



The Association for
Asian Studies

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Thomas LaMarre

Reviewed work(s):

Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature by Haruo Shirane ; Tomi Suzuki

Source: *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (Feb., 2002), pp. 266-269

Published by: Association for Asian Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2700247>

Accessed: 13/07/2009 11:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=afas>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Association for Asian Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Asian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

which their fantasies may be projected" (p. 35). Both East and West imagine, figure, and encounter the other, and bring limited abilities and understanding to the other's cultural products, or rather, bring differently formed traditional perspectives to bear upon newly forming ideas in a uniquely international arena.

The chapters of *Fault Lines* treat the subjects of establishing surrealist practice in Japan (chapter 1), an analysis of the image in surrealism (chapter 2), questions of influence and reading across cultures (chapter 3), the role of immediacy in surrealist poetry (chapter 4), Nishiwaki's notion of eternity (chapter 5), and the surrealist legacy in butoh (epilogue). The great majority of the discussion is dedicated to Kitasono, Takiguchi, and Nishiwaki. The contention that we still live with the Surrealist legacy, at least in terms of frame breaking and imagery in the arts, is difficult to refute. The present day Japanese use of the prefix *chō-* (ultra) appears early in the text and serves as *Fault Lines'* marker (to which the text returns at its close) of the pervasiveness of early-twentieth-century surrealism in our present actuality some eighty years on. Yet, following the specifics of a surrealist vein in the arts outside Peter Bürger's historical avant-garde remains exceedingly difficult, in the face of the French Surrealist staunch defense of the unique nature of their project, and in particular when the task is taken outside poetry and painting. The international movement was very diverse despite the internal dictatorial politics of its French base, and *Fault Lines'* own linking of distant realities at times threatens to break it apart, especially in its transition to butoh in the epilogue. Yet, the individual readings creatively and convincingly unfold and reveal the Japanese "poetics of shock," from which the book takes its title, and *Fault Lines* contains no shortage of insights into a diverse international movement.

JEFFREY JOHNSON
University of Utah

Inventing the Classics: Modernity, National Identity, and Japanese Literature.
Edited by HARUO SHIRANE and TOMI SUZUKI. Stanford: Stanford
University Press, 2001. xiii, 333 pp. \$60.00 (cloth); \$24.95 (paper).

The objective of this collection of essays, as Haruo Shirane announces in his cogent introduction, is to historicize the complex sociopolitical process of canon formation, particularly as it relates to the emergence of linguistic and cultural nationalism. To this end, the essays explore the history of scholarly reception of texts that have been established as classics, as repositories of the Japanese tradition, with an emphasis on the modern invention of national identities.

The collection presents a truly significant contribution to the study of Japanese literature, by calling attention to the impact of modernity on readings of classical texts, and by raising questions about the neutrality of received scholarship. All the essays are solidly researched and lucidly written, and the volume is certain to be widely used and cited. Given the importance of this collection, it is crucial to look at the central issues raised in it.

Across the essays are general indications that "literature" is a object produced by institutions and discourses of modernization that also generated "Japan." Literature is national literature, and to construct a literary canon is to construct a national identity—which Shirane highlights both in his introduction and in his essay on how institutions of education shaped the Japanese canon. And as a whole, the essays focus attention on the profound changes in textual interpretation that arose with the formation and consolidation of national literature in the Meiji and Taishō periods.

Shinada Yoshikazu, for instance, discusses how scholars in the Meiji period, in their search for a national lyric with qualities like those extolled in Western literary histories, made a national poetry anthology of *Man'yōshū*. Of particular importance was the notion that *Man'yōshū* presented a unified nation that extended from emperor to commoners. Later in the Meiji period, there occurred a second transformation that called attention to the popular or folk elements, and invented *min'yō* or “folk song.” The two interpretations coexisted in the prewar period, but only the second survived the postwar reduction of the emperor to a symbolic status, precisely because it was articulated in cultural rather than political terms.

