These Papists engage in something like covert espionage: “The Romish bishop was now absent from Shanghai on a secret mission to Peking” (p. 156), and the “Popery is already sending its agents with redoubled activity” (p. 527).⁵ However, Rev. Smith sees through them and communicates that to his audience: “Romanish Missionaries in China belie the pretensions, and expose the theory, of a visible unity of the universal church centring in a sovereign Pontiff enthroned on the Seven Hills” (p. 465).

The formation of the British imperial identity as Protestant Christian and superior to inferior religions is also evident in Smith’s reference to a Muslim as “Mahamodean” (p. 176), a term which Saïd finds especially “insulting” (1979, p. 66). At one point in his travels, Smith and his companions come upon another Muslim. The condescension in tone is quite clear: “We discovered a Mahomedan.... His bold features, prominent nose, and restless eye, confirmed the fact of the distinct origin of this descendant of Ishmael. I always felt a sympathy with the poor dispersed disciples of Islam in this pagan wild” (pp. 213–4). Like the ‘Papists’, the warning must go out to Rev. Smith’s readers as well about ‘Mahomedans’ and the competitive inroads which have been made in the China religion market. While the Romanists are engaged in secret activities to expand their activities in China, Muslims have been expanding theirs for hundreds of years: “The imposter of Mecca also, for 600 years, has had his numerous followers scattered over the neighbouring islands, and on the forbidden soil of China itself” (pp. 527–8).

Besides constructing and then denigrating both Catholicism and Islam as alien others, Smith also sets his discursive sights on Buddhism. In referring to the prayers of Buddhist priests in Canton, he writes of the “mystical and unintelligible sounds addressed to Budh” (p. 32). The logic and clarity of the Occident is lacking in those prayers, and instead there exists a “confused

⁵ Whether or not Smith’s concern with espionage among missionaries was influenced by his own reading of travel writing would be interesting to speculate on: Mary Baine Campbell, for example, has remarked in *The Witness and the other World: Exotic European Travel Writing, 400–1600* that “many missionaries were military spies” (quoted in Youngs, 2013, p. 91).

din and uproar” and “pandemonium” (p. 2). Both Buddhist clergy and laity, the narrator makes clear, are inferior: the priests “lead an idle and sauntering life” (p. 36) in the south of China, while further north “[t]he generality of the priests were men of fierce and unprepossessing aspect” (p. 117). Buddhist nuns are not reported to be much better: “The nuns were generally women of coarse manners and unprepossessing appearance” (p. 215). Unlike the excellence of Christian doctrine espoused by Smith and company, in Buddhism “[t]he more devout are able to revel in the imaginary paradise of absorption, or, in the words of, annihilation. This is the grand hope of Buddhism [*sic*]” (p. 185).

Smith equates the inferior religion of Buddhism with that other inferior religion he has been describing throughout his travels in China, i.e., Catholicism. He writes: “An honest Romanist priest must often be stumbled at the similarity between the religious forms of Popery and those of Buddhism” (p. 205). Later, he urges his readers to consider “[t]he mutual affinities which exist between the various systems of error, and to exclaim ‘How faithful a counterpart this to Popery!’” (p. 313). But in the battle for souls in China, Rev. Smith warns these readers, “Such a remarkable similarity of details ... may facilitate a transition from Buddhism to Popery” (p. 206).

Finally, Smith extends his religious stereotyping to Parsees and Jews, managing to stereotype Parsees in China with typecasts of Jews in Europe. Alluding to the commercial success of Parsees, he writes that Parsees in China have the same reputation which Jewish people have in Western countries (p. 25).

Catholicism, Islam, Buddhism, Zoroastrianism, and Judaism become surrogates against which Smith establishes the supremacy of British Protestantism in his book. In a passage in which he expounds on the superiority of Christianity to Buddhism, but which perhaps could be applied to any of the other religions discussed so far, he exclaims “How glorious, in the contrast with such meagre hopes, are the substantial realities which the Gospel reveals!” (p. 185). Like an angel appearing to the shepherds to announce the birth of Jesus in a nearby manger, Smith and his companions have come to China as “Heralds from the Church of England” (p. 2). He likens himself and his companions at one point to the Apostles: “Fewer than the original Apostles, and, like them in an upper room” (p. 38).

For Smith, the superiority of Christianity begins with Christ but extends to other areas, including “the medical skills of Christendom” (p. 23). China is set up as a surrogate against which Smith articulates the superiority of Christendom, headed by Britain. He does allude to a few positive phenomena in China, such as the “industrious population” (p. 13), the “hardy and enterprising race of Fokeen province” (p. 90), and an observation that in Canton, the “better

classes are intelligent, friendly and enquiring” (p. 102). Beyond such exceptions, the China he depicts and explains is subordinate to Britain.

Smith records his impressions of China as he journeys from the new British colony of Hong Kong to Canton and then north to Amoy, Shanghai, Ningpo, and other points. Beginning in Canton, he says that the Chinese are a “heathen people” (p. 2) under the “corrupt venality and cowardice of the Mandarins” (p. 5). The scenery is “monotonous” and filled with “strange scenes” (p. 3), “noisy discharges” and “noisy clamors” (p. 4). “Idle, reckless vagabonds ... infest” (p. 5) some areas like vermin, and in other places Europeans are likely to encounter an “infuriated mob” (p. 6). This is an area of “popular violence, so long encouraged against foreigners” (p. 19). The “idolatrous empire of China” (p. 38) is filled with “fraud and superstition” and is under the “baneful spell of paganism” (p. 49). In this place, “the uneducated are manifestly idolators”, and religious beliefs are “strange vagaries which falsehood, priestcraft, mysticism and fear have combined” (p. 63). Consequently, a “laxity of morals” (p. 58) persists, so “female infanticide” (p. 60) and “opium smoking” (p. 82) are rampant.

At times Smith appears to be complimentary towards aspects of Chinese culture, only to quickly criticize and denigrate them in relation to his own. For example, he refers to “the absurdities of Chinese principles of creation” (p. 112) then simultaneously compliments and degrades Chinese accomplishment: “the ingenuity of the Chinese, in turning to the best account their limited knowledge of the physical sciences” (p. 113). He laments that “amid the poverty of the physical sciences it is evident that a large amount of talent is wasted in the metaphysical system of the Chinese ... destitute of reality and truth” (p. 114). He judges that a scientific instrument he is examining “would be well worthy a nation more advanced in civilization” (p. 112). A similar occurrence of seeming to compliment while actually criticizing and undermining is evident when he refers to the “stern majesty of Chinese law” and its “severity of justice” (p. 115).

Smith does not confirm the infallibility of the British, however, merely their superiority. For example, while “[t]he temporary annexation of Chusan to the empire of Britain as a rare and precious opportunity for an exhibition of the arts and civilization of the west” (p. 271) is noted, he also notes that “[t]he English had always been overbearing towards [Chinese] countrymen, and until they showed a kind spirit towards them, Christianity would never be respected” (p. 53). While “the inhabitants of Foo-chow [are] more ignorant of the real power and superiority of foreigners than the inhabitants of the other consular cities of China” (p. 323), he also notes “British companions in arms, seemed to delight in the idea of their own superiority to the Chinese” (p. 203). In travelling north, Rev. Smith discovers that “[o]ur own vessel, though not engaged in the opium-traffic, carried 750 chests of opium as part of her freight” (p.

130); however, “our Government [must] show the example of sacrificing the gains of the opium revenue on the altar of Christianity” (p. 132). In reporting about an incident where the Empire’s troops behaved in a questionable way in China, Smith points out that they were Indian troops, not British (p. 380).

In addition to such oppositions, Smith distinguishes the culture of southern China from the culture of coastal communities to the north. For example, he writes: “I could not fail to contrast the respect and immunity from annoyance here ceded to foreigners, with the arrogant pride still predominant among the Canton populace in the south” (p. 135). In referring to Shanghai, he records a similar sentiment: “The character of the population is peaceable and industrious. They are friendly and respectful to foreigners though a mercenary and avaricious spirit seems likely to infect them in their dealings with Europeans” (p. 137). In general, he articulates the “friendly and peaceable demeanour of the people in the more northerly cities and the arrogant turbulence of spirit which still forms the distinguishing characteristics of the Canton mob” (p. 495). His most potent criticism is reserved for the new colony Hong Kong, however, where “the lowest dregs of native society flock to the British Settlement in the hope of gain or plunder” (p. 508).

Conclusion

As Smith was one of the first travel writers after the treaty ports were opened and Hong Kong was established as a British colony, his audience would have been eager to read of his travels. Indeed, the Church Missionary Society financed his trip (Headland, 1894) and his book was published in London. His often urbane tone when reporting facts and empirical observations, and his digressions on customs and culture, would have burnished his credibility on matters relating to China for his voracious readers. Working within an ideology of religion and empire, Smith produced a travel text which reinforced and reproduced British imperial ideology in the context of a missionary-exploration journey to China. The anti-Catholic sentiment he authoritatively expressed was a fundamental part of British imperialist ideology as it had evolved by the second British Empire. The anti-Catholicism within his *Narrative* would serve to reinforce and help reproduce existing attitudes rather than break new ground. His reproduction of imperial ideology would have contributed to the reification of British identity for those readers back in the imperial center and have been probably, to use Armitage’s words, “vestigially reassuring” (2000, p. 198) for Smith and readers alike as they encountered persons with languages, religions, and customs differing to what they normally encountered in Britain at the time.

Furthermore, Smith’s incremental contribution to the imperial ideology and the epistemological complex of the imperial archive was in its application of that oppositional

formula to other religious groups. While Orientalism is associated with the area today referred to broadly as the Middle East, its rhetorical features were so influential that Smith adopted them for his surrogatization of peoples ‘east of Suez’: i.e., China. Through this surrogatization and assertion of binary oppositions a hierarchy emerges in his writing where Britain is positioned atop the world, superior in culture, religion, medicine, military technology, and law. The other Western cultures are also near the top, except for those elements of Western culture which are associated with ‘Popism’, which is accorded the same low rank as the erroneous Buddhism which Smith encountered in China. The culture of the Muslim Tartars is seen as having temporarily dominated Chinese culture, but as Islam is built on the words of the ‘imposter’, it was not able to sustain that position and now is as low as Chinese culture. Smith’s reading audience at the imperial center must have gained a sense of their own culture as united in its modernity and its Protestantism, not by virtue of what they were, but by what they were not: neither Catholic, nor Buddhist, nor Muslim, not adherents to any of the other ‘false’ religions, and certainly not pagan Chinese.

Having asserted British superiority and having declared that China is a battlefield, the New Testament verse ‘Go and teach all Nations’ is deployed to justify the establishment of a kind of informal empire, i.e., a network of British Christian missions in China, whose work would be facilitated by the colonial infrastructure of the formal British Empire. While the missionary enterprise in China would ultimately fail, as noted earlier, the hope at the time would have been that these missions would provide the bases for the war against false religions on the periphery. Equally important, they could serve as frontline outposts of discourse formation, authoritative sources for constructing China in the imperial consciousness as the inferior and alien other, while synthesizing an imperial and religious discourse which would contribute to the reification, refinement, and dissemination of British identity as Protestant, civilized, and superior back at the imperial centers. Within a few decades, however, events in the colonies would complicate the missionaries’ purpose and their relations with colonial administrators, requiring new ways of reading their literary output in order to see some of the emerging dynamics like gender, class, and especially mutual imbrication, but Smith’s *Narrative* stands as an earlier work poised among the empirical, the imperial, the clerical, and the imaginative, effusing both zeal and clarity.

References

- Armitage, David. (2002). *Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bassnett, Susan. (2003). Introduction. In J. Speakes (Ed.), *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia, Volume One, A to F*. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Bayly, C. A. The Second British Empire. In R. W. Winks, *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume V, Historiography*. Oxford: OUP.
- Book of Psalms*. Available on-line:
<http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/book.php?book=Psalms&chapter=2&verse>.
- Campbell, Mary Baine. (2002). Travel Writing and its Theory. In P. Hulme and T. Youngs (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Travel*. Cambridge: CUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL052178140X.016>
- Clark, Steve. (1999). Introduction. In S. Clark (Ed.), *Travel Writing and Empire: Postcolonial Theory in Transit*. London: Zed Books. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27602-8_1
- Gospel of Matthew*. Available on-line: <http://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/Matthew-28-19/>.
- Hanes, William Travis and Sanello, Frank. (2002). *The Opium Wars: The Addiction of One Empire and the Corruption of Another*. Naperville IL: Source Books.
- Headland, Emily. (1894). *Brief Sketches of C.M.S. Workers. The Right Rev. George Smith, D.D.* London: James Nisbet and Company.
- Hevia, James L. (1997). Leaving a Brand on China: Missionary Discourse in the Wake of the Boxer Movement. In T. E. Barlow (Ed.), *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia*. Durham: Duke.
- Johnston, Anna. (2003). *Missionary Writing and Empire, 1800–1860*. Cambridge: CUP.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511550324>
- Mather, Jeffrey. (2010). Botanising in a Sinocentric World: Robert Fortune's Travels in China. *Studies in Travel Writing*. Vol 14, No. 2, September 2010, 257–270.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13645145.2010.500099>
- Osterhammel, Jurgen. (1999). Britain and China, 1842–1914. In A. Porter (Ed.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol. III, The Nineteenth Century*. New York: OUP.
- Porter, Andrew. (1999). Religion, Missionary Enthusiasm, and Empire. In A. Porter and A. Low, (Eds.), *The Oxford History of the British Empire, Vol III, The Nineteenth Century*. New York: OUP.
- Ryan, Simon. (2003). Missionary Narratives. In J. Speakes (Ed.), *Literature of Travel and Exploration, An Encyclopedia, Volume Two, G to P*. New York: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Richards, Thomas. (1993) *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London: Verso.
- Saïd, Edward. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Sample, Joe. (2008). 'The First Appearance of This Celebrated Capital'; or, What Mr. Barrow saw in the Land of the Chinaman. In S. Clark and P. Smethurst (Eds.), *Asian Crossings*

- Travel Writing on China, Japan, and Southeast Asia. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Smethurst, Paul. (2009). Introduction. In J. Kuehn and P. Smethurst (Eds.), *Travel Writing, Form, and Empire: The Poetics and Poetics of Mobility*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, George (1847). *A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to Each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan, Church Missionary Society, In the Years 1844, 1845, 1846*. London: Seeley, Burnside and Seeley. 1847. [Reprint: Taipei: Ch'eng Wen Publishing Company 1972.]
- Thomas, Nicholas. (1994). *Colonialism's Culture. Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tsao, Ting Man. *A Reading of Readings: English Travel Books, Audiences, and Modern Chinese History, c. 1832 to the Present*. In S. Clark and P. Smethurst (Eds.), *Asian Crossings Travel Writing on China, Japan, and Southeast Asia*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- United Nations World Tourist Organization (2014). *UNWTO Tourism Highlights 2014 Edition*. Available at: <http://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284416226>.
- Youngs, Tim. (2013). *The Cambridge Introduction to Travel Writing*. New York: CUP.

