



PROJECT MUSE®

Editors' Introduction: Sōseki Great and Small

Reiko Abe Auestad, Alan Tansman, J. Keith Vincent

Review of Japanese Culture and Society, Volume 29, 2017, pp. 1-11 (Article)

Published by University of Hawai'i Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/728578>

Editors' Introduction: Sōseki Great and Small

Reiko Abe Auestad, Alan Tansman, and J. Keith Vincent

The work of Natsume Sōseki (1867-1916) is a deep pool of ramifying literary, philosophical, and intellectual currents. The characters and plots of his novels belong to the cultural lingua franca of modern Japan: the cat with no name who catches no mice; Botchan, who jumps out of a second-floor window; Sanshirō and the woman on the train; Sensei and his younger friend strolling past tombstones in Zōshigaya. These literary moments, as well as episodes from Sōseki's own life story—the maid whispering in his ear as a boy the secret of his true parentage, or the glimpse of his own diminutive figure staring back at him in a London shop window—have acquired the resonance of so many primal scenes. Sōseki's very body, his pockmarked face and chronically bleeding stomach, has come to bear the stigmata of Japan's transition into modernity. He has proven inimitable among Japanese novelists, a towering figure whose genius chanced to flourish at a time of extraordinary cultural and political transformation.

To read and to study Sōseki has meant many things over the decades. In his own lifetime he was known as a poet, a theorist, a scholar of British literature, a generous mentor to younger writers, and a writer of wildly popular serialized fiction. In the interwar decades following his death in 1916, his disciples set about promoting his legacy as consummate stylist and a paragon of liberal humanist values. In the postwar period, to study Sōseki was to study what the first major Sōseki critic and biographer Etō Jun called “man's isolation in the egoistic modern world” and “the dark shadow that underlies Japan's seemingly rapid and successful modernization.”¹ Since the 1980s, writers on Sōseki in Japan and elsewhere have amassed a remarkable body of critical scholarship, bringing to bear a range of methodologies, from narratology to new historicism, to show how Sōseki's works and his iconic figure have been mobilized to serve a discourse of national exceptionalism, used as a smoke screen for colonial violence, and abetted an unexamined androcentrism.² From our vantage point now, the full reception history of

any one of Sōseki's novels can read like a compendium in miniature of a century of literary, historical, and political debates in Japan.³

The essays in this issue began at a conference held at the University of Michigan in 2014, when we attempted to take stock of this century of reading Sōseki and to begin to envision where the next century might take us. "Sōseki's Diversity" spanned three days, coming to a close on the one hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first installment of Sōseki's most canonical novel, *Kokoro*, in the *Asahi* newspaper, on April 20, 1914. As far as we know, it was the largest conference on a single Japanese author ever held outside of Japan. Seen in retrospect, it coincided with the beginning of a period of intense public and scholarly engagement with Sōseki's work. The *Asahi* newspaper re-serialized five of his major novels in their original format, beginning with the opening installment of *Kokoro* on the final day of our conference.⁴ The centenary of Sōseki's death in 2016 and the sesquicentenary of his birth in the following year brought more conferences and many more publications in Japanese,⁵ including a new edition of his collected works from Iwanami Shoten and a hefty one-volume encyclopedia of Sōseki studies.⁶ In the same year, roboticist Ishiguro Hiroshi unveiled an uncannily lifelike Sōseki android who is currently touring Japan performing lectures and readings of Sōseki's works. The publication since 2008 of no fewer than nine new or revised English translations of Sōseki's novels and a volume of his theoretical writings has brought Sōseki new readers in English as well.⁷ For Japanese readers, and for those of us who teach and write about Japanese literature outside of Japan, Sōseki seems to be everywhere, the air we breathe. This was no doubt why, when we first broached the idea of the conference to colleagues, many responded with sighs of exhaustion: "What, Sōseki again?"

