Abstract

The Novels of Ozaki Kōyō: A Study of Selected Works with Special Reference to the Relationship between the Fiction of the Tokugawa and early Meiji periods.

Peter Francis Kornicki, St Antony's College.

Submitted in Michaelmas Term 1978 for the degree of D.Phil.

This is a study of some of the works of the Japanese novelist, Ozaki Kōyō (1867-1903). The aim has been to identify the legacy that the fiction of the Tokugawa period (1600-1868) left in his work, so comparatively little attention has been paid to his life or to works that throw no light on this question, such as his adaptations and translations of western literature. Kōyō's fiction was influenced by two distinct literary traditions from the Tokugawa period. His interest in ninjōbon, a genre of romantic novel, spanned his creative life and imparted to his works a tendency towards complex romantic plots and a concern for realistic dialogue. For a few years, however, this source of influence yielded to another: Kōyō was involved in the revival of the works of Ihara Saikaku which took place in the years around 1890, and this profoundly affected his language and style for several years. Attempts to imitate Saikaku's fiction also enabled him to experiment with uses of the narrator that were foreign to ninjōbon writers, and he became progressively more interested in probing the minds of his characters. He took these developments further in his last two novels, stimulated both by the western fiction he had read and by current literary fashions. In Tajō takon he used the narrator to express his rejection of views of marriage imported from the West; in Konjiki yasha he combined the qualities of ninjōbon with a study of usury. Apart from revealing some of the areas in which Meiji fiction was indebted to tradition, Kōyō's works show that the influence of Tokugawa fiction was not always as harmful as it is often supposed to be.

The novels of Ozaki Kōyō: a study of selected works with special reference to the relationship between the fiction of the Tokugawa and early Meiji periods.

Peter Francis Kornicki
St Antony's College

Dissertation submitted in 1978 to the Board of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Preface

Since the conclusion of the Pacific War, Kōyō and his works have been subjected to increasingly thorough scrutiny by Japanese scholars and a considerable amount of important material has come to light. Nevertheless, the number of scholars engaged in the study of Kōyō remains small, and a great deal remains to be done. Bibliographical work, for example, is far from complete, with the result that the precise extent of Kōyō's oeuvre is still not clear, and many of his works deserve a more thorough treatment than they have so far received. A new study of Kōyō, as this thesis purports to be, needs no prefatory apology.

It is perhaps surprising that more scholars have not directed their attention towards Kōyō. He was, after all, recognised during his lifetime as one of the most influential writers of the age even by those who disagreed with his basic literary values. He demands attention because of his position as one of the first truly popular writers of the Meiji period and because of the ways in which he chose to depict the novelty of the Meiji period.

It has long been something of a commonplace that Kōyō was heavily influenced by the fiction of the Tokugawa period, and this assertion has usually, but not always, carried the undertones of a value judgement. The implicit judgement is that Kōyō failed as a writer to the extent that he was in debt to Tokugawa fiction. This judgement no longer figures importantly in the work currently devoted to Kōyō, but the initial assumption that Kōyō's debt was a large one has yet to be

examined in depth. The aim of this thesis is to do just that. The emphasis is on his works rather than on his life, for the object is to discern where he diverged from the techniques, subject matter and practises of Tokugawa fiction and where he did not do so. Nevertheless, I have included information on Kōyō's activities and other background material where it can serve to illuminate the discussion.

The selection I have made of the works to be examined in this thesis requires some explanation. The underlying aim has been to cover the major areas in which Kōyō adhered to or diverged from the norms of Tokugawa fiction, rather than to consider his entire oeuvre. As a result I have given considerable prominence to his earliest works at the expense, for example, of his translations and adaptations from western fiction. These early works are for various reasons missing from all the complete editions of Kōyō's works and have consequently received little attention, but they were written at a time when he was particularly susceptible to the influence of Tokugawa fiction. So Kokkei kai byōbu has a place in this thesis that on other criteria it might not be held to deserve.

It remains to thank all those whose assistance is not evident from my footnotes. I am indebted to the Japan Foundation, which made it possible for me to spend fourteen months in Japan from 1976 to 1978 working on Kōyō, and to the Humanities Research Institute of Kyoto University, which provided me with a base during that time. Professor Asukai Masamichi, my supervisor at the Institute, and Professor Tosa Tōru, of Aichi University of Education, have given freely of their time and expertise. Dr Brian Powell, who has supervised both my undergraduate and my graduate work at Oxford, has given me

much valuable advice: were it not for his pertinent comments my arguments would be in a sorrier state than they are now. I owe a lot to his teaching and help, and hope that he will accept this thesis as a form of tribute. Catharine has sustained me and removed many infelicities of expression.