Contact Paul C. Corrigan: Paul.Corrigan@cityu.edu.hk

Narratives of the Literary Island: European Poetics of the Social System after 1945

Ioana Andreescu

Abstract

In European post-war literature, the topos of the island takes centre stage, as the insular space often narrates a micro-scale society and the reconstruction of its social system. Isolation, semantically derived from 'island', characterises a European society radically transformed by the traumatic violence of the twentieth century. In this context, Robinson Crusoe—the 'rational adult white man'—is recreated and reinvented in a multitude of new meanings, newly significant for understanding a transformed (and in-transformation) European society: he is cruel, he is afraid, he is a child, he is a woman, he is alone among others.

The hypothesis of this paper is that the interest in and updating of Robinson Crusoe's story transform this narrative into a literary myth, invested via intertextual and palimpsestic approaches with "a programme of truth" (Veyne 1983) that reveals a continuous interest in an alternative social system, which is in-the-making, historically, socially, psychologically, geopolitically, and so on. The literary post-war island narratives considered here, *The Magus* (1965) by John Fowles and *Friday, or, the Other Island* (1967) by Michel Tournier, highlight the process of the rewriting and rescaling of European history, as well as the essential need for human values in the creation of a society that has economics at its core.

Keywords: Robinson Crusoe, myth, power, ideology, capitalism, individualism, palimpsest, postmodernism, postcolonialism

Introduction

This paper seeks to relate the myth of *Robinson Crusoe* and that of the desert island to modern European history, in order to apprehend several poetic¹ functions of the post-1945 social system, particularly as portrayed in two post-war European novels, namely *The Magus* (1965) by John Fowles and *Friday, or, the Other Island* (1967) by Michel Tournier.

After the experience of the violence of the twentieth century, though Daniel Defoe's island story continues to be an important European narrative of society-making (literary, but not exclusively so, as I shall demonstrate), the novel is nevertheless classified in libraries as 'children's literature'. In fact, after the Second World War the rewritings of Robinson and the desert island present a completely different perspective than the one proposed in *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (hereafter *Robinson Crusoe*),² as the perceptions of the nation-state, time and space, identity and the place of the individual within society are radically transformed.

In publishing *Robinson Crusoe* in 1719, Daniel Defoe highlighted "some of the most important tendencies of the life of his time" (Watt 1957, p. 67), those of the modern age, with its ascendant capitalism, colonialism and individualist ideology. The pervasiveness of the story of Robinson Crusoe in the collective memory is often considered as *mythological* (Certeau 1990) in nature, implying that on the one hand it fulfils the role of cultural mediation and on the other addresses a *community*. However, the disenchantment³ of modern European society can be linked, among other things, to the detachment from mythological explanations, mostly replaced by strictly rational and secularized ones.

The emergence of a so-called *myth of the economic man*⁴ in a literary genre corresponds to what Gilles Deleuze describes as the recovery of mythology in literature. In this context, Deleuze defines literature as "the attempt to interpret in an ingenious way the myths we no longer understand, at the moment we no longer understand them, since we no longer know how to dream them or reproduce them" (2004, p. 12). I further argue that post-war island literature represents an autonomous and dynamic actor, invested as it is with symbolic power in the creation of a discourse of its own.

Within this analytical context, I have identified two major cleavages regarding the notion of power: first, power relations as depicted in the literary text, or in other words the way characters on the island relate to each other; and second, the power of this literary myth in creating or reinforcing post-war discourses, implying a distance or relativism to modern discourses on society.

¹ Further suggested readings regarding poetics of the historical practice: Paul Ricœur 1997, *La métaphore vive* [*The Rule of Metaphor*], Paris: Éditions du Seuil; Hayden White 1973, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe*, London: Johns Hopkins University Press; François Hartog 2013, *Croire en l'histoire*, Paris: Flammarion.

² The full original title is: *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe Of York, Mariner: Who lived Eight and Twenty Years, all alone in an un-inhabited Island on the Coast of America, near the Mouth of the Great River of Oroonoke; Having been cast on Shore by Shipwreck, wherein all the Men perished but himself. With An Account how he was at last as strangely delivered by Pyrates.*

³ Such as understood and presented by Max Weber 1981, *L'éthique protestante et l'esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Editions du Plon.

⁴ Ulla Grapard, Gillian Hewitson 2011, *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*. New York: Routledge.

If we bear in mind that “History ... is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake”, as framed with acuity by the protagonist Stephen Dedalus, *Ulysses*’ literary alter ego of James Joyce (1961, p. 34), the post-World-War-II avatars of Robinson seem to constitute a literary act involving collective awareness and a therapeutic exercise in memory regarding that historical ‘nightmare’.

Narrative techniques such as irony, playfulness, black humour, pastiche, metafiction and intertextuality are typical in the rewritings of the myth of the desert island. Furthermore, the notion of palimpsest proposed by the literary critic Gerard Genette is particularly enriching. The concept of palimpsest stresses the manifold relationships between a given text and a prior text (Genette 1982). In this sense, the postmodern novel *The Magus* presents an apparently enchanted island where the main character, this time no longer called Robinson but rather Nicolas Urfe, finally discovers his real self after a series of philosophical tests and psychological games. Similarly, the French author Michel Tournier rewrites the story of Robinson Crusoe from a postcolonial perspective, entitling it *Friday, or, the Other Island* in order to establish from the very beginning that the main character of his novel is Friday, the man of colour, and no longer the red-headed, English Robinson.

To facilitate my analysis, I first draw on the notion of Power as theorised by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. The paper will then provide a brief description of *Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe and its relevance within modern history, followed by *The Magus* by John Fowles and by *Friday, or, the other island* by Michel Tournier. Finally, I draw conclusions concerning the discursive power of Robinson Crusoe and the desert island within a larger mythological European narrative.

The notion of Power as a “Regime of Truth”

According to Lukes, Power is an “essentially contested and complex term” (1974, p. 7), and is a concept which, moreover, can be understood in various ways, as it is equally legitimate to talk about political power, economic power, social power or, as Pierre Bourdieu has argued, symbolic power. Considering this, as well as the palimpsestic literature of avatars of Robinson, Foucault’s theory of power seems highly relevant to my analysis. I shall thus briefly outline some of the main characteristics of power.

To begin with, Foucault does not conceive of power operating independently, but rather as a system of *relations*, originating from a heterogeneous *social body*. A particularly important part of his theory is the intersection between power and knowledge. As a result, Foucault contests a global or abstract understanding of truth; power cannot be true or false in itself. Instead, he perceives power as a *regime of truth* that pervades society. As a direct consequence, Foucault moves away from the classical focus on political power as associated with the state and expands it to the social. What was long considered to be *political* is now to be considered *social*. Following from this, I propose below a *mythological* dimension of power.

A second particularly interesting point stressed by Foucault is that power is not necessarily repressive; in fact, power can be productive, even creative. Furthermore, he argues that discourses have the ability to *produce* subjects with different social identities, and that power can be described as embodied in discourses. To quote Foucault:

We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes’, it ‘represses’, it ‘censors’, it ‘abstracts’, it ‘masks’, it ‘conceals’. In fact power produces; it produces reality;

it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production. (1975, p. 227)

Though Foucault never developed a theory on literature as such, he nonetheless places literature among the complex, multiple, cyclic and significant discourses that exist in society (1971, p. 24). In this context, the literary myth of Robinson Crusoe is representative of such a lasting and expressive type of discourse.

I shall return to this concept of power at several points later in the essay, but first, I will summarize and contextualize the three works under discussion.

***Robinson Crusoe* by Daniel Defoe**

Published in 1719 by Daniel Defoe (c. 1660–1731), *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* is today “the subject of more editions and translations than any other book except the Bible” (Bevan 1986, p. 27), and is often considered to be the first modern novel (Watt 1973). Invested with what Joyce terms “a truly national spirit” (1973, p. 7), the novel has been described as “a mixed form of narrative, in turn pseudo-autobiography, marvellous traveller’s tale, religious diary and do-it-yourself manual, a collage of the various forms of textual discourse”.⁵ Its coexistent discourses are various: the novel has been variously perceived as depicting a need for adventure, the rise of individualism, a theory of economics, the arrival of modernity, a religious quest, a brief history of colonialism, the need for isolation from society, and more. To mention just two contrasting perspectives, for Jean-Jacques Rousseau the adventure of Robinson on the island represents the single-most-important educational reading for any young boy during his formative years, while for Karl Marx it embodies the undesirable capitalist mentality.

The novel was apparently inspired by the real-life shipwreck of the sailor Alexander Selkirk. *Robinson Crusoe* presents the story of an ordinary character with a fondness for wandering and adventure who leaves his parents’ home to embark on a ship that is later wrecked in a storm. As the only survivor and a castaway on a desert island close to South America, Robinson collects materials and tools from the hulk in order to reconstruct on his island a system based on the English puritan model. The island being occasionally visited by cannibals, Robinson saves one of their captives so as to make him his servant. Naming him after the day of their encounter, Robinson teaches Friday the values and customs of his original society, Christianity, and, naturally enough, the English language. After 28 years of living on the island, Robinson is rescued by a passing ship. He returns to England where he learns that his family believed him dead. He gets married, but, already used to an itinerant life, Robinson decides to return once more to his island.

The life of the author sheds an additional interesting light on the context of the publication of the novel. Daniel Defoe had a highly complex personality, as reflected by his various occupations as journalist, “linen factor, tile manufacturer, itinerant spy, perfumer, merchant adventurer, ship owner, embezzler, bankrupt, and professional liar” (Seidel 1991, p. 4). He set about writing the novel at the age of 57, after a second bankruptcy and when his entire life seemed to be a failure (Louis James in Spaas and Stimpson 1996, p. 46). Sytherland notes that during the eighteenth century, the activity of writing “pure fictions” and not “serious” writings, such as the historical, political or religious, could be perceived as a “a sign of social, if not

⁵ Louis James in Lieve Spaas & Brian Stimpson (editors), 1996, *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, p. 1.

indeed of intellectual, decay” (1950, pp. 227–228). However, contemporary analyses of this island novel consider a very ‘serious’ reading, in the sense that on the one hand it contributes to the developing individualist ideology, while on the other hand it legitimates the colonial conquest of the world by Occidental Europe.⁶

If the literary character of Robinson is interpreted as a subject or agent, then the desert island can represent his possession or domain. In this sense, the metaphorical laboratory of the island can be compared to a system-in-the-making under the influence of Robinson. From this perspective, I shall argue how and why the literary myth of Robinson Crusoe apprehends central elements of modern European history, but before this it is important to clarify what a literary myth represents.

Alban Bensa defines the literary myth as “an act of language by which one intervenes in history” (2006, p. 129). As Richard Slotkin has argued, “a society’s mythology is, in effect, its memory system” (2007, n. p.), a sort of combination of personal and collective *remembering*, closely connected to the ideology of that particular society. The myth also implies a type of narrative meant to explain or to give sense to everyday life events and experiences.⁷ The aim of literary myths is evidently not to present a real story, but rather a narrative relevant for its community of origin: a story that is not real, but that is true. Considering the relation between *myth* and *truth*, the historian Paul Veyne proposes an enriching approach, neither arguing that the myth is true, nor rejecting it as a “false story”. Instead he suggests we consider the myth as endowed with “a programme of truth” (1983, p. 56): in other words a truth conveyed by a symbolic narrative. In this sense, Robinson can offer a ‘programme of truth’ related to the occidental ideology of modernity or individualism.

At this point, it is essential to identify the major elements that have transformed the story of Robinson Crusoe on a desert island into an occidental modern myth, as the island adventure is the only part of Defoe’s novel sequence that has made it into history. The remainder and the following sequels, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* (1719) and *Serious Reflections During the Life & Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, With His Vision of the Angelic World* (1720), have been largely forgotten. As already noted by Ian Watt, this novel stresses “particularly clearly and comprehensively” the connection between essential aspects of individualism and the emergence of the modern novel (1957, p. 62). For the literary theorist Edward Saïd, the relationship between Robinson and his island is an essential element in the spread of a growing imperialist ideology. Thus Saïd argues that “the prototypical modern realistic novel is *Robinson Crusoe* and certainly not accidentally it is about a European who creates a fiefdom for himself on a distant, non-European island” (2000, p. xiii).

The French historian Michel de Certeau argues that the myth of Robinson Crusoe is one of the few invented within modern European society. Considering the island space as a metaphor for a European social system in-the-making, de Certeau argues that the story of Robinson Crusoe is highly representative of occidental modern historiography. According to him, the novel contains the three elements that define the modern practice of writing history, namely the *blank page*, the *text* and the *construction*: “the island that proposes an empty space, the production of a system of objects by a master subject and the transformation of a ‘natural’ World” (1990, p. 201, my translation from the French).

⁶ For further details on these matters, see Edward Saïd 2000, *Culture et impérialisme*, Librairie Arthème Fayard, Le Monde Diplomatique.

⁷ For further details on modern myths, see Roland Barthes 1957, *Mythologies*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Following the Second World War, “when hopes were deceived, when disillusionment took root”, as François Dosse comments (1987, p. 189, my translation from the French), it is not surprising that European history and the myth of Robinson Crusoe were both subject to narrative fragmentation and relativism. In post-war European society, “history lost its meaning, it was fragmented into multiple segments” (ibid). In literature too, new Robinsons were to question the great narrative discourses of modernity.

***The Magus* by John Fowles: narratives of postmodernism**

The Magus, the first novel written by John Fowles (1926–2005) and the third he published, was conceived under a general feeling that “the world was wrong”.⁸ Following its initial publication in 1965, the writer revised the novel “almost obsessively”⁹ in order to republish it in a new version in 1977 (Tarbox 1988, p. 12). The long and laborious process of writing marks both a literary and a personal quest.

At the end of his university studies—without really knowing what to do with his life—John Fowles decided to live for one year on a Greek island. This island experience, often described in terms of loneliness and desertedness, was nonetheless highly influential for the conception of *The Magus*. As he puts it:

I had no coherent idea at all of where I was going, in life as in the book. (Fowles 2004, p. 5)

Like Crusoe, I never knew who I really was, what I lacked (what psycho-analytical theorists of artistic making call the ‘creative gap’), until I had wandered in its [the island’s] solitudes and emptinesses. Eventually it let me feel it was mine: which is the other great siren charm of the islands—that they will not belong to any legal owner, but offer to become a part of all who tread and love them. (Fowles 1978, p. 11)

The Magus, a “cross between an intellectual puzzle and a dazzling work of fiction” as described by Roberta Rubenstein (1975, p. 328-339), is a novel widely read on both sides of the Atlantic. It is also a story that *The New York Times* has said “reverberates in the mind” (1966, n. p.) because of its multiple meanings and postmodernist formulations of a transformed post-war society.