The response was understandable given the recent flurry of translations and the mountain of Sōseki scholarship in Japan. And yet despite the feeling of *déjà vu* it inspired, "Sōseki's Diversity" was in fact the first major conference devoted to Sōseki held in the Anglophone world. Aside from a handful of monographs, a few dozen essays, and now a long-awaited biography,⁸ Sōseki remains scandalously understudied in English. This is not to say that there has not been excellent work done on Sōseki in English, but that his work would repay much more.⁹ Only a few of his novels have been the focus of more than two or three essays. Very little has been written on his haiku, his poetry in Chinese, or his *shaseibun* sketch prose, not to mention his essays and lectures, his theoretical writings, and his voluminous correspondence.¹⁰ And while the recent spate of retranslations of his novels into English is something to celebrate, there exists no standard English edition of Sōseki's collected works translated according to a consistent editorial vision.¹¹

One year after the conference in Michigan, some of us met again at Berkeley to workshop the papers as a group. The eight original essays, three new translations of Japanese-language criticism, and two translations of two newly discovered pieces by Sōseki himself that we have included here are the result of that workshop and many more

months of editing and lively conversations. Each contributor has brought Sōseki's work into dialogue with their own literary, aesthetic, and historical concerns, employing a wide range of methodologies including the intellectual history of translation, affect theory, actor network theory, queer theory, gender studies, postcolonial critique, and the history of book design. This special issue is the third collection of essays in English on Sōseki to appear since 1972.¹² A companion volume in Japanese is forthcoming simultaneously from Iwanami Shoten.¹³

Among the greatest pleasures of reading and rereading Sōseki are those moments when his sheer linguistic virtuosity becomes visible beneath the surface calm of his novels. As our opening essay, we include the novelist Tawada Yōko's keynote lecture delivered at the Michigan conference. In "What Kind of Stone Was Sōseki?" Tawada surveys the whole of Sōseki's output to show how his realism is underpinned by what Roland Barthes called "the rustle of language" in the service of an exquisite imagistic lexicon.

The manifold interpretative possibilities of Sōseki's work comes through with particular force in three very different readings of Sōseki's *Kokoro* included in this issue. In "*Kokoro* and the Economic Imagination," Brian Hurley looks back at *Kokoro*'s emergence as a modern classic by examining the history of Edwin McClellan's 1957 translation of *Kokoro* into English. McClellan's translation was for many English-language scholars the first introduction to Sōseki and Japanese literature, the inescapable lure into a lifetime of reading Japanese literature. But Hurley begins with the observation that McClellan's translation was not originally composed and received within "Japan Studies," the field we know today, but in the intellectual historical context characterized by McClellan's dissertation advisor at the University of Chicago, the economist Friedrich Hayek, who attempted to rehabilitate right-leaning liberal sentiments in the early Cold War years. Hurley's analysis brings together economic perspectives and literary sensibilities from that age, to show how they help us to read McClellan's *Kokoro* as a "great book" made congenial to the political persuasions of the Cold War American right. Through McClellan, then, Sōseki turns out to have played a small part in the birth of American conservatism.

There is perhaps no greater example of the conservative view of Sōseki than the postwar reception of *Kokoro* in Japan, where Sensei's guilt over his betrayal of K was elevated to the status of moral parable and used to force young readers to "kneel before the 'ethical' and 'spiritual' death of Sensei and shrink before the deified author as they contemplate their own ethical and spiritual inadequacies."¹⁴ The quotation is from Japan's preeminent Sōseki critic Komori Yōichi, who famously debunked this powerful ideological function of the text in the context of the "canon wars" of the 1980s. Reiko Abe Auestad begins her essay, "The Affect that Disorients *Kokoro*," by recalling how this

dominant reading described by Komori made her hate the novel growing up in Japan. She then proceeds to show us another *Kokoro* entirely: a novel not about “a moral man who takes responsibility for his actions” by killing himself, but a man who “crafts a moralizing, emotion-laden narrative out of the chaos of his own affective responses in the past” that leaves him with no choice but to kill himself. For Auestad, the tragedy of *Kokoro* lies in Sensei’s inability to forgive himself as a result of a too simplistic theory of causality. Remarkably, Auestad arrives at this reading via Sōseki’s own theories of affect and emotion, which show a striking affinity with recent work on affect in literary studies in the United States.