Table of contents

Preliminary notes

1 I have endeavoured to use the best texts available of the works mentioned in this thesis without sticking as a matter of course to zenshū editions. In the case of Kōyō, textual variations in the various editions of his works have in some cases compelled me to use the earliest available edition in the interests of the aims of this thesis.

2 I have used the romanization to be found in the most recent edition of Kenkyūsha's New Japanese-English Dictionary.

3 In many works of Tokugawa and early Meiji fiction there is a tsunogaki, or subsidiary title, preceding the main title. I have indicated the division with a colon. Thus in Enoshima miyage: Kokkei kai byōbu, Enoshima miyage is the tsunogaki and Kokkei kai byōbu is the main title.

4 All books and articles mentioned in the footnotes and the bibliography were published in Tokyo unless stated otherwise.

5 The following abbreviations have been used throughout:

KZ	Kōyō zenshū
MBZ	Meiji bungaku zenshū
NKBT	Nihon koten bungaku taikei
NKinBT	Nihon kindai bungaku taikei

CHAPTER ONE

The Ken'yūsha and Kōyō's earliest works

Kōyō shared his earliest years as a writer with a group of young friends and fellow students known together as the Ken'yūsha. They worked enthusiastically to produce a magazine, which was at first hand-written and passed from hand to hand. It was as members of the Ken'yūsha that they gradually came to change their general ideas about literature, and Kōyō was no exception. He was no more independent of the group than any of the others. So although literary biography is not the main concern of this study, the circumstances in which Kōyō wrote his first works demand some attention. This chapter will describe the formation of the Ken'yūsha and deal with the three works of fiction Kōyō wrote for the other members of the group. These do not have much intrinsic appeal, but they show Kōyō at a time when he was beginning to understand and react to literary ideals that were new to Meiji Japan and at least in some respects hostile to the fiction of the Tokugawa period.

After the death of his mother in 1872, when he was four years old, Kōyō moved into the home of his maternal grandparents, who lived in the Shiba district of Tokyo. In July 1873 he entered a _terakoya_ school run by a neighbour, Kuga Tomisaburō. This brought him into contact with Kuga's son, Junnosuke, who was later to be closely associated with Kōyō and the Ken'yūsha.[1] In the following

1 Iwaya Daishi, _Ozaki Kōyō_ (Jinbutsu Ōraisha, 1967), p. 10.

year he met Yamada Bimyō (1868-1910) for the first time, and they renewed their friendship when Kōyō entered the Tōkyō Furitsu Daini Chūgakkō in 1881 and found Bimyō two classes ahead of him.[2] During this and the following year he studied the Chinese classics under Oka Senjin and attended Ishikawa Kōsai's private school of Chinese literature, where Bimyō was also studying at the time.[3] The fruit of these studies was a Chinese poem by Kōyō which appeared in the student magazine Eisai shinshi on 20 May 1882 and an interest in the composition of Chinese poetry that survived until well after the founding of the Ken'yūsha. In 1882 he also entered the Mita Eigakujuku to prepare for the entrance examination for the Daigaku Yobimon in Kanda.

Shortly after entering the Yobimon in September 1883 Kōyō joined a group known as the Bun'yūkai. Maruoka Kyūka (1865-1927) founded the group either in 1882 or in 1883, and it met once a month for the criticism of Chinese poetry and prose written by the members.[4] They produced a small hand-written magazine and

2 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', Shinshōsetsu, vi, No. 1 (1901), p. 55. This is a transcription of an oral account given by Kōyō of the genesis and development of the Ken'yūsha. By 1901 he had lost contact with many former members of the group and as a result his version contains several factual errors.

3 Iwaya Daishi, p. 14.

4 Maruoka's recollections are one of the main sources for the early history of the Ken'yūsha and its antecedents. He committed them to paper in his Hatsukawazu, which he began in May 1906 and completed in March 1926. This was never published and the manuscript, together with other important material relating to the Ken'yūsha, passed into the hands of Katsumoto Seiichirō, who died in 1967. I presume that these items remain in the possession of the family but I have not been allowed to consult them. Japanese researchers have been no more successful, so some aspects of the early history of the Ken'yūsha remain in doubt. However, in his articles 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku' and 'Ken'yūsha no seiritsu', Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō, xxvii, Nos 5, pp. 9-17, and 6, pp. 9-21 (1962), Katsumoto published some extracts from the material in his possession. In addition, Maruoka himself published a series of articles based on what he had written in Hatsukawazu: 'Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku' and 'Ken'yūsha no bungaku undō'(in two parts), Waseda bungaku, Nos 232 (June 1925), pp. 24-49, 233 (July 1925), pp. 108-26, and 243 (April 1926), pp. 78-91. The two accounts of the