The main character, the young Oxford graduate and aspiring poet Nicholas Urfe, seems somehow “handsomely equipped to fail” (Fowles 2004, p. 17), partly because of his cynicism and misunderstanding of the world. At a London party he meets an Australian girl, Alison Kelly. They have an affair that Nicholas prefers to consider superficial. In order to escape boredom, he accepts an English-teaching position at the Lord Byron School on the Greek island of Phraxos. Depressed and alone, here he has to admit his failure as a poet—which almost leads him to commit suicide. His encounter with the eccentric, mysterious and wealthy Maurice Conchis represents the beginning of a series of psychological games that are to have an important impact on his way of thinking. On the island, Urfe becomes the main actor in a meta-theatre, where various episodes—sometimes recalling the Second World War, sometimes

⁸ John Fowles quoted in James R Aubrey 1991, *John Fowles: A Reference Companion*. New York: Greenwood Press, p. 14.

⁹ The term was used by his biographer Barry N. Olshen. 1978, *John Fowles*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., p. 31.

scenarios from Greek mythology—shed a new light on his understanding of existence. At the end of the book, Urfe realises that these hypothetical theatrical episodes relate to himself more than to the mysterious Conchis. Having accepted this, he is now ready to meet Alison once again, this time assuming and revealing his feelings of love for her.

The Magus is written in the form of a *Bildungsroman* that reveals an encounter with the inner self. Its structure is that of a labyrinth, where each hypothesis is tested to find if it is true or false. When reason cannot solve the matter, dreams and mystery intervene. Apparently the island experience leads Nicholas Urfe to reconcile nature and culture, rationality and love, the individual and Occidental post-war society.

The novel can also be read as expressing a desire to re-enchant society through the recovery of mythology, an understanding of psychology, and a recollection of the arts and humanities. The narrative techniques used in the novel, such as fragmentation, paradox, pastiche and irony, are characteristic of postmodern literature, and equally reveal a desired detachment from major discourses of modernity.

Among other things, *The Magus* highlights the aim of literary creation as conceived by John Fowles. In this regard, Fowles argued that his writings aim to present to the reader a new perspective on things, different from political or media discourses. If literary writing is related to the freedom of expression, reading fiction is linked to the freedom of thinking and to the exercise of boosting creativity.

I am very clear that the true function of the novel, beyond the quite proper one of pure entertainment, is heuristic, not didactic; not instruction, but suggestion; not teaching the reader, but helping the reader teach himself.¹⁰

In short, then, part of the symbolic power of *The Magus* involves a combination of reflexivity, imagination, acceptance of a social construction of reality, and an experience of esthetics, which are equally understood as an exercise in liberty of thought.

***Friday, or, The Other island* by Michel Tournier: A Postcolonial Narrative**

Friday, or, The Other Island (original French title *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique*) was published in 1967 and won the prestigious prize of the *Académie française* the same year. For Michel Tournier (b. 1924), the decision to rewrite the myth of Robinson Crusoe stemmed from his conviction that the contemporary French collective mentality had to adapt to a multicultural, postcolonial French context. Defining man as a “mythological animal” (1977, p. 192), Tournier argues that narratives are essential in the shaping of human identity. Thus, he states that “man becomes a man, acquires a gender, a heart or a human imagination thanks to the rustle of stories, to the kaleidoscope of images that surround the child from the cradle and accompany him to the tomb”.¹¹

In this French palimpsest, the initial values established in *Robinson Crusoe* are reversed and new designs are introduced. While starting from the story written by Daniel Defoe and

¹⁰ Fowles quoted in Barry N. Olshen & Toni A. Olshen 1980. *John Fowles, a Reference Guide*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co, p. viii.

¹¹ My translation from the original French: “L’homme ne devient homme, n’acquiert un sexe, un cœur et une imagination d’homme que grâce au bruissement d’histoires, au kaléidoscope d’images qui entourent le petit enfant dès le berceau et l’accompagnent jusqu’au tombeau.” Ibid, p. 191.

keeping the same settings and characters, *Friday, or, The Other Island* presents a gradual metamorphosis: Robinson changes radically, physically and psychologically, under the influence of his existence on the island and the presence of Friday. The island evolves as well: ironically called in the beginning “the administrated island”, it becomes at the end of the novel a ‘solar island’, where Robinson decides to stay. Thus he is no longer a homo economicus but a homo philosophicus.

Like Fowles’s novel, Tournier’s text suggests the idea of a choice, of a change and of a social deconstruction (this time, of colonialist values and ideology, among others). This is not surprising, as the author states that

a good book is only half of a book, and it is up to the reader to write the other half. Literature is therefore a lesson in freedom, a lesson in creation, and it is dangerous if it appeals to disorder and ideas. That is why, whatever they write, writers are always persecuted by tyrants. And the tyrant is right to persecute the writer, because the writer is a professor of freedom.”¹²

Arguing that the writer is “socially responsible”, Tournier conceives his rewriting of the myth of Robinson as an imaginative exercise of liberty and to some extent a projection of a collective European identity. Implicitly, it is a liberating reflexive act of power. The aim of this hypertext is to raise rather than to respond to questions of a changing, multicultural society.

Some Concluding Remarks

The myth of Robinson Crusoe—in its initial form as well as in its further rewritings—represents an act of symbolic, discursive power. In fact, the three texts above reveal several dimensions dealing with power: at a textual level, *power over* Friday can be identified in a colonist/colonizer logic, and there is the *power to* understand and to change, as in the novel of John Fowles; from the perspective of literary criticism, we can identify the skilful ‘power’ of the writer to *seduce*¹³ the reader; at an institutional level, the notion of power can be understood as a *relation network*, where discourses from various disciplines, such as literature, history, anthropology, mythology and economics, interact and coexist within the (re)writings of Robinson Crusoe. Moreover, at a macro-sociological level, modernity itself is challenged by new literary discourses of the island genre, by a postmodern perspective in *The Magus* or a postcolonial one in *Friday, or, The Other Island*.

The rewritings of Robinson and the desert island, I suggest, point to a literary, mythological and social transformation. The narrative of the literary island, apart from being a poetic act, also implies a historical or a social dimension. This is why the island space is often understood as a human laboratory where a dominating/dominated human experiment takes place. If in Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* the reader can identify an act of legitimating or reinforcing the political power of modern discourses, the post-war rewritings of Robinson distance themselves from an individualist ideology and tend to deconstruct its narratives. This is one reason why ‘post-’ literary techniques such as postmodernism or postcolonialism are adopted by writers.

¹² My translation from the original French: “Un bon livre n’est que la moitié d’un livre, et c’est au lecteur d’écrire l’autre moitié. La littérature est donc une leçon de liberté, une leçon de création, et elle est dangereuse si elle appelle au désordre et aux idées. C’est la raison pour laquelle, quoiqu’ils écrivent, les écrivains sont toujours persécutés par les tyrans. Et le tyran a raison de persécuter l’écrivain, car l’écrivain est un professeur de liberté.” Michel Tournier quoted in Bruno de Cessole 1996, p. 44.

¹³ Term borrowed from Roland Barthes.

To put it in another way, in European post-war society notions such as collective memory, fiction and history became essential in understanding the emergence and evolution of this literary myth. The analysis of the myth of Robinson Crusoe, as I have shown, highlights several interdisciplinary tensions. One of the consequences is the narrative *hybridization* of codes from several disciplines, including literature, anthropology, philosophy, history, and sociology. Michel Foucault associated power with the social body; Gilles Deleuze considered islands as the embodiment of a shared imaginary. Can we then suggest that the image of the island and the character of Robinson are relevant elements in shaping a collective imaginary of colonial, and even postcolonial, Europe?

To return to Paul Veyne's analysis, the position of myth vis-à-vis truth from Veyne's perspective might correlate with the relation between power and truth as described by Michel Foucault, in that the 'programme of truth' theorised by Veyne is comparable to Foucault's 'regime of truth'. Though mythology and power are radically different concepts, they nevertheless have common mechanisms of functioning. In this sense, if power relates to knowledge, myth relates to common acceptance or validation, which the story of Robinson Crusoe confirms, given its striking popularity.

The present paper has shown how both John Fowles's and Michel Tournier's rewritings of Robinson and the island were invested with analytical, reflexive functions. I have also revealed the correlation implied between these literary palimpsests and the discipline of history, as rewritings of this literary myth often constitute an act of 'remembering' a colonial past, or a revision of individualist narratives. I would like to conclude with a third function of the island post-war literature, which concerns the process of soothing collective painful memories, in this case the violence of the twentieth century. As Kenzaburō Ōe commented in his 1994 Nobel Prize speech, "I wish my task as a novelist to enable both those who express themselves with words and their readers to recover from their own sufferings and the sufferings of their time, and to cure their souls of the wounds" (1994, n. p.). Similarly, the post-war poetics of the literary island and of its solitary hero respond to this triple literary function, that of reflexivity and apprehension, of remembering and assuming the past, and of alleviating the present of the burden of history.

References

- Aubrey, J. R. (1991). *John Fowles: A Reference Companion*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologies*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Bensa, A. (2006). *La fin de l'exotisme: Essais d'anthropologie critique*. Toulouse: Anacharsis Editions.
- Bevan, D. G. (1986). *Michel Tournier*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, coll. 'Monographique Rodopi en littérature française contemporaine'.
- De Certeau, M. (1990). *L'invention du quotidien I. Arts de faire*. Paris: Gallimard.
- De Cessole, B. (1996). *Michel Tournier: Entretien avec Bruno de Cessole*. Paris: Bibliothèque publique d'information Centre Georges Pompidou.
- Defoe, D. (1966). *Robinson Crusoe*. Paris: Editions de l'Érable.
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Deserted Islands and Other Texts*. The University of Michigan: Semiotext(e).
- Dosse, F. (1987). *L'histoire en miettes: Des 'Annales' à la 'nouvelle histoire'*. Paris: Editions de la Découverte.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Fowles, J. (1978). *Islands*. New York: Random House.
- (2004). *The Journals. Part I*. London: Vintage.
- (2004). *The Magus*. London: Random House.
- Fremont-Smith, E. (1966). The New York Times. "Players of the Godgame." <http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/05/31/specials/fowles-magus1.html>. Accessed 12 March 2015.
- Genette, G. (1982). *Palimpsestes*. Paris: Le Seuil, coll. "Poétique".
- Grapard, U. and Hewitson, G. (2011). *Robinson Crusoe's Economic Man: A Construction and Deconstruction*. New York: Routledge.
- Hartog, F. (2013). *Croire en l'histoire*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Joyce, J. (1973). *Daniel Defoe*. Buffalo: State University in New York.
- (1961). *Ulysses*. New York: Random House.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.
- <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-02248-9>
- Ōe, K. The Nobel Prize in Literature 1994. *Japan, The Ambiguous, and Myself*. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1994/oe-lecture.html. Accessed 15 March 2015.
- Olshen, B. N. and T. A. (1980). *John Fowles, A Reference Guide*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.
- Olshen, B. N. (1978). *John Fowles*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Ricœur, P. (1997). *La métaphore vive [The Rule of Metaphor]*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Rubenstein, R. (1975). "Myth, Mystery, and Irony: John Fowles's 'The Magus'." *Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 328–339. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1207406>. Accessed 21 March 2015. Crossref
- Saïd, E. (2000). *Culture et impérialisme*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard.
- Seidel, M. (1991). *Robinson Crusoe: Island Myths and the Novel*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Slotkin, R. (2007). "Mythogenesis." *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. George Ritzer (ed). Blackwell Publishing, 2007. Blackwell Reference Online.

- http://www.sociologyencyclopedia.com/subscriber/tocnode.html?id=g9781405124331_chunk_g978140512433119_ss1-140. Accessed on 15 March 2015.
- Spaas, L., and Stimpson, B. (1996). *Robinson Crusoe: Myths and Metamorphoses*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-13677-3>
- Sytherland, J. (1950). *Defoe*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Tournier, M. (1972). *Vendredi ou les limbes du Pacifique*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- (1977). *Le vent Paraclet*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Tarbox, K. (1988). *The Art of John Fowles*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Veyne, P. (1983). *Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes?* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Watt, I. (1957). *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe*. London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Weber, M. (1981). *L'éthique protestante et l'esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Éditions du Plon.

Contact Ioana Andreescu: andreescu_ioana@yahoo.com

**The Power of Fiction:
The Nameless Book and the Birth of Literary Criticism in Japan**

Joseph T. Sorensen

Abstract

The Nameless Book (*Mumyōzōshi*, ca. 1200) is frequently cited as the first work of prose criticism in the Japanese literary tradition, in part due to its author's sensitive treatment of several vernacular tales (*monogatari*) composed between the early tenth and late twelfth centuries. The author is generally assumed to be the poet known as Shunzei's Daughter (ca. 1171–1252), and the text can be seen as part of a larger movement on the part of her father's Mikohidari House to promote *monogatari* fiction as essential to poetic training at court. This paper explores possible models the author may have considered in constructing this work, the first of its kind. An analysis of the text's rhetorical strategies reveals several of its implied objectives, including the promotion of literary women, and the elevation of vernacular fiction itself to the same critical level as the more-esteemed genre of traditional *waka* poetry.

Keywords: literature, criticism, *monogatari*, tales, fiction, Japan, waka, poetry

In the classical era in Japan, specifically during the Heian (794–1185) and Kamakura (1185–1333) periods, the composition of poetry was a skill expected of every nobleman and noblewoman at court. Indeed, superior poetry was a mark of the enlightened aristocrat, and was even seen as an indicator of social and political worth. Not long after Murasaki Shikibu completed her famous novel *The Tale of Genji* (*Genji monogatari*) in around the year 1010, the ongoing competition between various schools of poetic composition took on a new twist: the *monogatari* genre, that is to say narrative fiction itself, became a point of contention. Up until the late 1100s, *monogatari* fiction was generally frowned upon as a source or model for serious poetry. As these schools competed over what constituted the essentials of poetic training, the more conservative Rokujō School and the more progressive Mikohidari School became the main players in the dispute over who had access to and authority over certain proprietary realms of knowledge. In a complex series of exchanges, which included poetry contests (*uta-awase*), edited compilations (*kashū*, *chokusenshū*), poetic treatises (*karon*), and personal letters to important imperial patrons, the highly respected scholar and leader of the Mikohidari School, Fujiwara no Shunzei (1114–1204) successfully argued that knowledge of *monogatari* was essential for composing any kind of formal poetry. At the same time, through a related, but no less complex, series of activities, Shunzei and his descendants also cornered the market on *monogatari* expertise, by collating and editing *The Tale of Genji* and other important works of narrative fiction, by securing authoritative manuscripts and commentaries, and by promoting these texts as part of the foundational education required for competent poetry.