Ken Ito’s essay, “*Kokoro* in the High School Textbook,” offers yet another refreshing rereading of *Kokoro*. Building on the Americanist Rita Felski’s recent work on how ideological critique came to eclipse all other forms of reading by the 1990s, Ito shows how such readings of *Kokoro* have failed to account for the novel’s extraordinary ability to find its way into readers’ hands and minds. *Kokoro*, he argues, must be considered a powerful non-human object, a “protean text,” whose “thematic superabundance” and narrative complexity have produced a seemingly endless series of readings. Like the revenant ghost of K, just when we think we have exhausted what can be said about it, *Kokoro* keeps coming back to life, and Ito shows how this happens even when the novel is grotesquely “dismembered” in excerpted form in high school textbooks.

Sōseki, we have said, was centrally concerned with people in the complex mesh of their time and place. One major axis of his understanding of human relationality is gender. One can chart a development in Sōseki’s novelistic career from a profoundly homosocial writer with almost no interest in the reality of women’s lives to one who created some of the most finely drawn female characters in all of Japanese literature. In writing about women in his later works, Sōseki became increasingly ethically attuned to the real-life workings of power, money, uneven access to education, as well as to the effects on women of the gendered segregation of literary genres in Japan.¹⁵

Sōseki’s 1906 novel *Kusamakura* is one of the last of Sōseki’s works to display the characteristically male homosocial worldview of his early years. And yet it features a female character who speaks her mind and seems able to challenge that worldview. In “Doubled Visions of Desire: Fujimura Misao, *Kusamakura*, and Homosocial Nostalgia,” Robert Tuck argues that the female protagonist (Nami) is a literary creation that emerged from Sōseki’s grief over the recent suicide of one of his male disciples, an event that had transfixed the country and devastated Sōseki’s tightly knit circle. In Tuck’s reading, what feminist critics have celebrated as Nami’s transgression of heteronormative gender and sexual norms comes to appear less as a challenge to such norms, and more as an expression of Sōseki’s own nostalgia for “an artistic space predicated on exclusively male homosocial bonds.” For Tuck, in other words, Nami can be read as a man in drag. That *Kusamakura* as a text can fully support both readings of Nami—one that sees her as a precursor to a forward-looking feminism and another as a cross-dressed specter

of a male homosocial past—reflects the novel’s complex positioning at a transitional moment in Sōseki’s career as a writer and in the history of gender and sexual relations in the Meiji period (1868-1912).

As Sayumi Takahashi Harb’s essay shows, Sōseki was also capable of identifying across gender lines, especially with women writers. “Penning the Mad Man in the Attic: Queerness, Women Writers, and Race in Sōseki’s *Sanshirō*,” takes up Sōseki’s apparent identification with the seventeenth-century British novelist Aphra Behn. Behn makes a number of appearances in Sōseki’s 1909 novel *Sanshirō*, which Harb reads to suggest that Behn’s most famous novel—the story of an African prince sold into slavery—preoccupied Sōseki because it spoke to him of his own fraught position at the center of one empire and at the periphery of another. Harb’s method involves intricate philological analysis to reveal Sōseki’s text as a dense weave of “mutually contesting intertextual allusions overlaid with intersectional skeins of race, (queer) gender, sexuality, and location.” In Harb’s reading, there is a “kind of queer literary theory tucked away in the folds” of this novel, and Sōseki himself emerges, with Behn, as a queer writer. That Sōseki read Behn so carefully and sympathetically fully two decades before the rehabilitation of her reputation in England at the hands of Virginia Woolf and Vita Sackville West says something extraordinary not only about the sheer breadth of his reading, but also its depth. In Harb’s account, despite his own conservative views of women and gender, Sōseki was simply too good a reader not to be profoundly affected by Behn’s writing.