went on frequent outings, which gave them subjects for compositions in Chinese. According to Maruoka, group activities of this kind, with a slight literary bias, were quite popular with Yobimon students at the time, so it would be a mistake to see the Bun'yūkai as exceptional in any way. Maruoka also records that Kōyō joined the group at the invitation of Andō Kumatarō, who was one of Maruoka's close friends, but it is not clear how Kōyō came to know Andō in the first place. Kuga Junnosuke, whose father's school Kōyō had attended as a child, was also a member of the Bun'yūkai[5], so it may in fact have been this connection that drew Kōyō into the group.

The Bun'yūkai met for the last time in 1884. On that occasion the members decided to change the name of their group. Maruoka explains the circumstances:

> After this Bun'yūkai had been going for just about a year, Maeda Gingai and other members said that we students should always be one step ahead of everybody else and tower above our contemporaries. They insisted that we change the name of the group to Tottotsukai with that idea in mind.[6]

The new name stuck, but the Tottotsukai was in fact little more than a group of friends who enjoyed boating, hiking, and practising sumō wrestling together. Literature had a very small part to play in their activities. There were, however, more members than there had been in the Bun'yūkai and one of the new members was Ishibashi Shian (1867-1927). Shian had matriculated at the Yobimon at the same time as Kōyō, and the two met through Kuga Junnosuke, who

Bun'yūkai, on which most of what follows is based, are to be found in the first of Katsumoto's articles (p. 12) and the first of Maruoka's (p. 24). They give different years for the founding of the Bun'yūkai, hence the alternative dates above.

5 Iwaya Daishi, p. 14.

6 Extract from Hatsukawazu quoted in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 12. The character totsu (凸), which is used twice in the new name of the group, means 'convex' or 'protruding' and is thus an apt symbol of the members' aspirations.

had known Shian at the elementary school attached to the Ochanomizu Shihan Gakkō.[7] The Tottotsukai did not survive beyond 1884, and for a while Maruoka lost touch with Kōyō and Shian. Sometime in that year Kōyō left his grandparents' home for lodgings in Kanda, so as to be nearer the Yobimon. One of his fellow lodgers was Kuga, by now an old friend of both Kōyō and Maruoka.[8]

In September 1884 Yamada Bimyō entered the Yobimon and found Kōyō one year ahead of him. They became friends once again. By this time, according to Kōyō, they both had definite literary ambitions, and Bimyō had already written a full-length novel about King Alfred called Tategoto sōshi, which Kōyō read with great admiration.[9] In February 1885 Kōyō, Bimyō and Shian were all still at the Yobimon, but Maruoka had already left for the Gaikokugo Gakkō Fuzoku Kōtō Shōgyō Gakkō, where Kuga was also studying at the time. In that month the three at the Yobimon decided to form a group for the study of literature and through Kuga they asked Maruoka to join them.[10] The four of them agreed that the kind of group they had in mind would place less emphasis on poetry and verse-making than had the Bun'yūkai and the Tottotsukai. They decided instead to solicit literary contributions of all kinds from the participant members. Kōyō and Bimyō would then edit the contributions and write them out by hand to produce a bimonthly magazine. The magazine would be passed from member to member and each would be entitled to keep it for three days and to write his comments or criticisms in the margins. Shian proposed 'Ken'yūsha'

7 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 57.
8 Iwaya Daishi, p. 16.
9 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', pp. 56-57.
10 Maruoka Kyūka, 'Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku', pp. 24-26. This, and Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', are the main sources for what follows.

for the name of the group and 'Garakuta bunko' for the name of the magazine, the latter on the ground that a magazine covering such a wide range was best described by a word like garakuta (rubbish). All concurred with these proposals, and with Kōyō's suggestion for the man'yōgana to be used for garakuta (我樂多), which showed that the members thought of the magazine primarily as a means of amusing themselves.

The first issue of Garakuta bunko, which Kōyō and Bimyō completed a few months later, was dated 2 May 1885. In common with the next seven issues it contained contributions from various members of the Ken'yūsha which Kōyō and Bimyō had written out by hand.[11] Among the contributions were the first instalments of several novels, including Bimyō's Tategoto sōshi, and an assortment of poems and riddles. The first two items, excluding the table of contents, were addresses to the members by Koyo, while the congratulatory passages by Bimyō and Shian were left until later in the magazine. This is some indication of Kōyō's importance in the Ken'yūsha. The first of Kōyō's addresses, which has no title, amounts to little more than a string of excuses to explain why the first issue appeared later than was apparently expected.[12]

The second address, 'Garakuta bunko hirō', is worth quoting in full for what it shows us of Kōyō's mentality at the time.