Given this context, it is unsurprising that the work hailed as “the first work of Japanese literary criticism” appeared at roughly this time.¹ *The Nameless Book* (*Mumyōzōshi*) was composed around the year 1200, most likely by the poet known as Shunzei’s Daughter (ca. 1171–1252), and actual granddaughter of Shunzei, who was then adopted.² *The Nameless Book*, which runs to about 110 pages in modern printed editions, is the earliest text of any significant length that evaluates, analyzes, describes, and interprets a range of works in the genre of vernacular fiction. As an early work of criticism, it is also noteworthy because its

¹ See, for instance, Suzuki Hiromichi’s entry for *Mumyōzōshi* in *Nihon koten bungaku daijiten*, vol. 5 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1984), p. 678. In *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of ‘The Tale of Genji’* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), Haruo Shirane identifies it as “the first significant critical essay on the *monogatari*” (1987, p. xvi). The ensuing discussion of the historical background and structure of *The Nameless Book* is indebted to the commentary in Suzuki Hiromichi’s *Kōchū Mumyōzōshi* (Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1970), as well as the commentaries in two other standard edited editions of the work: the version edited by Kuboki Testuo in *Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū* (1999), and the version edited by Kuwabara Hiroshi in *Shinchō Nihon koten shūsei* (1976). I have also consulted Michele Marra’s three-part “*Mumyōzōshi*: Introduction and Translation” in *Monumenta Nipponica* 34 (1984) and Thomas Rohlich’s “In Search of Critical Space: The Path to *Monogatari* Criticism in the *Mumyōzōshi*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57 (1997), which constitute the only extended treatments in English of *The Nameless Book*.

² The rather indistinctive title by which this text is best known (there are a few alternate titles among the extant manuscripts of the text) was perhaps prompted by the fact that certain contemporary historical figures are mentioned in the text. Some scholars have surmised that the author did not want the argument for the elevation of *monogatari* to be associated with any other work or any particular literary or poetic house. Keeping the work “nameless” and the author, as well as the narrator within the text, anonymous may have conferred a more-general applicability to the arguments within *The Nameless Book*. See, for instance, Ogiwara Sakae, “Shunzeikyō no musume kenkyū: *Mumyōzōshi* sakusha no tachiba kara,” *Komazawa kokubun* 17 (1980): 143–154, and Tabuchi Kumiko, “*Mumyōzōshi* no sakusha zō,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 89: 5 (2012): 73–86.

assessment of these *monogatari* has withstood the test of time. Furthermore, because it discusses several works of narrative fiction that are no longer extant, it also serves as an essential resource for research into so-called lost and fragmented tales (*san'itsu monogatari*)—works such as *The Magic Cloak* (*Kakuremino*), *Waves upon the Crags* (*Iwa utsu nami*), *A Temporary Shelter* (*Tsuyu no yadori*), *First Snow* (*Hatsuyuki*), and *Tribute Horses* (*Koma mukae*). In total, *The Nameless Book* offers at least a brief evaluation of twenty-five tales, including all the most famous works of fiction we know of from the Heian era, providing an important window into the reading culture of the period.

The author employs specific rhetorical strategies to elevate vernacular tales as a genre: she argues their relevance to the central practice of poetic composition, their suitability as a mode of criticism, their historical worth, and their power to effect change in the real world. Furthermore, the intricately structured discussions within *The Nameless Book* contribute to a move towards the serious study of fiction, and are an important step in the canonization of *The Tale of Genji* and other works of fiction from the classical period.

This paper explores the models that Shunzei's Daughter may have looked to for both the content and structure of *The Nameless Book*. Drawing inspiration from a wide range of sources, she borrows the outer framework of certain historical tales (*rekishi monogatari*) such as *The Great Mirror* (*Ōkagami*, ca. 1118–1123), and employs critical terms found in earlier poetic treatises. The author's implementation of arguments and descriptions from works ranging from Sei Shōnagon's (ca. 966–ca. 1025) court collectanea *The Pillow Book* (*Makura no sōshi*, ca. 1002) to Taira no Yasuyori's (ca. 1146–ca. 1220) vernacular compendium of Buddhist tales *The Collection of Treasures* (*Hōbutsushū*, ca. 1179), to *The Tale of Genji* itself, shows she was a careful reader of fiction and non-fiction alike. This paper reconsiders the objectives of *The Nameless Book*, and argues that it is not only a pioneering work of literary criticism, but embodies a *raison d'être* for the *monogatari* genre itself.

The Nameless Book begins with a first-person narrator who, the reader soon discovers, is an elderly nun wandering through the eastern hills of the old capital, the Higashiyama region of modern-day Kyoto. The woman happens upon the temple Saishōkōin, and meets up with other women at a dilapidated dwelling on the premises. The narrator begins to recite from the *Lotus Sutra*, but is soon interrupted by the other women there who gradually draw out the narrator's life story. The old nun was formerly a lady-in-waiting at court, and has taken her Buddhist vows late in life. She then becomes a listener in the background as one of the other women begins a discussion with the question, "What is the most difficult thing to give up in this world?"³ Responses range from "the moon," to "letters," to "the Buddha," before the talk turns to Murasaki Shikibu and her famous tale. The three or four anonymous women continue to discuss about a dozen of the chapters thematically, and then go on to appraise several characters within the tale, both male and female.

The characters from the tale are often judged according to the poems they compose. Similarly, the women of *The Nameless Book* evaluate several other Heian-period *monogatari*, not so much on plot or character development but on the quality of the poetry included in each tale. After discussing such major works as *The Tale of Sagoromo* (*Sagoromo monogatari*, ca. 1060), *The Hamamatsu Counselor* (*Mitsu no Hamamatsu* or *Hamamatsu Chūnagon*

³ "Well now, what is the most difficult thing to give up in this world? Let each of us give her opinion on this," someone suggested. 「さてとも、何事かこの世にとりて第一に捨てがたきふしある。おのおの、心におぼされむことのたまへ」と言ふ人あるに。Marra (1984), p. 133; Kuboki (1999), p. 181.

monogatari, ca. 1060), and *The Changelings* (*Torikaebaya*, ca. 1070), the conversation turns to more minor works of the period, many of which are no longer extant.⁴ Praise for *Tales of Ise* (*Ise monogatari*, early tenth century) and *Tales of Yamato* (*Yamato monogatari*, ca. 951), primarily because they are based on true events, forms the transition to a discussion of poetry and poetic collections.⁵ The interlocutors in *The Nameless Book* lament the fact that no woman has ever been afforded the task of compiling an imperially recognized anthology, despite the abundance of great female poets throughout history. What ensues is a review of the great women poets from the past, including Ono no Komachi (ca. 825–ca. 900), Izumi Shikibu (ca. 976–ca. 1033), Murasaki Shikibu, and her patron, Empress Shōshi (988–1074). *The Nameless Book* ends rather abruptly when a brief proposal to discuss the great men in history is cut off by one of the women, who notes that other works have already covered that particular topic.

Much has been made of the framework of the text. The elderly narrator introduced at the beginning has taken Buddhist vows, but was previously an eyewitness at court—a figure that can be readily associated with the narrators in *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes* (*Eiga monogatari*, ca. 1030 and later) and *The Great Mirror* (*Ōkagami*, 1118–1123). That these historical narratives written in *kana* and in vernacular Japanese are mentioned by name more than once is an internal clue that points to the fact that these were likely models for Shunzei's Daughter. In fact, in the very last sentence of *The Nameless Book*, the two texts are mentioned by name: ““On this topic it would surely be better to consult *Yotsugi* and *Ōkagami*. What more could we add to these chronicles?” a lady answered, continuing the conversation....”⁶

Commentary on *monogatari* tale fiction that predates *The Nameless Book* is quite limited. A handful of examples can be found in diaries, letters, and in other *monogatari*. There are several works of poetic criticism, a genre later known as *karon*, that appear earlier, but there is nothing that approaches *The Nameless Book* in terms of its extended discussions of vernacular tales, their authors, and the poems and characters therein. This work is truly the first of its kind. Aside from the narrative framework of historical tales, what other models might Shunzei's Daughter have looked to for inspiration?

The Collection of Treasures (*Hōbutsushū*, 1179), with its conversational tenor and episodic format, also seems to have served as a model. The links to this collection of Buddhist stories compiled by Taira no Yasuyori become clear when one considers the religious tone of

⁴ For more on these mid-eleventh-century tales, see, respectively, David P. Dutcher, *Sagoromo*, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 2006); Thomas Rohlich, *A Tale of Eleventh-Century Japan: Hamamatsu Chūnagon Monogatari*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983); and Rosette F. Willig, trans., *The Changelings: A Classical Japanese Court Tale* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983).

⁵ A translation and study of the former can be found in Helen Craig McCullough, *Tales of Ise: Lyrical Episodes from Tenth-Century Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968). See also Joshua S. Mostow and Royall Tyler, trans., *The Ise Stories: Ise monogatari* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010). For the latter tale, see Mildred M. Tahara, *Tales of Yamato: A Tenth-Century Poem-Tale* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980).

⁶ Marra (1984), p. 434. 「『世継』 『大鏡』などを御覽ぜよかし。それに過ぎたることは、何事かは申すべき」と言いながら。 Kuboki (1999), p. 285. *Yotsugi* is an alternate title for *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes*, and specifically refers to the fictional narrator of that text. For more on the possible relationship of these works to *The Nameless Book*, see Takahashi Tōru, “*Mumyōzōshi* to rekishi monogatari,” *Kokubun ronsō* 34 (March 2004): 40–48.

the opening passages of *The Nameless Book*, and the fact that it appears to defend the criticisms of Murasaki Shikibu that are included in that text. *The Nameless Book* opens with the following lines:

When I consider that I have spent three and eighty years in idleness, I am deeply saddened. It was my good fortune to be born by chance as a human being, and when I realized how sad it would be to die without leaving behind any trace in this sorrowful world, I shaved my head and dyed my clothes. But only my body has barely entered into the Way, and my heart has not undergone any change at all.⁷

In *The Collection of Treasures*, the author of *The Tale of Genji* is consigned to suffering in hell because of all the misleading “fabrications” (*soragoto*) woven into her tale.⁸ As Thomas Rohlich has pointed out, the religious setting laid out at the beginning of *The Nameless Book* provides the “critical space” necessary to begin the discussion of *monogatari*, and addressing the condemnation of Murasaki Shikibu, as specified in *The Collection of Treasures*, provides the segue.⁹ A few quotes from *The Nameless Book* serve as examples.

‘Didn’t Murasaki Shikibu recite the *Lotus Sutra*?’ The first lady answered, ‘Well, it’s rather sad that she has to put up with such criticism.’¹⁰

Someone replied, ‘But Murasaki was in fact a very religious person. She was anxious about the next life and spent morning and evening in continuous religious services. She doesn’t seem to have been a person engrossed in the things of this world.’¹¹

‘I can’t help being surprised when I think about the appearance of *Genji Monogatari*. However much I think about it, its origin is surely not of this world. Didn’t it spring from the fervent worship of the Buddha?’¹²

⁷ Marra (1984), p. 173. 八十あまり三年の春秋、いたづらにて過ぎぬることを思へば、いと悲しく、たまたま人と生まれたる思ひ出でに、後の世形見にすばかりのことなくてやみなむ悲しさに、髪を剃り、衣を染めて、わづかに姿ばかりは道に入りぬれど、心はただそのかたみに変はることなし。Kuboki (1999), p. 129. See also Nakamura Aya, “*Mumyōzōshi* bōtōbu no kōsō,” *Saitama Gakuen Daigaku kiyō* 5 (Dec. 2005): 15–29.

⁸ Rohlich (1997), pp. 186–187, outlines this argument. See Koizumi Hiroshi, et al., eds., *Hōbutsushū, Kankyo no tomo, Hirasen kojō reitaku*, Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikei 40 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993). See also Marra (1984), p. 123, and Shirane (1987), p. xvi, and p. 227, n. 9. The female narrator’s opening lament about growing old also has a parallel in *The Collection of Treasures*. See Terry Kawashima, *Writing Margins: The Textual Construction of Gender in Heian and Kamakura Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001), p. 116.

⁹ Again, see Rohlich (1997), especially pp. 197–202.

¹⁰ Marra (1984), p. 137. 「紫式部が、法華經を読みたてまつらざりけるにや」と言ふなれば、「いさや。それにつけても、いと口惜しくこそあれ。」Kuboki (1999), p. 187.

¹¹ Marra (1984), p. 137. また、「さるは、いみじく道心あり、後の世の恐れを思ひて、朝夕行ひをのみしつつ、なべての良には心もとまらぬさまなりけるひとにや、とこそ見えためれ」など言ひはじめて。Kuboki (1999), p. 188.

As Michele Marra has noted, whereas in *The Collection of Treasures*, Buddhism is ultimately the answer to the query, “What is the most difficult thing to give up in this world?” in *The Nameless Book*, *monogatari* fiction is accorded that distinction.¹³

Once the discussion of *Genji* and other tales begins, Shunzei’s Daughter incorporates critical terms that appear to be borrowed from certain *karon*, or poetic treatises. Her use of, for instance, the term *sugata* (form/structure) and the *kokoro-kotoba* (meaning-word) dichotomy clearly indicate that the author was familiar with works such as Fujiwara no Kintō’s (966–1041) *Newly Selected Essences* (*Shinsen zuinō*, ca. 1012) and Shunzei’s own *Treatise on Poetic Styles Past and Present* (*Korai fūteishō*, 1197).¹⁴ An older contemporary of Shunzei’s Daughter, Kamo no Chōmei (ca. 1155–1216), wrote a treatise titled *Nameless Notes* (*Mumyōshō*) in around 1211. Even though this similarly titled work likely postdates *The Nameless Book*, Chōmei’s treatise in some ways represents a culmination of the studies of poetry from which Shunzei’s Daughter may have drawn.¹⁵ These poetic treatises often offer model compositions, based on a set of circumstances, and then judge the quality of those responses. In *The Nameless Book*, a total of 97 poems, mostly but not all from *monogatari*, are quoted in full, generally as positive models, and several more poems are partially quoted or otherwise clearly referenced. The appraisal of several of the tales begins with a simple judgment of whether the poems are good or bad, suggesting that the quality of the poetry was an overriding consideration when judging the success of any particular tale. Furthermore, the sensitivity of characters within a tale is exemplified through representative poems. Poetic composition and modeling is clearly a major concern of this text. Even so, I would hesitate to call *The Nameless Book* a poetic primer or handbook, because it does much more than present and discuss poetry. So what is the purpose of this hybrid text that has elements of historical narratives, stories of religious awakening, and poetic treatises?