A member of the Meiji elite, Sōseki was friends with many of the central players in Japan’s colonial adventures abroad, including Nakamura Zekō (1867-1927), the second president of the Manchurian Railway Company. As Angela Yiu discusses in her essay, “Beach Boys in Manchuria, An Examination of Sōseki’s *Here and There in Manchuria and Korea*, 1909,” it was Zekō who invited Sōseki to tour Manchuria, leading to the serialization of his travelogue *Here and There in Manchuria and Korea* (Mankan tokorodokoro, 1909). While most recent critics have looked to this work for evidence of Sōseki’s attitude toward other Asians and toward Japanese imperial ambitions, Yiu reads it as a “private, literary space for memory and affect, not a journalistic, intellectual space for political criticism.” It is also a “boyish and bantering” homosocial text in the vein of *I Am a Cat*, and a self-consciously literary one, reminiscent of *Kusamakura*. For Yiu, both of these characteristics of *Here and There in Manchuria and Korea*—its nostalgic homosociality and its escapist aestheticism—were ways for Sōseki to distance himself from the pervasive jingoistic rhetoric of his time. His is the stance of the artist as opposed to that of the scientist or the politician. Yiu also discusses a lecture that was recently discovered in 2008, which Sōseki delivered in Manchuria in 1909 to the leaders of the Manchurian Railway Company. Titled “The Relation Between Things and Three Types of People” (Mono no kankei to sanyō no ningen), the lecture provides a valuable record of Sōseki’s view of the activities of Japanese colonists in Manchuria and his own

position vis-à-vis the expanding Japanese empire. We have included Yiu's translation of its full text in this issue.

Andre Haag's essay, "'Why Was He... Well Killed?' Natsume Sōseki, Empire, and the Open Secrets of Anticolonial Violence," further complicates our understanding of Sōseki's relation to Japan's colonial project. In his 1910 novel *The Gate* (Mon), the characters Sōsuke, Oyone, and Koroku discuss the dramatic assassination of Itō Hirobumi in the previous year, when he was serving as Japan's Resident General of Korea. "Why was he, well, *killed*?" asks Oyone, using the passive voice to obscure the agent of violence. Neither Oyone nor any other character in the novel ever mentions the name of the Korean assassin, displaying what Haag calls an "assertive disinterest" in drawing links between Itō's death and the empire's enduring "Korea problem." Haag argues that this "disinterest" is not the same as the refusal, or repression, of the knowledge of colonial violence that other critics have seen operating in this scene. For Haag, drawing on the work of the comparative literature scholar Anne-Lise François, colonial violence in *The Gate* is better characterized as an "open secret": a piece of knowledge that does not require action and therefore authorizes non-participation in the "easy, self-satisfied explanatory circuit" of jingoistic rhetoric that filled newspapers at the time linking the act of assassination to the "backwards" nature of Korean resistance. Haag's argument is bolstered by a comparison of the scene in *The Gate* with Sōseki's description of his own reaction to the news of the assassination in an essay published in a Japanese-language newspaper in Manchuria a few months earlier. That essay, which was discovered in 2013, is also included in Haag's translation in this volume.

Pedro Basso's essay, "Judging a Book by Its Cover" details Sōseki's collaborations with the illustrators Hashiguchi Goyō (1880-1921), Nakamura Fusetsu (1866-1943), and Tsuda Seifū (1880-1978) to create covers and illustrations for his books, showing the great care Sōseki took in curating the aesthetics of his books in their physical form. For Sōseki, and for the designers he worked with, the book was a total work of art. He valued design less as an illustration of a book's plot and more for its intrinsic aesthetics. In the care Sōseki took with the design of his books, Basso sees not only his desire to follow the dictates of his own taste, but also his willingness to make room for the taste of others. As Basso argues, the process of book design was a particularly powerful example of Sōseki's understanding that "literature was something to be treated with care and discerning taste."

In addition to the recently discovered lecture and newspaper article written by Sōseki during his trip to Manchuria in 1909, we include here three previously untranslated critical essays on Sōseki by Japanese critics: just a small sample of the extraordinary scholarship on him produced in Japan in recent years. Robert Tuck has translated Karatani Kōjin's "Death and Poetry: From Shiki to Sōseki," an important study of the haiku poet Masaoka Shiki's powerful influence on Sōseki's understanding of literature, first published in 1992. Andre Haag and Robert Tierney have translated the sections

on Sōseki in Komori Yōichi's 2001 book *Postcolonial*, in which Komori shows how intimately Sōseki's works register the history of Japanese imperialism. We also include Kristin Sivak's translation of "Camelias and Vampires: Reading the Spermatic Economy in Sōseki's *And Then*," a 2008 essay by the feminist scholar of British literature Miyazaki Kasumi, who uncovers a startling subtext of vampirism in *And Then* (Sore kara) to reveal the novel's underlying gender ideology.