Kōnoshi Takamitsu deals with *Kojiki* and *Nihonshoki*, ancient imperial texts that in the modern era have served to define the foundation of the folk and nation. He first undermines any sense of a unified foundation, showing how these two texts not only entailed different legitimations of the emperor but also vied with other interpretations. The subsequent history of their reception is one of diverse attempts to unify their mythologies. Crucial to the modern nation, however, is its discovery of the early modern work of Motoori Norinaga, who read these texts in terms of linguistic unity and ethnic identity—crucial because unified language became the foundation for national unity. And scholars today continue to construct mythologies from these texts, reading them as if they provided direct access to the origins and foundations of the Japanese people.

Particularly in the second of these first two essays, there are signs of radical historicization, which tends to emphasize how discourses produce their objects. Such a gesture establishes an historical divide, often with the formation of the modern nation as the site of rupture. For instance, Karatani's work famously set forth such examples as “Man” and “landscape” and “interiority” as distinctly modern objects of knowledge. Similarly, Kōnoshi calls attention to the modern discovery of Norinaga, and thus to the modern invention of linguistic unity. Or, in a fine essay on Chikamatsu, drawing on Karatani, William Lee writes persuasively of a “discovery of dramatic literature” that “involved a fundamental reformulation and the repression of the historical nature of this reformulation” (p. 184).

The point of such historicization is to introduce theoretical and historical specificity into the analysis of modern discourses. Moreover, the notion that discourses produce their objects is radically different from national literary studies (*kokubungaku*). One of the crucial totalizing strategies of *kokubungaku* is to look for the origins of its modern objects in the past, thus to make the past serve as a source of unity and identity for the modern nation. Generally, the essays in *Inventing the Classics* are strongest when they tend toward radical historicization, for this permits critical opposition to some of the totalizing strategies of *kokubungaku*.

In his survey of the scholarly literature on *The Tale of Heike*, for instance, David Bialock shows how the modern disciplinary separation of history and literature encouraged scholars to fold this military tale into courtly literature, emphasizing pathos, loss, and suffering. Subsequently, this separation allowed key scholars to link lyric emotions to military action around the emperor. Only in the postwar period did Marxist scholars introduce questions about history and empire, about the “people” and the nation, by way of the historical questions raised by the notion of epic literature. Bialock concludes that the postwar turn to *Heike* as epic paved the way for accounts that begin to deal with its diversity and complexity of historical conflict, away from “the monological voice of the nation” (p. 178).

On a different tack, in his survey of modern scholarship on *Ise monogatari*, Joshua Mostow looks at how the Heian period came to be construed as feminine. Meiji

scholarship associated the Heian with all that was licentious and effeminate, and tended to condemn it. Taishō scholarship began to construe this in positive terms, linking the Heian with love and elegance. In the early years of Shōwa, scholarship on *Ise monogatari* constructed a world of *miyabi*, in an attempt to recover lost values and traditions associated with Heian women. In the postwar years, this *miyabi* became inextricably meshed with the “emperor as culture” system, and the emperor and Heian women were posited as the guarantors of Japanese tradition. Essential to authorizing *kokubungaku* methodologies was the generation and maintenance of gender asymmetries. Thus Mostow points to how the totalizing methodology of *kokubungaku* may be consonant, even complicit, with other totalizing formations.

A certain theoretical tension arises in many essays and throughout the collection, however. It follows in part from the essays’ focus on enshrined texts (or on received genres). For, as objects of knowledge, things like *Man’yōshū*, *Kojiki*, *Tales of Ise*, *Tsurezuregusa*, and *The Tale of Heike* are rather different from constructions such as “interiority” or “literature” or “Japan”—or, at least, they entail a different set of problems. When the focus is on an individual text or texts, the impulse to historicize the formation of modern Japanese literature can become subtly confused with an impulse to tell the history of Japan’s literature. It is as if objects of knowledge bearing proper names—*Man’yōshū*, *Tales of Ise*, etc.—introduced another set of criteria by which objects preceded discourses. Historicization gives way to historical survey. This can be a workable strategy provided the objective is still to historicize modernity, to highlight its qualitative differences. Yet a theoretical tension arises because this is now a very different story. This is now history of reception, about the series of transformations of an immutable object, rather than about the discursive construction of an historically novel object.