Both the structure and content suggest that *The Nameless Book*, as a whole, is fundamentally a highly crafted defense of fiction, argued along the lines of Murasaki Shikibu’s own so-called “Defense of Fiction” in the “Fireflies” chapter of *The Tale of Genji*. To summarize that argument, *monogatari* are of value to the extent that they are true to life, if not true to fact. In other words, works of fiction can draw attention to significant details about our existence in the real world. As *Genji* says in his conversation with Tamakazura, histories “give only part of the story. It is tales that contain the truly rewarding particulars!” He continues, “Not that tales accurately describe any particular person; rather, the telling begins when all those things the teller longs to have pass on to future generations—whatever is it about the way people live their lives, for better or worse, that is a sight to see or a wonder to

¹² Marra (1984), p. 137. 「さて、この『源氏』作り出でたることこそ、思へど思へど、この世一つならずめづらかにおぼほゆれ。まことに、仏に申し請ひたりける験にやとこそおぼゆれ。 Kuboki (1999), p. 188.

¹³ Marra (1984), p. 123.

¹⁴ These terms as used in *karon* are nicely summarized in Nicholas J. Teele, “Rules for Poetic Elegance: Fujiwara no Kintō’s *Shinsen Zuinō* & *Waka Kuhon*,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 31 (1976): 145–164.

¹⁵ See Hilda Kato, “The *Mumyōshō* of Kamo no Chōmei and Its Significance in Japanese Literature,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 23: 3–4 (1968): 321–430. Marra (1984, p. 124) mentions Chōmei’s *Nameless Notes* and states, “The influence of such treatises on *Mumyōzōshi* is apparent throughout the work. We see it first of all in the author’s critical approach to prose through its poetry.”

hear—overflow the teller’s heart.”¹⁶ Later during the same discussion, Genji puts forward the idea that events that happen in fictional tales are not “removed from life as we know it,” but rather “happen to people in real life too.” This argument within *The Tale of Genji* invokes the familiar *hōben* “expedient devices” section of *The Lotus Sutra*. Very briefly, *hōben* encompasses the idea that, even though words are necessarily an inaccurate representation of truth, some stories, such as sutra parables, can be useful as “expedient devices” to lead readers or listeners to religious awakening. Using Genji as a mouthpiece, Murasaki Shikibu likens fictional tales to “expedient devices” that can help uncover the truth of our experiences.¹⁷

It is precisely this notion of “expedient devices” that links the “Defense of Fiction” in *The Tale of Genji* to the beginning of *The Nameless Book*. The elderly nun who serves as the initial narrator takes refuge at a thatched lodging on the grounds of a temple in the eastern hills of the former capital, and sits down to read aloud from *The Lotus Sutra*: “I started to recite in a low voice the verses addressed to the monks in the chapter ‘Expedient Devices’ in the final part of Book One.”¹⁸ By foregrounding the concept of “expedient devices” at the beginning of the narrative, Shunzei’s Daughter clears the way towards a serious discussion of tale literature. A number of women gather to listen to the narrator, and they then engage her in conversation, especially after hearing that she was previously in service at court. Various topics come up, and the narrator then notes, “Three or four ladies sitting close to me continued talking quietly. ‘Well now, what is the most difficult thing to give up in this world? Let each of us give her opinion on this,’ someone suggested.”¹⁹ Suzuki Hiromichi and Mori Masahito have pointed out how many of the descriptions in the first several responses to this question, and even the thatched-hut setting of the discussion, rely on *Genji*, *The Pillow Book*, *The Izumi Shikibu Collection* (*Izumi Shikibu shū*, mid-eleventh century), and other well-known Heian-era texts.²⁰ The praise for how wonderful letters are, for instance, is directly indebted to *The Pillow Book*—and *The Nameless Book* author in no way tries to cover her tracks:

Another lady remarked, “If I were to have to think of something almost too marvelous to exist in this world, then I would think of letters. Since the subject often comes up in *Makura no Sōshi*, it is hardly original to say how letters appeal to the heart.... Even if somebody is living far away and you haven’t seen

¹⁶ Royall Tyler, trans., *The Tale of Genji* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2002), p. 461.

¹⁷ The uneasy relationship between the literary arts and Buddhist beliefs during the Heian period has been outlined elsewhere. See D. E. Mills, “Murasaki Shikibu: Saint or Sinner?” in *The Bulletin of the Japan Society of London* 90 (1980), pp. 4–14 and *passim*.

¹⁸ Marra (1984), p. 132. 一の巻の末つ方、方便品比丘偈などよりやうやう忍びてうちあげなどすれば。Kuboki (1999), p. 179.

¹⁹ Marra (1984), p. 133. 三四人はなほみつ、物語をしめじめとうちしつ、「さてもさても、何事かこの世にとりて第一に捨てがたきふしある。おのおの、心におぼされむことのたまへ」と言ふ人あるに。Kuboki (1999), pp. 180–181.

²⁰ For several examples, see Suzuki Hiromichi, “Mumyōzōshi jobun zakkō: Hiwadabuki yashiki no jujutsu ni kanshite,” *Sonoda Gakuen Joshi Daigaku ronbunshū* 1 (1967): 13–20, and Mori Masato, “Mumyōzōshi no kōzō,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 55: 10 (1978): 29–42.

him for many years, you get the feeling that you're standing right in front of him when you just get a glimpse of one of his letters."²¹

By referencing classic works of literature from the past as she covers recognized poetic and literary topics such as “tears” and “the moon,” Shunzei’s Daughter claims her place as part of that tradition, and establishes herself as a careful reader of those texts.

Eventually, *monogatari* fiction is proposed as “the most difficult thing to give up in this world.” The women fondly recall scenes from various chapters of *The Tale of Genji*, and then move on to discuss characteristics of leading women in the tale. One of the women mentions Tamakazura as belonging to the category of “Pleasant Women” (*konomoshiki onna*). The same speaker offers the following opinion of Tamakazura: “She was self-confident and clever, and I think that what she said about Genji, ‘In this world we cannot see such an unparental heart,’ doesn’t fit her character at all.”²² That is to say, Tamakazura is usually so pliable that her behavior in this instance is striking. The poem by Tamakazura that is cited here is the one she addresses to Genji in the middle of the so-called “Defense of Fiction” part of the “Fireflies” chapter. The context here is that Genji is pointing to various *monogatari* romances from the past as precedents to start up an affair with his adopted daughter, and Tamakazura parries with her poem that scolds him for his rather unparental expressions of desire. This is the key moment in *The Tale of Genji* text where Murasaki Shikibu puts forward an extended discussion of the usefulness of tales. Much more than idle entertainment, they provide valuable vicarious experience and teach their readers life lessons. Shunzei’s Daughter no doubt had this “Defense” in mind as she constructed her own discussion of tale fiction. Just as Murasaki emphasizes that tales can be true to life and therefore useful, the women in *The Nameless Book* also show a predilection towards works that can be applicable to real-life circumstances.

In *The Nameless Book*, it is clear that truth and realism are prized. The fantastic and the old-fashioned are shunned, partly because they do not reflect true experience, but also for a more utilitarian reason: because they cannot be applied to the practical composition of poetry at court. Antiquated tales with unlikely scenarios did not provide the kinds of model compositions that *The Nameless Book* discussants seem to be seeking. As mentioned previously, the quality of any particular tale is often contingent on the poetry, and the quality of the poetry is often measured by the usefulness of the examples. The unmistakable emphasis on poetry and the act of composition in the women’s discussion of their favorite tales, along

²¹ Marra (1984), p. 134. また、「この世に、いかでかかることありけむと、めでたくおぼゆることは、文こそはべれな。『枕草子』に返す返す申してはべるめれば、こと新しく申すに及ばねど、なほいとめでたきものなり。遥かなる世界にかき離れて、幾年あひ見ぬひとなれど、文といふものだに見つれば、ただ今さし向かひた心地して...。」 Kuboki (1999), pp. 182–183. For more comparisons, see Abe Motoko, “Mumyōzōshi shōkō: Makura no sōshi no eikyō ni tsuite,” *Shōkei Daigaku kenkyū kiyō* 27 (2004): 17–25. Abe cites a similar passage from the Nōin-bon version of *The Pillow Book*. One of her points is that many of the specific turns of phrase come from the Nōin-bon rather than other manuscript lineages. The particular passage on “letters,” for instance, does not appear in the major English translations of the text (Ivan Morris’s, *The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), and Meredith McKinney’s, *The Pillow Book* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2006)), both of which are based on other manuscript versions of the text.

²² Marra (1984), p. 141. 「...あまりに誇りかに、さかさかしくて、『この世にかかる親の心は』など言へるぞ、あの人の御さまにはふさはしからずおぼゆる。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 195.

with the focus on true-to-life scenarios, funnel into a central proposition of *The Nameless Book*: that women should be afforded the opportunity to compile an official anthology of poetry.

All of the first eight imperial collections of Japanese poetry were compiled by exclusively male editors, usually working alone, but sometimes as part of a committee of as many as six, along with their male imperial patrons. A second impetus for composing *The Nameless Book*, in addition to elevating vernacular fiction as a worthy literary genre, may have been to suggest that women should be allowed to participate in the anthologizing process. *The Nameless Book* dovetails these two motivations by providing a compelling pedigree of feminine poetic prowess to pair with the fact that almost all of the most important tales of the time were written by women—the first and foremost example, of course, being *The Tale of Genji*.

The second *monogatari* taken into consideration is *The Tale of Sagoromo* (*Sagoromo monogatari*, ca. 1080), composed by a lady-in-waiting known as Senji. Much as the women in *The Nameless Book* admire *The Tale of Sagoromo*, which is praised as second only to *Genji* among Heian tales, they find fault with its fantastic ending. In the tale, the hero Sagoromo rises to become emperor, and his father is given the honorary title of the Horikawa Retired Emperor, a fact that the women find absurd. Other works, such as *The Tale of the Hollow Tree* (*Utsuho monogatari*, tenth century) and *The Tale of Matsura* (*Matsura no miya monogatari*, late twelfth century) are similarly criticized for being “fantastic” or “devoid of realism.”²³ One of the women goes so far as to say about *Sagoromo*, “I feel that this is the work of someone without a grain of common sense and I feel utterly disappointed. His father, the Minister, also became a Retired Emperor, and is called the Retired Emperor Horikawa, no less! A novel is surely absurd if it isn’t realistic.”²⁴

By contrast, there exist a handful of texts that, for lack of a better term, were known throughout most of their history as “non-fictional *monogatari*,” a genre distinct from both traditional tales (*tsukuri monogatari*) and historical fiction (*rekishi monogatari*). The women in *The Nameless Book* show that they are keenly aware of the difference between a piece of fanciful fiction and a narrative that was “based on a true story,” as it were. In the following quote, one of the women suggests that *Tales of Ise* (*Ise monogatari*, tenth century) and *Tales of Yamato* (*Yamato monogatari*, tenth century) are categorically different from the other works they have been talking about because they describe things that really happened:

A certain lady in the group raised her voice and declared, “When I think about these novels, I feel that they are nothing but fabrications, full of falsehoods. So let’s talk about literary works that report things that

²³ Marra (1984), p. 418. 「むげにまことなきものどもにはべるなるべし。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 257. The comment is applied to the *The Tale of Matsura*, a story purportedly by Fujiwara no Teika (1162-1241), uncle to the author of *The Nameless Book*.

²⁴ Marra (1984), p. 295. 「大臣さへ院になりて、堀川院と申すかとよな。物語といふもの、いづれもまことしからずと言ふなるに、これは殊の外なることどもにこそあんめれ。」 Kuboki 1999, p. 234.

really happened. I've heard it said that *Ise Monogatari* and *Yamato Monogatari* both describe actual events, and so they must be marvelous works.”²⁵

The woman observes that it is precisely because these tales describe things that really happened that “they must be marvelous works.” Furthermore, and this is a key transition in *The Nameless Book*, they are marvelous because they have good poems that are included in imperial anthologies. Continuing the discussion of these two “true” tales, she offers, “If you want to know whether the poems in these tales are good or bad, then you have only to look at *Kokinshū*, and you'll find that all the good poems in these two tales have been included in the anthology.”²⁶

There is a definite connection here between *monogatari* that are based on true events, the poetry composed upon those occasions, and the real-life collection of what is probably the single-most-influential poetry anthology in the Japanese literary tradition. As the first imperial anthology of Japanese poetry, *Kokinshū* (*The Collection of Ancient and Modern Times*, ca. 905) established the standards for court poetry for centuries after its compilation. In *The Nameless Book*, the argument that women should be given an official commission to compile an anthology builds from this point onward. Shunzei's Daughter proceeds through several sections that serve to express a desire for permanence, convey a wish to bequeath works to posterity, and articulate an aspiration to have one's name remembered in future generations. One woman straightforwardly remarks, “Why don't I possess the talent to write a work that would last into posterity?” and laments that passing away without having one's name “recorded for future generations is really sad.”²⁷

All of this lays the groundwork for a central proposition of the text, as stated by one of the conversing women: “If only I were given the chance to be like the Lay Priest of the Third Rank and to assemble an anthology!”²⁸ Here, “Lay Priest” refers to the author's adoptive father Fujiwara no Shunzei, and the compilation is the seventh imperial anthology, *Senzaishū* (*Collection of a Thousand Eras*, ca. 1187). Another one of the women complains,

²⁵ Marra (1984), p. 418. 例の若き声にて、「思へば、皆これは、されば偽り、そら事なり。まことにありけることをのたまへかし。『伊勢物語』『大和物語』などは、げにあることと聞きはべるは返す返すいみじくこそはべれ。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 258.

²⁶ Marra (1984), p. 418. 「そのうちの歌のよし悪しなどは、『古今集』などを御覧ぜよ。これによきとおぼしき歌は入りはべるべし。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 258.

²⁷ Marra (1984), p. 422. 「さらば、などか、世の末にとどまるばかりの一ふし、書きとどむるほどの身にてはべらざりけむ...世の末までも書きとどめられぬ身にてやみなむは、いみじく口惜しかるべきわざなりかし。」 Kuboki (1999), pp. 263–264.

²⁸ Marra (1984), p. 421. 「あはれ、折につけて、三位入道のやうなる身にて、集を撰びはべらばや。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 262.

“There is nothing more deplorable than the fate of being a woman. From olden times there have been many of us who have loved emotions and studied the arts, but no woman has ever been chosen to compile a collection of poetry. This is really a great shame.”²⁹

The act of compilation is, of course, not an end in itself. It is a part of a process of presenting models, defining aesthetics, and influencing the practical composition of future poetry. *The Nameless Book* even suggests as much: one of the women notes that because anthologies contain poems on topics (*dai*), “they are very useful when you are suddenly called upon to write a poem quickly.”³⁰ It is perhaps ironic that the anonymous women in this text known as *The Nameless Book*, a generically humble title, seem to have a preoccupation with making a name for themselves.