These pieces were chosen not according to any particular editorial principle but by collaborators in this project who found them especially meaningful and useful for their own work. Given the vast quantities of superb scholarship on Sōseki in Japanese that remains untranslated into English, this seemed the most reasonable way to proceed. As it happens, the three essays provide something of a cross-section of the current state of Sōseki studies in English and Japanese, revealing an abiding interest in questions of genre, empire, and gender.

It is our hope that this special issue will contribute to the endeavor that John Nathan sets out to accomplish with his recent biography: to "liberate Sōseki from an exceptionalist characterization as a Japanese novelist and to install him alongside other great writers of global literature where he belongs."¹⁶ And yet we are also conscious, perhaps all too conscious, of the fact that Sōseki remains a relatively minor writer outside of Japan. If he is "everywhere" inside Japan, anywhere else in the world, you need only take one step outside the Japanese literature classroom and hardly anyone will have heard of him.¹⁷ But this double status as both a major and a minor writer is, we believe, not just a problem to be remedied by more efforts at promotion. It is also an integral part of the interest his work affords. Just as in Sōseki's novels we are often not entirely sure who the main characters are and who the minor, Sōseki's stature as an author flickers intriguingly between great and small. This can be freeing for readers outside of Japan, for whom he does not loom so large in their national imaginations. It is also a healthy reminder of what made Sōseki who he was: a writer destined to know much more of the world than it would ever deign to know of him. Writing in a nation that was both culturally centered and culturally marginal, he became his own center, from which he considered all literary forms and all literary histories as contingent and not universal.¹⁸ It was this vantage—gained by his position on the periphery—that paradoxically made of him a world writer. It also allowed him to elaborate the world's first scientific theory of literature, standing above any particular literature, and predating by a decade the work of Viktor Shklovsky and by almost two decades the work of I.A. Richards.¹⁹

Taken together, the essays and translations included here hardly add up to the "truly synthetic" treatment of Sōseki that Thomas Rimer hoped to see in the future when he reviewed the last collection of essays on Sōseki in English three decades ago, in 1988.

Indeed, throughout this endeavor, we have felt keenly the difficulty of imagining, as Rimer put it then, “how those of us who admire Sōseki might possibly encompass him. His roving imagination, his aesthetic insights, his moral compunctions, are larger, and sometimes more elusive, than the nets we can reasonably throw out in an attempt to capture them.”²⁰ But that is as it should be. If there is anything that these very different essays share, it is an appreciation for Sōseki’s complexity as a writer and a person rather than a desire to pin him down. The picture that we hope they create is not another version of what we have come to call the “big Sōseki”—the one who personified the great dilemmas of modernity and morality in Japan, but a crowd of “little Sōseki’s” who keep slipping from our grasp, reminding us of how much more of him there is to know.

Reading Sōseki closely as we put together this collection over the last few years, we three editors have searched for ways to describe what it is that continues to attract us and so many other readers to his work. We have been struck by the precision with which he calibrates his language of daily life to bring the worlds he describes into sharp focus, while also giving his readers the freedom to imagine, theorize, and speculate—not only about the motivations of his characters but also about what might be motivating their own reading. He pushes readers to project themselves onto his characters—sympathetically, but at a distance; to worry about what they might be thinking and feeling, to ask why and whether they care; to clarify how they are functioning in the novel itself.

So we keep reading, and rereading, asking ourselves how and why we feel a certain way about a given character. And no sooner do we begin to feel that these strands have coalesced than the stream is dispersed, or rerouted, or disappears altogether. It is thanks to this unforced quality—Sōseki called it *yo-yū*, or “leeway”—that his novels are able to capture so much of the worlds they describe without getting stuck in one ideological current or another. It may also be why even now, more than a century later, the novels have hardly aged; readers around the world feel his characters to be people that they know.

The editors would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers for their helpful comments on the essays included here. We are also grateful to everyone who brought good ideas and good cheer to the “Sōseki’s Diversity” conference at Michigan in 2014, and to the Berkeley workshop the following year. Finally, our sincere thanks go to Miya Elise Mizuta Lippit, without whose expert editorship this issue would never have come together.