The essays show awareness of this tension between a history of reception and one of invention. Shirane aptly reminds us of a potential pitfall of radical historicism, urging that invention does not come out of nothing. From the outset, he thus suggests that the canonical status of certain texts is “as much a result of reception in medieval period . . . as it is of the radical configuration of notions of literature and learning that occurred in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries” (p. 1). In a different vein, at the end of her essay on *Tsurezuregusa*, Linda Chance suggests that the classics may well possess qualities that lend them to continual transformation and interpretation.

In sum, the disciplinary emphasis on received texts encourages the contributors to work back and forth between reception and invention, between historical survey and historicization. Indeed, canon formation as a topic sets up this kind of tension or oscillation. The contributors negotiate this in very different ways and with very different agenda, which adds to the interest of the collection as a whole.

One of the notable essays in this regard is that by co-editor Tomi Suzuki, in which she shows that it was only with the emergence of an “I-novel” discourse in 1920s that women’s diary literature came to rank as classics. Her critical survey makes visible the pronounced ambivalence of male scholars toward women’s literature. Even as Japanese literature came to be characterized and praised on the basis of its feminine qualities, male scholars continually strove to “de-essentialize,” displace, or disavow the historical connection between women writers and vernacular literature. Some scholars placed emphasis on the mediation of language (the “mother tongue”), or otherwise made women the bearers of tradition. Others began to read women’s diary literature in terms of universal human expression, freed of time and place. Thus Suzuki underscores the ambivalence that continues, at the heart of canon formation, to

authorize an uncritical application of gendered distinctions, which effectively erases questions about power and gender.

Suzuki's attention to ambivalence is extremely important because it serves as a reminder that the problem of *kokubungaku* is not simply that of its overt statements of nationalism but also of the theoretical ambivalence at the heart of its methodologies. Her essay thus calls attention to one of the crucial problems in working between invention and reception.

Problems arise when theoretical ambivalence encourages a kind of balancing act between an account of reception and invention, between tradition and modernity. The problem is not merely that the focus on modernity and national identity is weakened, or that there is more historical continuity than rupture. Rather, there is a loss of specificity in historicizing the disciplinary formation that is under scrutiny, *kokubungaku*. A history that centers on textual reception can naturalize the totalizing strategies of *kokubungaku*, which tend not toward historicization but rather toward simple contextualization of texts, in accordance with the wisdom received from histories of the nation. *Kokubungaku* relies on the historical overview or survey in which one charts the waning and waxing fortunes of a text in conjunction with historical shifts in attitudes and state formations. As a consequence, its historical contextualization leans toward a reflection model: texts and their commentators reflect the state formation contemporary to them. On the one hand, this can give the impression that texts and scholars do not respond to, invent, or express communities but reflect or embody them. Texts then become embodiments of tradition or of the state, and scholars function as informants, with the nation as community. On the other hand, the historical survey tends to produce an ambivalence about the relation between tradition and modernity, and usually resorts to modernization scenarios by default, or leaves them unchallenged.

It is the great strength of *Inventing the Classics* that its essays question such strategies insofar as they continually underscore the ideological charge of classical texts and commentaries, and raise questions about specific power formations and discursive conditions. They call into question the neutrality of academic knowledge about traditional texts, and open many lines of inquiry.

One line of inquiry that logically follows from this critical look at canon formation would be to historicize the disciplinary formation of *kokubungaku* that continues to authorize historical survey, periodization, and simple contextualization as the basic elements for literary history—and thus to imagine other histories. As the essays frequently indicate, the combination of totalizing and individualizing forces that arise with the modern nation are qualitatively different from prior power formations: they also generate the specific form of historical and temporal consciousness expressed in *kokubungaku*. To pursue this problem, literary critics should continue to historicize the discursive conditions that give rise to the key terms of *kokubungaku*, such as author, book, literature, culture, class, history, emperor, nation, and Japan, to mention a few other modern inventions. Above all, it is then necessary to explore the theoretical consequences of *kokubungaku* methodologies.

THOMAS LAMARRE
McGill University

The Price of Death: The Funeral Industry in Contemporary Japan. By HIKARU SUZUKI. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001. vi, 266 pp. \$39.50 (cloth).