To conclude the discussion of the framework of *The Nameless Book*, one other model must be mentioned, the so-called “Rainy Night Discussion” [*amayo no shinasadame*] from the “Broom Tree” chapter of *The Tale of Genji*. When one reads these two texts side by side, the parallels are quite specific and unmistakable. Both Genji and the old nun in *The Nameless Book* become listeners in a group discussion about character traits of women and men. The following passage from *The Nameless Book* is clearly patterned on the “Rainy Night Discussion” from *the Tale of Genji*:

One of the ladies asked, “Among the men, who is the most wonderful?”

A lady answered, “It would be hopeless to try to establish now whether Minister Genji’s behavior was good or bad. There is no need even to bring the matter up. Still, there are many places in the novel where we may wonder whether it would have been better for Genji to have acted otherwise.

The Palace Minister was close to Genji from his youth and never parted from him. He began the Rainy Night Discussion by reciting the poem,

‘Though we left / The Palace / Together,

The moon of the sixteenth night / Does not show me where you are going.’”³¹

Referred to here as “*amayo no on-monogatari*” or “A Tale on a Rainy Night,” the *Genji* scene is both modeled and referenced in this segment of *The Nameless Book*, a section known as the “appraisal of men” (*dansei-ron*). A comparison of the contexts, however, reveals a significant role-reversal. In *Genji*, a group of young men discuss the types and characteristics of women, whereas in *The Nameless Book*, the ensuing discussion has a group of older women

²⁹ Marra (1984), p. 421. 「いでや、いみじけれども、女ばかり口惜しきものなし。昔より色を好み、道を習ふ輩多かれども、女の、いまだ集など撰ぶことなきこそ、いと口惜しけれ。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 263.

³⁰ Marra (1984), p. 421. それを見ても題の歌はいとよく心得ぬべし。 Kuboki (1999), p. 262.

³¹ Marra (1984), pp. 142–143. また、例の人、「男の中には誰々かはべる」と言へば、「源氏の大臣の御事は、よし悪しなど定めむも、いとこと新しくかたはらいたきことなれば、申すに及ばねども、さらでもとおぼゆるふしぶし多くぞはべる。まづ、大内山の大内。若くよりかたみに隔てなくて慣れ睦び思ひ交はして、雨夜の御物語をはじめ、もろともに大内山を出でつれど行く方見せぬいさよひの月。」 Kuboki (1999), p. 198.

discussing the types and characteristics of men. I shall unfortunately have to relegate to another venue the several other aspects of this text that characterize it as a powerful work of feminist criticism.

Like the “Defense of Fiction” from the “Fireflies” chapter of *The Tale of Genji*, the “Rainy Night Discussion” from the “Broom Tree” chapter also looms large in the imagination of the author of *The Nameless Book*. As mentioned at the outset, *The Nameless Book* is, on a fundamental level, not just a pioneering work of criticism, but also a defense of fiction in its own right. To take the argument a step further, one could even categorize *The Nameless Book* itself as a *monogatari*. While acknowledging the other models noted above, one notes the narrative framework is closest to the fictional world of a romance or tale. Scholars such as Hoshiyama Ken have identified *The Nameless Book* as part of a category of narratives known as “site- specific storytelling” (*ba no monogatari*).³² These typically begin with a gathering of like-minded individuals that are willing to discuss a particular topic at hand. The “Rainy Night Discussion” in *Genji* that Shunzei’s Daughter clearly took as a model also falls into this category, and that discussion itself has been referred to as “A Tale on a Rainy Night” in *The Nameless Book* and elsewhere.³³

Thus allow me to conclude by suggesting that *The Nameless Book* is a meta-*monogatari*, a tale about tales, and as such is advocating the potential of these fictional romances. It is proposing that *monogatari* are an entirely appropriate genre for offering literary criticism—for appraising and assigning value to poems, to character traits, and to other *monogatari*. It argues a defense of fiction, but also *embodies* a defense of fiction by exemplifying the fact that *monogatari* can serve as a vehicle for literary analysis. It takes Murasaki Shikibu’s argument, that fiction can be useful, to a new level of discourse by showing not only that tales are worthy of focused criticism, but also that they can be the vehicle of that focused criticism. Much as Murasaki asserts that fiction offers insights that can have an effect on real life, Shunzei’s Daughter makes the rather ingenious move to use this same framework to suggest change, to argue for an anthology collected by women, and to offer compelling reasons for this proposal as well.

Returning to the notion of *The Nameless Book* as a *monogatari*, and the power of fiction to effect change in the real world, it is perhaps not a surprise that two of the oldest extant manuscripts of *The Nameless Book* actually refer to it as a *monogatari*. The Shōkōkan Library manuscript is titled *Kenkyū monogatari* (after the era name during which it was produced), and the Tenri Library manuscript is titled *Mumyō monogatari*, or *The Nameless Tale*. The work should be considered a success as a *monogatari*, as a piece of criticism, and as a proposal for change. The fact that eventually, an anthology known as *Fūyōshū* (*Collection of Wind-Blown Leaves*, ca. 1271) is compiled by a team of women under the direction of the Empress Dowager Ōmiya-in, and that *Genji* and other tales do indeed become the focus of serious study from the twelfth century onward, I think speaks, on several levels, to the power of fiction.

³² Hoshiyama Ken, “‘Ba no monogatari’ no keifu ni okeru *Mumyōzōshi*: Kikite rōni no keireki oyobi nenrei ni chakumoku shite,” *Nihon bungaku* 56: 6 (June 2007): 13–22.

³³ For more on the parallels to the “Rainy Night Discussion” from *Genji*, see Mori Masato, “*Mumyōzōshi* no kōzō,” *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 55: 10 (1978): 29–42.

References

- Abe Motoko 安倍素子. “*Mumyōzōshi shōkō: Makura no sōshi no eikyō ni tsuite*” 「無名草子」小考—「枕草子」の影響について. *Shōkei Daigaku kenkyūkiyō* 27 (Feb. 2004): 17–25.
- D’Etcheverry, Charo B. “Out of the Mouths of Nurses: *The Tale of Sagoromo* and Midranks Romance.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 59: 2 (2004): 153–177.
- Dutcher, David P. *Sagoromo*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 2006.
- Fukazawa Tōru 深沢徹. “*Mumyōzōshi no toporojii: kakoikomare, ōryō sareru ‘onna’ no gensetsu*” 「無名草子」のトポロジー：囲い込まれ、横領される＜女＞の言説. *Kōza Heian bungaku ronkyū* 13 (Oct. 1998): 279–291.
- Higuchi Yoshimaro 樋口芳麻呂. “*Fukurōzōshi, Mumyōzōshi no seiritsu jiki ni tsuite*” 「袋草子」「無名草子」の成立時期について. In Higuchi Yoshimaro, ed., *Heian Kamakura jidai san’itsu monogatari no kenkyū*. Tokyo: Hitaku Shobō, 1982.
- Hoshiyama Ken 星山健. “‘Ba no monogatari’ no keifu ni okeru *Mumyōzōshi*: Kikite rōni no keireki oyobi nenrei ni chakumoku shite” <場の物語>の系譜における「無名草子」聞き手老尼の経歴および年齢に着目して. *Nihon bungaku* 56: 6 (June 2007): 13–22.
- Ishida Yoshisada 石田吉貞. “*Mumyōzōshi sakusha kō*” 「無名草子」作者考. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 243 (March 1944): 48–62.
- Ishino Keiko 石埜敬子. “Dokugen to tenarai: *Sagoromo monogatari kara*” 独言と手習い—「狭衣物語」から. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū kanshō* 37: 4 (April 1992): 82–84.
- Kataoka Toshihiro 片岡利博. “*Mumyōzōshi no senshū hyō ni tsuite*” 「無名草子」の選集評について. *Chūko bungaku* 25 (April 1980): 47–55.
- Kato, Hilda. “The *Mumyōshō* of Kamo no Chōmei and Its Significance in Japanese Literature.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 23: 3–4 (1968): 321–430.
- Kawashima Kinue 川島絹江. *Mumyōzōshi no shohon ni tsuite no oboegaki* 「無名草子」の諸本についての覚書. *Tokyo Seitoku Tanki Daigaku kiyō* 19 (March 1990): 28–32.
- . *Mumyōzōshi no Saishōkōin*. 『無名草子』の最勝光院. *Kenkyū to shiryō* 38 (Dec. 1997): 11–18.
- Kawashima, Terry. *Writing Margins: The Textual Construction of Gender in Heian and Kamakura Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.
- Koizumi Hiroshi 小泉弘. *Hōbutsushū* 宝物集. *Nihon koten bungaku daijiten*, v. 5. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1984.
- Koizumi Hiroshi, et al., eds. *Hōbutsushū, Kankyo no tomo, Hirasen kojō reitaku* 宝物集・閑居友・比良山古人霊託. Shin Nihon koten bungaku taikō 40. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993.
- Kojima Yukari 小島ゆかり. “Kajin o yomu *Genji Monogatari*” 歌人を読む「源氏物語」. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* 73: 5 (May 2008): 82–84.
- Komachiya Teruhiko 小町谷照彦. “Uta to utakotoba” うたと歌ことば. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū* 36: 10 (Sept. 1991): 83–89.

- Kuboki Testsuo 久保木哲夫, ed. *Mumyōzōshi* 無名草子. In *Matsura no miya monogatari, Mumyōzōshi* 松浦宮物語・無名草子. Shinpen Nihon koten bungaku zenshū 40. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1999.
- Kuwabara Hiroshi 桑原博史, ed. *Mumyōzōshi* 無名草子. Shinchō Nihon koten shūsei 7. Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1976.
- Marra, Michele. “*Mumyōzōshi*. Introduction and Translation.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 39: 2 (1984): 115–145. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2385013>
- . “*Mumyōzōshi*, Part 2.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 39: 3 (1984): 281–305. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2384595>
- . “*Mumyōzōshi*, Part 3.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 39: 4 (1984): 409–434. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2384574>
- Matsuda Takeo 松田武夫. “*Genji monogatari* no waka: *Mumyōzōshi* no fushi bushi no ron o chūshin ni” 源氏物語の和歌—無名草子のふしぶしの論を中心に. In Murasaki Shikibu Gakkai, ed., *Genji monogatari to waka kenkyū to shiryō*. Tokyo: Musashino Shoin, 1974.
- McCullough, Helen Craig. *Tales of Ise: Lyrical Episodes from Tenth-Century Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968.
- . *Ōkagami: The Great Mirror*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- McCullough, William H. and Helen Craig McCullough. *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes: Annals of Japanese Aristocratic Life in the Heian Period*. 2 vol. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980.
- McKinney, Meredith, trans. *The Pillow Book*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2006.
- Mori Masato 森正人. “*Mumyōzōshi* no kōzō” 無名草子の構造. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 55: 10 (Oct. 1978): 29–42.
- . “*Ba no monogatari: Mumyōzōshi*” 場の物語・無名草子. *Chūsei bungaku* 27 (Oct. 1982): 8–18.
- Morris, Ivan, trans. *The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Mostow, Joshua S., and Royall Tyler, trans. *The Ise Stories: Ise monogatari*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2010.
- Nakamura Aya 中村文. “*Mumyōzōshi* bōtōbu no kōsō” 「無名草子」冒頭部の構想. *Saitama Gakuen Daigaku kiyō* 5 (Dec. 2005): 15–29.
- Okada, Richard Hideki. *Sagoromo Monogatari: A Study and Partial Translation*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1977.
- . *Figures of Resistance: Language, Poetry, and Narrating in The Tale of Genji and Other Mid-Heian Texts*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Ogiwara Sakae 荻原さかえ. “*Shunzeikyō* no musume kenkyū: *Mumyōzōshi* sakusha no tachiba kara” 俊成卿女研究—無名草子作者の立場から. *Komazawa kokubun* 17 (March 1980): 143–154.
- Ōtsuki Osamu 大槻修. “*Monogatari nihiyakuban utaawase, Mumyōzōshi* kara Fūyōwakashū e” 「物語二百番歌合」 「無名草子」 から 「風葉和歌集」 へ. *Bungaku gogaku* 143 (Feb. 1995): 9–25.
- Rohlich, Thomas H., trans. *A Tale of Eleventh-Century Japan: Hamamatsu Chūnagon Monogatari*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- . “In Search of Critical Space: The Path to *Monogatari* Criticism in the *Mumyōzōshi*.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 57: 1 (1997): 179–204. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2719364>

- Shirane, Haruo, ed. *Traditional Japanese Literature: An Anthology, Beginnings to 1600*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Sakurai Hironori 桜井宏徳. “*Ōkagami ni hajimaru mono: Imakagami, Mumyōzōshi o chūshin to shite*” 「大鏡」に始まるもの—「今鏡」「無名草子」を中心として. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* 76: 8 (Aug. 2011): 51–59.
- Sonobe Mikio 蘭部幹生. “*Mumyōzōshi no josei ron: kohon setsuwashū to no mondai kara*” 無名草子の女性論—古本説話集との問題から. *Komozawa kokubun* 22 (1985): 81–98.
- Suzuki Hideo 鈴木日出男. “*Monogatari no waka, hikiuta, uta kotoba*” 物語の和歌 • 引歌 • 歌言葉. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kyōzai no kenkyū kanshō* 37: 4 (April 1992): 88–93.
- Suzuki Hiromichi 鈴木弘道. “*Mumyōzōshi jobun zakkō: Hiwadabuki yashiki no jujutsu ni kanshite*” 無名草子序文雑考—檜皮葺の叙述に関して. *Sonoda Gakuen Joshi Daigaku ronbunshū* 1 (Feb. 1967): 13–20.
- . “*Mumyōzōshi no Hamamatsu chūnagon monogatari hyōgen*” 無名草子の浜松中納言物語評言. *Sonoda Gakuen Joshi Daigaku ronbunshū* 2 (Nov. 1967): 15–26.
- . *Kōchū Mumyōzōshi*. 校注無名草子. Tokyo: Kasama Shoin, 1970.
- . *Mumyōzōshi ron* 無名草子論. Tokyo: Daigakudō Shoten, 1981.
- . “*Mumyōzōshi*” 「無名草子」. *Nihon koten bungaku daijiten*, v. 5. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1984.
- Tabuchi Kumiko 田渕句美子. “*Mumyōzōshi no shiza*” 「無名草子」の視座. *Chūsei bungaku* 57 (2012): 43–52.
- . “*Mumyōzōshi no sakusha zō*” 「無名草子」の作者像. *Kokugo to kokubungaku* 89: 5 (May 2012): 73–86.
- Tachibana Kenji 橘健二, ed. *Ōkagami* 大鏡. NKBZ 20. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1974.
- Tachibana Kenji 橘健二 and Katō Shizuko 加藤静子, ed. *Ōkagami* 大鏡. SNKZ 34. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1996.
- Tahara, Mildred M. *Tales of Yamato: A Tenth-Century Poem-Tale*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980.
- Takahashi Tōru 高橋亨. “*Mumyōzōshi to rekishi monogatari*” 「無名草子」と歴史物語. *Kokubun ronsō* 34 (March 2004): 40–48.
- Tanaka Hiroki 田仲洋己. “*Fujiwara Teika no Genji monogatari, Mumyōzōshi o tōshite mita Monogatari nihyakuban utaawase*” 藤原定家の「源氏物語」「無名草子」を通して見た「物語二百番歌合」. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* 75: 10 (Oct. 2010): 123–131.
- Taniyama Shigeru 谷山茂. “*Shunzei: Sono hito to uta*” 俊成—その人と歌. In Taniyama Shigeru, *Chūsei waka no tsurezure* 中世和歌のつれづれ. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1993.
- Teele, Nicholas J. “Rules for Poetic Elegance: Fujiwara no Kintō's *Shinsen Zuinō* & *Waka Kuhon*.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 31 (1976): 145–164. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2384458>
- Tomikura Tokujirō 富倉徳二郎. *Mumyōzōshi hyōkai* 無名草子評解. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1978.
- Tyler, Royall, trans. *The Tale of Genji*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2002.
- Tyler, Royall. “*Sagoromo and Hamamatsu on Genji: Eleventh-Century Tales as Commentary on Genji monogatari*.” *Japan Review* 18 (2006): 3–28.