Notes

1. Etō Jun, “A Japanese Meiji Intellectual: An Essay on *Kokoro*,” in *Essays on Natsume Sōseki’s Works*, compiled by the Japanese National Commis-

sion for Unesco, 1972, 49-65. See also Hirakawa Sukehiro, *Natsume Sōseki: hi-seiyō no kutō* (Natsume Sōseki: The Struggle Against the West) (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1975).

On how Sōseki’s writing set the terms for subsequent discussion of Japanese modernity and its critique, see Satō Izumi, “‘Kindai’ to ‘Nihon kindai’”: Natsume Sōseki no / ni yoru

saikenshō” (On “Modernity” and “Japanese Modernity”: A Reconsideration of/and through Natsume Sōseki), *Journal of Aoyama Gakuin Women’s Junior College* 51 (1997): 119-48.

2. A good overview in English of one especially rich vein of Sōseki reception can be found in Atsuko Sakaki’s synopsis of the famous “Debates on *Kokoro*” (*Kokoro* ronsō). See “The Debates on *Kokoro*: A Cornerstone,” in *Recontextualizing Texts: Narrative Performance in Modern Japanese Fiction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 1999), 29-54. Highlights of critical approaches in the 1990s to Sōseki in English scholarship include James Fujii, “Death, Empire, and the Search for History in Natsume Sōseki’s *Kokoro*,” in *Complicit Fictions: The Subject in the Modern Japanese Prose Narrative* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 126–50, and the discussion of Sōseki’s *Kokoro* in Sharalyn Orbaugh, “General Nogi’s Wife: Representations of Women in Narratives of Japanese Modernization,” in *In Pursuit of Contemporary East Asian Culture*, eds. Xiaobing Tang and Stephen Snyder (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996), 7–31.

3. Important critical essays on each of Sōseki’s major novels, from writing by his own contemporaries to the 1980s, have been collected in *Sōseki sakuhinron shūsei* (Critical Essays on the Works of Sōseki), ed. Tamai Takayuki, et al. (Tokyo: Ōfūsha, 1990-91). Each of the thirteen volumes of this series includes a useful roundtable discussion by Sōseki researchers on the reception history of the novel in question. For concise and useful summaries of the more recent reception history of a dozen Sōseki novels, as well as thirteen important monographs on Sōseki, see Ishihara

Chiaki, *Sōseki wa dō yomarete kita ka?* (How Has Sōseki Been Read?) (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 2010).

4. Shinchōsha reported that sales of their paperback version of *Kokoro*, which average 30,000 copies per year, increased to more than twice that after the Asahi reserialization. See Nakamura Mariko, “Asahi shimbun no sairensai kara miru “*Kokoro* būmu” (The *Kokoro* Boom Seen Through the Asahi Reserialization), *Ajia yūgaku* (Asian Studies) 194 (2016): 143-56, 147.

5. There are far too many to mention, but two especially useful volumes are *Tanjō 150 nen: sekai bungaku toshiteno Natsume Sōseki* (Natsume Sōseki as World Literature: 150 Years After His Birth) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2017), which collects the essays from a major conference at Ferris University marking the sesquicentennial of Sōseki’s birth, and *Sōseki genshō* (The Sōseki Phenomenon), a special issue of *Nihon kindai bungaku* (Modern Japanese Literature) that appeared in 2018.

6. Iwanami has had a strong connection with Sōseki’s work from its earliest days, beginning with the publication of the luxury edition of *Kokoro*, which Sōseki himself funded. On the design of that edition, see Pedro Bassoe’s article in this issue. In his recent biography of Sōseki, John Nathan calls Iwanami “the house that Sōseki built.” See John Nathan, *Sōseki: Modern Japan’s Greatest Novelist* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018), 230. For a useful study of Sōseki’s publishing history with Iwanami, see Yaguchi Shin’ya, *Sōseki zenshū monogatari* (The Story of *The Collected Works of Sōseki*) (Tokyo: Seieisha, 1985). *Sōseki jiten* (A Sōseki Dictionary), eds. Komori Yōichi, Iida Yūko, et al. (Tokyo: Kanrin Shobō, 2017).