- Watanabe Ayumi 渡辺あゆみ. “*Mumyōzōshi shōkō*: Shunzei kyō no musume sakusha setsu e no ichi gimon” 「無名草子」小考—俊成卿女作者への一疑問. *Tokushima Daigaku kokugo kokubungaku* 1 (March 1988): 44–52.
- Willig, Rosette F., trans. *The Changelings: A Classical Japanese Court Tale*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983.
- Yamagishi Tokuhei 山岸徳平. *Mumyōzōshi*. Tokyo: Kadokawa Bunko, 1973.
- Yamanaka Yutaka 山中裕. *Heianchō no nenjū gyōji* 平安朝の年中行事. Hanawa sensho 75. Tokyo: Hanawa Shobō, 1972.
- , et al., ed. *Eiga monogatari* 栄華物語. 3 vols. SNKZ 31–33, 1995.
- Yoshida Kōichi 吉田幸一 and Koizumi Hiroshi 小泉弘, ed. *Hōbutsushū* 宝物集. Tokyo: Koten bunko, 1969.

Contact Joseph T. Sorensen: jsorensen@ucdavis.edu

**Consumerism and the Possibility of an Authentic Self in
Haruki Murakami's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World***

Burcu Genç

Abstract

With reference to Jean Baudrillard's theory of consumerism embedded in his scrutiny of power, this paper investigates the possibilities of an authentic self in Haruki Murakami's novel *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* within the context of Japanese consumerism in the 1970s and early 1980s. By alluding to the Baudrillardian discourse, I argue that the protagonist's choice to abandon his shadow at the very end of the novel is closely linked with his attempt to find an authentic self: in other words, an attempt to liberate himself from the power consumerism exerts on him.

Keywords: contemporary Japanese literature, Haruki Murakami, consumerism, Japanese society, Jean Baudrillard, power

Critics such as Matthew Strecher, Micheal Seats and Chiyoko Kawakami have already established a possible correspondence between Baudrillardian discourse and Murakami's works. Strecher, in *Dances With Sheep: the Quest for Identity in the Fiction of Murakami Haruki*, suggests an affinity between Murakami's employment of historical elements and Baudrillard's simulacrum. He argues that popular-culture icons in Murakami's works cross-reference to historical periods as an alternative to overt mention of major past events. Through such cross-references, Strecher claims, the past masked and reduced to the level of simulacrum by media is recovered in the realm of the fiction:

Indeed, one can go even further, as Baudrillard does, and argue that "reality" in the hand of the mass media has been erased, its replacement with the so-called "simulacrum" only partially hidden from us. There is no particular reason why this argument should be limited to present reality; if mass media can "mask" its (re)construction of a simulated reality, why not also a history? Indeed this is precisely what has occurred in postwar Japan with the mass media's ever-delicate handling of Japanese war responsibility in the Second World War. (2002, p. 165)

Seats limits his Baudrillardian analysis to the very early works of Murakami in *Murakami Haruki: The Simulacrum in Contemporary Japanese Culture*. In contrast to Strecher's argument, he puts emphasis on Murakami's deliberate utilization of a simulacrum, in lieu of exposure of reality through less significant events, in his early works by way of literary devices and tropes in order to achieve a critique of contemporary Japanese society. For instance, in his investigation of *A Wild Sheep Chase*, Seats states that the photo, by means of which the narrator searches for a rare breed of sheep, reveals itself as an allegorical element and thus reduces reality to a signifier through the lens of a camera: "the copy of the artificially constructed photograph of the pastoral idyll is synonymous with 'the real', and the modalities of the camera lens and xerox machine are implicitly confirmed as the basis of a way of seeing which faithfully and accurately reproduces the object seen" (2006, p. 216).

In addition to these Western critics, independent Japanese scholar Chiyoko Kawakami applies Baudrillard's simulacrum to Murakami's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* in "The Unfinished Cartography: Murakami Haruki and the Postmodern Cognitive Map" (2002). Kawakami particularly highlights the power relations and how the city as an urban space in Murakami's works turns into a sphere of hyperreality, full of signs and simulations. For instance, the elevator scene, she argues, yields to the Baudrillardian idea of disappearance of meaning and representation through the protagonist's use of language and immediate fictionalization of the scene: "a still life: Man in the Elevator" (Murakami, 2003, p.3). According to Kawakami, the protagonist, in his choice of words in this particular scene, puts a distance between the real and the imagined experience. In this way, he takes the role of a cameraman, who surveys the scene through the lens of a camera with a third point of view. Thus, in the novel, Kawakami suggests, reality is frequently turned "into an object of his detached gaze. Real situations are thus constantly transformed into pictorial representations" (2002, p. 324).

With reference to Baudrillard's notion of simulacrum, it seems that the primary concern of Strecher, Seats and Kawakami is the representation of reality under the influence of the political in Murakami's works. In the selected early works of Murakami, while Strecher raises the controversial issue of representation of history with regard to the topic, Seats and Kawakami focus on the urban space as a medium for pictorial representations of the reality. In all their analyses, an allusion to the Baudrillardian notion of simulacrum is unequivocally instrumental

in emphasizing the role of any form of power through the disclosure of the gap between reality and an idealized account of that reality. However, I argue that manifestation of any power structure, particularly that concerning political economy, is enunciated in more thorough and definite terms in Baudrillard's theory of consumerism. Thus, an analysis of *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* through the theory of consumerism allows for an understanding of the individual's engagement in power relations on multiple levels.

In *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, consumerism, defined as “the immediately social function of exchange, of communication, of distribution of values across a corpus of signs” (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 78), extends beyond goods and services to include various concepts such as leisure, history, labour and family. With such a definition, Baudrillard separates himself from the 19th-century consumption Thorstein Veblen (1992) describes in *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. Veblen interprets consumption as a conscious purchasing process that allows individuals to fashion themselves in a certain way in their societies. Particularly, in the fourth chapter of *The Theory of the Leisure Class*, he underlines that “the utility of consumption ... as an evidence of wealth is to be classed as a derivative growth. It is an adaption to a new end, by a selective process, of a distinction previously existing and well established in men's habits of thought” (61). Since consumption is as a result of a consumer's careful choice regarding his/her appearance and social relations, it is also simultaneously grounded on the determinate conditions regulating the individual's position in the social hierarchy: in other words, the antagonism of the elite, middle and working classes.

Baudrillard's theory of consumption, however, denotes a form of power that is no longer a uniform ideological institution. Rather, he identifies authority as a non-representational entity permeating and determining the social structure and relations with regard to the dissemination and exhaustion of values and standards such as leisure, labour, history and the arts. Thus, Baudrillard seems to derive his definition of consumption from his examination of Michel Foucault's description of power as a non-representational entity in the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*: “power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength that we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society” (1990, p. 93).

Although Baudrillard's non-representational definition of consumption seems to be closely associated with Foucault's interpretation of power, two distinctively crucial aspects inform his examination of consumerism implanted in his understanding of power. First, Foucauldian discourse does not dismiss the determinate conditions or antagonistic forces such as production and consumption, terrorist and hostage, or the wealthy and the poor. Foucault considers such determinate conditions as existing on the level of the real. Under these determinate conditions, resistance, he explains in *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, is equally achievable with a meticulous scheme: “as soon as there is a power relation, there is a possibility of resistance. We can never be ensnared by power: we can always modify its grip in determinate conditions and according to a precise strategy” (Foucault, 1988, p. 123). Baudrillard, in *Symbolic Exchange and Death*, quite the contrary, claims that antagonistic forces or determinate conditions are nullified within a vicious cycle of signification:

there is still an illusion in thinking that the capitalist system, at a certain threshold of increased reproduction, passes irreversibly from a strategy of shortage to a strategy of abundance. The current crisis proves that this strategy is reversible. The illusion still comes from a naïve faith in a *reality* of shortage or a *reality* of abundance, and therefore from the illusion of a real opposition between these two terms. (2012, p. 33)

Second, highly pertinent to the reversibility of the antagonistic forces, Baudrillard observes a discontinuity concerning the political economy and referential reason¹ in the period before, during and after the Second World War. For instance, he assesses the 1929 crisis, “resolved by regulating demand in an endless exchange of finalities between production and consumption” (2012, p. 33), as a real one resulting from the social limitations of consumption. Conversely, preventative action against a possible shortage, he asserts, precedes a real shortage today. More precisely, reversible shortages and abundance, under an illusionary antagonism, duplicate society on a Marxist model “in order the better to mask the system’s real law and the possibility of its symbolic destruction” (ibid, p. 31). Therefore, in a society circumscribed by such a mask, “social function and social organization far surpass individuals and impose themselves upon them by way of an unconscious social constraint” (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 78).

As a culmination of the above-named two propositions’ playing a pivotal role in the formation of Baudrillardian consumerist discourse, the relationship between any antagonism, such as highbrow and lowbrow in literature, or revolution and conformity in politics, can be deciphered in a similar fashion to how that correlation between shortage and abundance is understood. In other words, today any binary opposition, on the level of the real, acts as a substitute for another and ultimately leads to production: “other societies have known multiple stakes: over birth and kinship, the soul and the body, the true and false, reality and appearance. Political economy has reduced them to just one: production” (Baudrillard, 2012, p. 38). From such a standpoint, consumption as a concept not only covers goods and services but is expanded into a wide range of areas, in particular media, fashion, sex and family.

Similarly, I shall investigate the representation of labour and leisure in *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* in line with Baudrillard’s theory of consumption. It is my argument that the antagonism between the protagonist’s labour and non-labour/leisure activities, playing a crucial part in understanding the self, is invalidated under the influence of the policies of Japanese political economy and its consumer society. As the title suggests, *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* has two distinct storylines: one is the hard-boiled land set in a futuristic urban Tokyo converted into a centre of high information technology. In this high-tech urban setting there are workers called ‘Calcutecs’ serving a quasi-governmental institution named ‘the System’ by processing and encrypting data through their subconscious. The second narrative is the end of the world, or the Town, as it is frequently referred to by its inhabitants. Life is conversely idyllic, and the Town’s inhabitants perform jobs that do not really require any high technology. While the narrator is a certain nameless ‘Calcutec’ only known by his profession and consumption habits in the hard-boiled land, he tries to understand his significance in the Town through his profession as a dream-reader. Since the only information regarding the protagonist is his consumption habits and profession, it is his labour and non-labour activities, as a result, that impart the means through which self is understood in both narratives. Put another way, any meaning the protagonist attaches to the self is delineated either through his labour activity—his profession—or leisure activity—shopping and sightseeing. Thus, despite the apparent differences between the hard-boiled land and the Town, the protagonist in both narratives is under the leverage of policies of political economy as an apparatus of production through his labour and seemingly non-labour activities.

¹ By “referential reason”, Baudrillard refers to the disappearance of link between the word, meaning and referent.

The nameless narrator of the hard-boiled storyline, who defines himself as a born shopper, is indeed a typical consumer of 1970s and early-1980s in Japan. Conforming to Baudrillard's rejection of determinate conditions, he equally serves the system through his shopping or consumption, adhering strictly to a time span outside the labour hours. Any system, such as political economy or the arts, Baudrillard underlines, is deprived of antagonistic forces cancelling one another out. Neither, likewise, does non-labour time manifest itself as an opposition to the labour time. Rather, it establishes itself as the allotted span bought through one's wage, and the individual is "given a wage, not in exchange for labour, but so that you spend it, which is itself another kind of labour" (Baudrillard, 2012, p. 41). Thus, so long as "the system is charged with neutralising the symbolic retaliation *by buying it back through wages*" (ibid, p. 41, original emphasis), its domination over the individual never ceases. By comparing each ordinary day to that of "a squirrel in November, with mounds of little things" (Murakami, 2003, p. 71), the narrator of the hard-boiled land reveals himself as an object of such domination:

At eleven o'clock, I left the apartment, headed for the supermarket near the station, stopping next at the liquor store for some red wine, soda water, and orange juice . . . Then to the bookshop for two magazines, the electrical goods store for light bulbs and cassette tapes, the photo store for a pack of Polaroid film. Last, it was the record shop, where I picked out a few disks. By now, the whole back seat of my tiny coupé was taken up with shopping bags. (Ibid, p. 71)

The narrator's depiction of his daily shopping experience might at first seem a series of indiscriminate choices. However, when his justification for buying a car is taken into account together with his postulation about the sofa in the old man's room, it also becomes palpable to what extent his consumption habits are in line with two significant concepts shaping the advertisements and shopping habits of consumers in the post-war miracle years: namely, rationalisation and lifestyle status. Regarding these habits, in "New Tribes and Nostalgia: Consumption in the Late Twentieth Century and Beyond", Penelope Francks (2009) writes, "in the post-war and miracle years the purchase of new goods—a large proportion of them electrical consumer durables—could be based on their functionality and 'rationality', [and] by the 1980s Western-style furnishings had become more a matter of status and lifestyle choice" (p. 201).