7. The new translations include (by date of publication): *Kusamakura*, trans. Meredith McKinney (New York: Penguin Classics, 2008); *Theory of Literature and Other Critical Writings*, eds. Michael K. Bourdaghs, Atsuko Ueda, and Joseph A. Murphy (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009); *Botchan*, trans. Matt Treyvaud (Amazon Kindle, 2009); *Kokoro*, trans. Meredith McKinney (New York: Penguin Books, 2010); *Nowaki*, trans. William N. Ridgeway (Ann Arbor: Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, 2011); *Botchan*, trans. Joel Cohn (Cambridge, England: Penguin Classics, 2012), 2012. *The Gate*, trans. William F. Sibley (New York: New York Review Books, 2013); *Light and Dark*, trans. John Nathan (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013); *Sanshiro: With an Introduction by Haruki Murakami*, trans. with notes by Jay Rubin (Cambridge, England: Penguin Classics, 2016); *The Miner*, trans. Jay Rubin (London: Aardvark Bureau, 2016).

8. John Nathan, *Sōseki: Modern Japan’s Greatest Novelist* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018).

9. An admittedly eclectic list of what we consider some of the most insightful and useful readings of Sōseki in English (not mentioned elsewhere in these notes) would include: Michael Bourdaghs, “Property and Sociological Knowledge: Natsume Sōseki and the Gift of Narrative,” *Japan Forum* 20:1 (2008): 79-101; Stephen Dodd, “The Significance of Bodies in Sōseki’s *Kokoro*,” *Monumenta Nipponica* 53, no. 4 (1998): 473–98; Hosea Hirata, “The Emergence of History in Natsume Sōseki’s *Kokoro*,” in *Discourses of Seduction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 183–206; Ken K. Ito, “Writing Time

in Sōseki's *Kokoro*," in *Studies in Modern Japanese Literature: Essays and Translations in Honor of Edwin McClellan*, eds. Dennis Washburn and Alan Tansman, Michigan Monograph Series in Japanese Studies (Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1997), 3-21. Fredric R. Jameson, "Sōseki and Western Modernism," *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture* 18, no. 3 (1991): 123-41; Patricia Merivale, "Silences: Sōseki Natsume's *Kokoro* and Canadian Elegiac Romance," in *Nature and Identity in Canadian and Japanese Literature*, eds. Kinya Tsuruta and Theodore Goosen (Toronto: University of Toronto and York University Joint Center for Asia Pacific Studies, 1988), 127-41. For an extensive list of critical work on Sōseki in English up to 2016, see the preface to Reiko Abe Auestad, *Rereading Sōseki: Three Early Twentieth-Century Japanese Novels* (2016). CEAS Reprint Series for Rare and Out of Print Publications, Book 1. (Available online at: https://elischolar.library.yale.edu/ceas_reprint_series/2/).

10.

An essay on Sōseki's poetry in Chinese came out as this issue was going to print: Xiaohui Zhang, "The Pursuit of the Dao: Natsume Sōseki and His *Kanshi* of 1916," *The Journal of Chinese Literature and Culture* 5:1 (April 2018): 148-71.

11.

Of course no such collection exists for any Japanese author in English. But Sōseki would be the logical author to begin with. Such collections have recently appeared in both Korean and Chinese. In Korean, see *Natsume Sōseki sosōl chōnjip* (The Complete Novels of Natsume Sōseki), 14 vols., trans. Song T'aek and Na Chaemyōng (Seoul: Hyōnsamsa, 2013-14). In Chinese, see *Xiamu shushi zuo pin ji* (Works of

Natsume Sōseki), 9 vols. (Shanghai, China: Shanghai yi wen chu ban shi [Shanghai Translation Publishers], 2017). Thanks to Yoon Sun Yang and Petrus Liu for alerting us to these collections.

12.

The first such volume was a collection of essays by Japanese critics compiled to mark the centenary of Sōseki's birth in 1967 and published in 1972. See *Essays on Natsume Sōseki's Works*, compiled by the Japanese National Commission for Unesco, 1972. The second was *The World of Natsume Sōseki*, eds. Iijima Takehisa and James M. Vardaman (Tokyo: Kinseido, 1987).

13.

See *Sōseki no ibasho: Nihonbungaku to sekai bungaku no kōsa* (The Site of Sōseki: At the Intersection of Japanese and World Literature, Iwanami Shoten, 2019). The volume includes Japanese translations of the original essays included here by Basso, Hurley, Haag, Ito, Takahashi, Tawada, Tuck, and Yiu, as well as a separate essay on Sōseki's *Light and Dark* by Auestad and two new essays by J. Keith Vincent and Nakagawa Shigemi.

14.

Komori Yōichi, "Kokoro ni okeru hanten suru 'shuki'" (The Recursive "Memoirs" of *Kokoro*), in *Kōzō toshiteno katari* (Narrative as Structure) (Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 1988), 415-16.

15.

For this reading of Sōseki, see Minae Mizumura, "Resisting Woman: Reading Sōseki's *Gubinjinso*," in *Studies in Modern Japanese Literature: Essays and Translations in Honor of Edwin McClellan*, eds. Dennis Washburn and Alan Tansman (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 23-37. More recently, Kitakawa Fukiko has shown how Sōseki's narration (*ji no bun*) in his final novel *Light and Dark* (Meian,

1916) represents the unspoken thoughts of his female protagonist using abstract and complex Chinese compounds (*kango*) that were previously the province of men, thus blurring the boundaries of gender and genre. See Kitakawa Fukiko, "Janru no kioku: Sōseki ni okeru 'bun' no ten'i" (The Memory of Genre: Transition and Transformation of "Literary Prose" in Sōseki), *Nihon kindai bungaku* (Modern Japanese Literature), vol. 98 (2018): 71-86.

16.

Sōseki: Japan's Greatest Novelist, xi. Nathan delivered a keynote lecture at the Michigan conference that was published in Japanese translation (together with earlier versions of the essays by Auestad, Harb, Hurley, and Tuck that appear here in this volume), in Alan Tansman and J. Keith Vincent, eds., "Shō tokushū: daishō no Sōseki" (Sōseki Great and Small: A Mini-Special Issue), *Bungaku* (Literature) 15, 6 (2014): 100-74.

17.

As Bruce Fleming, one of the few non-specialists who has written about Sōseki, wrote in a 2001 essay, "Who's heard of Sōseki? Try dropping his name at a campus or urban cocktail party and listen for the silence." Fleming's essay discusses various possible explanations for why Sōseki has "failed to catch on in the U.S." He ends with a useful analysis of what he calls the "missing structural middle layer" that characterizes many of Sōseki's works. This is the layer between the details of his plot and the meta-narrative that tells the reader "what it all means," often leaving the reader confused about a character's motivations. But insofar as this "missing middle" is characteristic of all primary texts of European modernism, Sōseki may be "more accessible, more universal, than critics admit." See Bruce Fleming, "Sōseki and His Discontents," *Michigan Quarterly*

Review 40, no. 3 (2001): 457-83.

18.

On how Sōseki's perspective from the margins of Western modernity informed his thinking on world literature and his "continued preoccupation with understanding the transformation of literatures due to global interaction" see Annette Thorsen Vilslev, "Questioning Western Universality: Sōseki's *Theory of Literature* and his novel *Kusamakura*," *Japan Forum*, vol. 29, no. 2 (2017): 259-78. See also Todd Andrew Borlick's discussion

of how Sōseki's frustration with his Shakespeare tutor W. J. Craig whose "erratic style" and "Bardolatry," typical of the state of British literary criticism before I. A. Richards, inspired Sōseki to hatch his plan to develop a "systematic and scientific approach to literary studies" that also "anticipates post-colonial theory by exposing Shakespeare's universality as a shibboleth." Todd Andrew Borlick, "Reading Hamlet Upside Down: The Shakespeare Criticism of Natsume Sōseki," *Shakespeare*, vol. 9, no 4. (2013), 383-403.

19.

On Sōseki's *Theory of Literature*, see the translation referenced above and the special issue "Sōseki's Theory of Literature," eds. Joseph A. Murphy, Atsuko Ueda, and Michael Bourdaghs, *Japan Forum*, 20:1 (2008).

20.

Thomas Rimer, "Review of *The World of Natsume Sōseki*. Ed. by Takehisa Iijima and James M. Vardaman, Jr.," *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol. 14, no. 2 (Summer 1988); 551-55, 554.