The narrator, as a typical consumer of his day as portrayed by Francks, seems to be balancing these two concepts, the rationalisation of goods and goods as a sign of status and lifestyle. This born shopper chooses his car based on its functionality, ironically grounded on a justification of his excessive shopping: "I only wanted a car for shopping" (Murakami, 2003, p. 72). Much as he rationalises his consumption habits, the narrator equally considers evidence of lifestyle philosophy essential: "Procuring a good sofa . . . requires style and experience and philosophy. It takes money, yes, but you also need a vision of the superior sofa. That sofa among sofas" (ibid, p. 45). Therefore, when Junior and the Big Boy smash everything in his 'cosy and tasteful' house, the scene yields to the example of the Kwakiutl's potlatch. A potlatch is, according to the definition provided in the OED, "an opulent ceremonial feast (among certain North American Indian peoples of the north-west coast) at which possessions are given away or destroyed to display wealth or enhance prestige." Under this local tradition, the destruction or distribution of goods is equally emphasized as a manifestation of wealth and prestige. Therefore, Baudrillard, who argues the value of objects in consumer societies lies in their destruction as much as it does in their accumulation, refers to potlatch tradition in *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures* to explain the illusionary opposition between these

two terms. According to him, the destruction and accumulation of objects are indistinguishable in their effect, prompting the very same consequence—that is to say, “tell me what you throw away and I’ll tell you who you are” (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 42). Correspondingly, the Calcutec revels in how his apartment, a symbol of his lifestyle and status, is being destroyed: “Big Boy was bringing *a new meaning* to the word destruction in *my cozy, tasteful apartment*. I pulled another can of beer out of the refrigerator and sat back to watch the fireworks” (Murakami, 2003, p. 142, my emphasis).

Much as the narrator is under the sway of the system as a typical consumer, he is equally controlled by the same system as a member of the labour force. This is because, as Baudrillard puts it, “a man must die to become labour power. He converts this death into a wage. But the economic violence capital inflicted on him in the equivalence of the wage and labour power is nothing next to the symbolic violence inflicted on him by his definition as a productive force” (2012, p. 39). In other words, the system robs the individual of any other value and reduces him/her only to productive force while the difference between his labour and non-labour activities is concurrently being negated. In similar fashion, although the narrator, as a Calcutec, can gain access to wide range of information, he is only permitted to receive and decode it in line with the System’s needs and purposes. Moreover, depending on the type of data encryption, he can even be driven into the position of a mere container as in the case of ‘shuffling’. He describes it as “nothing I can pride myself on. I am merely a vessel to be used. My consciousness is borrowed and something is processed while I’m unaware. I hardly feel I can be called a Calcutec when it comes to shuffling” (Murakami, 2003, p. 115). Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the narrator can claim his labour, whose productive results are denied to him, only through his wage and consumption habits. Moreover, despite the fact that he “can only follow the prescribed order of business” and “despite the meddling and raised eyebrows at the System”, the narrator knows “no line of work that allows the individual as much freedom to exercise his abilities as being a Calcutec” (ibid, p. 115). While this further demonstrates the impossibility of an authentic self in the hard-boiled land, the narrator’s physical death, on grounds of an experiment carried out on him as a work requirement, ironically highlights him more as a worker alienated from his own labour.

The Town, where the power of consumerism is also imposed on the narrator, can equally be seen as an aspect of 1970s and early-1980s consumer culture, particularly in connection with the Japan Railways ‘Discover Japan’ project. In her thorough article “Formations of Mass Culture” (1993), Marilyn Ivy characterizes ‘Discover Japan’, an outcome of a concentration on nature and self-reflection after Nixon and the oil shock exposed the fragility of the Japanese economy, as the most extensive project in Japanese history. The most significant result, according to Ivy, was that such a large-scale project “reorganized the entire cultural topography of Japan according to a continuum of “tradition” and “modernity”” (1993, p. 252). The outcomes of the project are particularly crucial because its launch coincided with the Nixon-era oil shock, a period that indicated a possible shortage after the affluence of the post-war miracle years.

From the Baudrillardian point of view, such simultaneity is closely linked with a need for shortages as a result of mythic accumulation of production and labour: “Capital, to avoid the risk of bursting from these liquefied values, thus becomes nostalgic” (Baudrillard, 2012, p. 32). In other words, it seems that a turn towards nature as a result of excessive accumulation of wealth and production became necessary to reverse the possible negative effects of excess after the Nixon-era oil shock. Hence “ecology, where the danger of absolute scarcity reinstates an

ethic of energy conservation” (ibid, p. 32), becomes the solution in the form of the Town after the attack of the inklings. In this sense, the seemingly hostile inklings, a destructive force causing shortage through data erasure, indeed work towards the benefits of the system in the novel: “it’s a strategic move.... [T]he government doesn’t mind INKlings and INKlings don’t mind the government” (Murakami, 2003, p. 138). Therefore, the attack of the inklings, interpreted as cooperation with the System, together with narrator’s death evokes a yearning for nature and the past by marking the end of the hard-boiled land.

Contrary to the very high-tech and urban depiction of the hard-boiled land, the narration of the Town—following both Ivy’s and Baudrillard’s arguments—begins with a reference to a sphere strictly outside the urban: “this is the time when instinct compels the males to clash—after they have shed their winter coats, a week before the females bear young. They become so fierce, wounding each other viciously” (ibid, p. 17). Yet allusion to nature is not the sole aspect categorising the Town as a domain outside the modern. Time can be treated as another major element dissociating it from the modern or hard-boiled land. The depiction of a fight among golden beasts for the female—being repeated at a certain season each year—is a reminder of cyclical time, a notion analogous with the past and nature. In addition, the clock tower, a product of industrialisation and symbol of modernity, fails to function in the Town: “the clock has long forfeited its original role as a timepiece” (ibid, p. 38). The narrator of the Town, as revealed towards the end of the novel, is the Calcutec of the hard-boiled land and thus can be taken for the domestic urban traveller in the Town, the latter portrayed as against the hard-boiled land.

On account of having a living shadow, the narrator distinguishes himself from the inhabitants and fulfils the role of newcomer/non-member in a group. The narrator’s existence in the Town as a newcomer/non-member conforms to the primary principle of tourism or travel warranting a destination outside home. Following this primary principle, all journeys, regardless of the destination and length of the stay, presuppose eventually going back home. Thus, the shadow not-so-surprisingly encourages the narrator to escape the Town as it simultaneously resorts to the discourse of “us” and “them”: “We’re the ones who are right. They are the ones who are wrong absolutely” (ibid, p. 248). In addition, John Clammer discusses in “Sites and Sights: The Consuming Eye and the Arts of the Imagination in Japanese Tourism” that it is not so infrequent among Japanese domestic tourists to visit a rural town in order to experience the ‘natural’ life as it once was. On such trips “one can visit the countryside, stay in a traditional inn, eat wholly natural foods” (Clammer, 1997, p. 150). Similarly, Murakami’s narrator, like the domestic tourist Clammer mentions, stays in the Town and experiences life as its inhabitants live it. He consumes food different from what he is used to: “The food here is different than elsewhere. We only use a few basic ingredients. What resembles meat is not. What resembles egg is not.... Everything is made in the image of something” (Murakami, 2003, p. 224).

According to Clammer, domestic trips to rural areas not only promote economic growth but also lead to “a dual activity of construction: identity construction on the part of tourists and of the construction of the countryside on the part of urbanites with the complicity of the ruralites” (1997, p.150). Through his dream-reading job and experience of Town life, the narrator tries to understand not only the peculiarities of the Town but also the meaning of his own existence. Although the narrator acknowledges that it makes more sense to go back to his former world, he feels that the Town is a key to his existence and decides to stay: “I have discovered something that involves me here more than I could have thought” (Murakami, 2003, p. 398). The narrator’s wish to stay implies a deviation from the standards the ‘Discover Japan’

project aimed at. The project “targeted Japanese desires for a simpler rural past, yet its recuperation of that past indicated all the more clearly the difficulty of escaping the managed society of the 1970s” (Ivy, 1993, p. 252). In other words, ‘Discover Japan’ was a project intended to evoke a sense of past and nostalgia not as a result of the traveller’s independent experience but rather as “a system which secures the ordering of signs and the integration of the group” (Baudrillard, 1998, p. 78). As a natural consequence of a pre-decided experience, “the whole recent ecological turn ... [is] no longer a crisis of overproduction as in 1929—[but is] the involution of the system, recycling its identity” (Baudrillard, 2012, p. 32), as in the case of the ‘Discover Japan’ project. Therefore, the narrator’s decision to abandon his shadow and stay in the Town, in order to find an authentic self through his own unique and independent experience, can be regarded as an attempt to set himself free from the limits consumer society exerts on him.

As a matter of fact, the narrator’s experience of the Town life is also governed by the system in spite of his wish to stay at the end. Initially, the narrator learns how to live in the Town according to the instructions given to him by the gatekeeper upon his entrance. More crucially, for the narrator to perform his dream-reading profession the same gatekeeper blinds the narrator’s eyes. Both the act of blinding the eyes and instructions can be interpreted as an exertion of power on the narrator by the system. This is because they encourage the narrator to read the dreams and experience the Town life as desired by the system. As a result, both the information he can access through his dream-reading job and his leisure activity as a tourist are simultaneously manipulated and eventually converted into a means of production. However, the narrator, who tries to learn about the Town as much as possible in order to reunite with his shadow and plan an escape together with it, decides to stay in the Town at the very end. As opposed to his life in the hard-boiled land, where he renders up everything and emerges only as a productive force aligning with the system and its needs, the narrator unexpectedly finds something fundamental to his existence in the Town. Yet he does not try to persuade his shadow to stay together with him. The shadow, who makes a clear distinction between the narrator and the inhabitants of the Town, seems to belong to the hard-boiled land rather than the Town. With the adoption of an invidious approach to the inhabitants of the Town and its attempt to urge the narrator to leave the Town, the shadow seems to be a part of the system like the inklings are. Therefore, much as narrator’s experience and self are shaped by the pre-decided consumption patterns in the hard-boiled land, so long as his shadow remains attached to him, there is no actual freedom as a domestic traveller in the Town, either. Under such circumstances, detachment from the shadow becomes a means of escaping the managed society Baudrillard talks of, as well as an emancipation of the self. In this way, the narrator hopes to recover an authentic self, although he is not certain himself whether such a deed is within the reach of possibility.

References

- Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. C. Turner (Trans.). London: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526401502>
- . (2012). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. I. H. Grant (Trans.). London: Sage.
- Clammer, J. (1997). Sites and sights: the consuming eye and the arts of the imagination in Japanese tourism. In *Contemporary Urban Japan: A Sociology of Consumption* (pp. 136-151). Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470712771.ch7>
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*. L. Kritzman (Ed.). A. Sheridan (Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- . (1990). *The History of Sexuality* (Vol. 1). R. Hurley (Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage.
- Francks, P. (2009). New tribes and nostalgia: consumption in the late twentieth century and beyond. In *The Japanese Consumer: An Alternative Economic History of Modern Japan* (pp. 183-217). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivy, M. (1993). Formations of mass culture. In A. Gordon (Ed.), *Postwar Japan as History* (pp. 239-258). Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Kawakami, C. (2002). The unfinished cartography: Murakami Haruki and the postmodern cognitive map. *Monumenta Nipponica*. 37(3), 309–337. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3096769>.
- Murakami, H. (2003). *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*. Birnbaum (trans.). London: Vintage.
- Potlatch. (n.d.). In The Oxford English Dictionary online. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/148873?rskey=4UXU9o&result=1&isAdvanced=false>.
- Seats, M. (2006). *Murakami Haruki: the Simulacrum in Contemporary Japanese Society*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Strecher, C. M. (2002). *Dances With Sheep: The Quest for Identity in Murakami Haruki*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.18278>
- Veblen, T. (1992). *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. London: Transaction.

Contact Burcu Genç: burcu.gnc@gmail.com

About the Journal

The Editor welcomes unsolicited contributions to the Journal, but the vast majority of papers accepted for publication come from the related IAFOR conferences and are usually closely associated with the themes of the conferences. Papers are mostly selected for publication in April and May, to be published in the Northern autumn of the same year. There is no particular Journal house style, but contributors are expected to conform to one of the major academic styles such as Chicago, APA or MLA. If accepted for publication, the paper's style will likely be slightly modified to provide consistency across papers. Both British and U.S. English is acceptable, but spelling and punctuation conventions should be consistent with the form of English used. In-text citations rather than footnotes should be used for references to secondary sources. General notes should be in the form of footnotes rather than endnotes, and should *not* be manually inserted (use Word's automatic formatting). Generally contributions should be between 4,000 and 7,000 words in length. Japanese names should follow the modified Hepburn system of transliteration, including the use of macrons for long vowels.

Contributors for whom English is not a native language are responsible for having their manuscript corrected by a native-speaking academic prior to submitting their paper for publication.

Publication Ethics and Malpractice Statement

Duties of Author

Plagiarism is an affront to the established tenets of academic research. The submitted text should be entirely original, apart from the properly acknowledged use of other authors' work for citation purposes, and not have already appeared in another publication except with the written consent of all parties. (Papers translated into English for the first time may fall into this category.) Submitting an identical or very similar paper simultaneously to multiple journals is unethical. All sources should be cited in accordance with internationally accepted norms of fair use. Any images included in the paper must be out of copyright or used with the express written permission of the copyright holder. While the Editor will make all reasonable efforts to publish the paper to the highest standards, the author of the paper is solely responsible for his or her content, including any errors or omissions, and for any issues such as libel that might arise from the publication of their work in the Journal.

Duties of the Editorial Board

The Editor of the Journal is primarily responsible for working with a prospective author to produce a good-quality paper that meets international academic standards in terms of content, style and citation. The final decision regarding the publication or otherwise of a submitted paper lies entirely with the Editor, and he or she reserves the right to exclude a paper for any reason prior to publication, notwithstanding assurances of publication given prior to this, if the said publication is seen as potentially prejudicial to the reputation of the Journal. Manuscripts shall be assessed solely on the basis of their intellectual content in relation to the context of the particular Journal issue. Each issue is different and has its own priorities, to be determined exclusively by the Editor. The Editor and Editorial Staff shall exhibit care in the treatment of submitted manuscripts and related information, and in general not disclose information to

outside parties. Peer review shall generally be conducted ‘blind’, with both author and reviewer unaware of each other’s identity.

Duties of Reviewers

Reviewers shall review the paper in a timely fashion and to the best of their academic ability, offering constructive feedback about issues regarding content and form. Personal criticism should be avoided. Opinions should be supported with clear arguments and examples and be as specific as possible. Reviewers should make an effort to confirm that the paper contains sufficient and accurate citation of relevant sources, whether mentioned or otherwise. Reviewers who feel they have a conflict of interest should inform the Editor and be replaced.

the iafor
journal of literature & librarianship

ISSN: 2187-0608