> Making a formal statement is a bit too much trouble, and starting off in a literary way is a little too showy. So I am addressing all you fine and talented men in the form of a letter. Well now, each man has his own pleasures. Stealing

11 The sixth issue has apparently been lost, but the surviving seven are in the possession of the Katsumoto family (see note 4 above). A detailed list of their contents is to be found in Tanimura Hisako, 'Garakuta bunko hisshabon mokuroku', Gakuen, No 242 (May 1960), pp. 64-71.

12 Both addresses are reprinted complete in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 15. Only Katsumoto (ibid., p. 14) gives Kōyō as the author of the first address.

light from the next room to read a book is one such pleasure. Misers who delight in filthy lucre and poor but honest men who are satisfied with a bowlful of cold rice surely have their pleasures in these ways. A man who ignores leaks in the roofs of his home and storehouse for the tears of a courtesan; or a man who pawns his winter clothes for a nightcap of half a litre of sake and does all sorts of terrible things; they have their pleasures too, you know. Yet if you steal your neighbour's light you are in danger of copping it. Filthy lucre is mean, and cold rice makes the stomach hard and may lead to illness. If you haven't a home you may feel that a courtesan's tears are rain leaking through the roof. And without a penny to your name you can't have any nightcaps. Oh, what shall we do then? What we need is a good idea. I'll share the pleasures of some fine young men who recline in a forest of brushes and do no harm. I have gathered up some fine poetry in Chinese and Japanese, some novels, humorous bits of poetry and prose, hauta and dodoitsu - all without discrimination, and leaving any difficult things aside. It all bears the name Garakuta bunko. I shall edit the magazine each month, and it will be a lot of pleasure for me and for all of us, something to amuse ourselves with when we're not reading books. Ah! There can be no finer pleasure than this. You have all had enough interest to want to join, so don't hide your pearls needlessly. If you say you want to sell something and don't mind the price, I'll say, "I'll buy it".

This is all that Kōyō had to say when Garakuta bunko made its first appearance. The playful tone and the emphasis on the pleasure they all hope to derive from the magazine reappear in the passages written by Bimyō and Shian. Both Kōyō and Shian seem to have singled out the miscellaneous or indiscriminate character of Garakuta bunko as its main feature, but it is what they do not say that is of greater importance. For there is no mention in any of these passages of any definite aims for the magazine, and they all ignore such literary phenomena of the early Meiji period as translations and political novels. If metaphor and pun appear in the place of statement of opinion or principle, it is probably not because Kōyō and the others were hostile to contemporary literary trends. Their literary interests at this stage had not changed a great deal since the days of the Bun'yūkai and were still essentially for private enjoyment: it was still some time before

they were to show that they were even aware of the ideas that were gaining currency in the literary world outside the Ken'yūsha. After all, none of the three main members was older than eighteen in May 1885.

Handwritten issues of Garakuta bunko continued to appear at irregular intervals until the eighth appeared on 25 May 1886. By this time the number of actual and aspirant members of the Ken'yūsha had become far too large for the magazine to be passed from hand to hand in the usual way. It was the growing reputation of Garakuta bunko in student circles that attracted all the applications for membership[13], and the publication in August 1886 of Shintaishisen, a collection of shintaishi poems by Kōyō, Kyūka, and Bimyō, may well have ensured that the Ken'yūsha continued to become more widely known. According to Kyūka, the collection was far more successful than they had hoped.[14] At any rate, the result of the growing numbers was that Kōyō, Shian, and Bimyō decided to have future issues of the magazine printed for private distribution to each member of the Ken'yūsha. To cover the expenses this would entail, they raised the subscription fee from three to ten sen and solicited more members. After an interval of some five months, the ninth issue of Garakuta bunko appeared on 1 November 1886. It was followed by a further seven issues of which the last, the sixteenth issue altogether, appeared in February 1888. Kōyō and Bimyō were once again responsible for the editing throughout, while Shian dealt with the accounts and other business. This is now the place to turn to Kōyō's earliest literary works, which all appeared in the handwritten or printed pages of the first sixteen issues of

13 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', pp. 59-60.
14 Maruoka Kyūka, 'Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku', p. 32.

Garakuta bunko. The subsequent history of the magazine will be outlined at the beginning of the next chapter.

Kōyō's contributions to the first eight issues of Garakuta bunko are an accurate reflection of the miscellaneous nature of the magazine itself. Under the pen-name Hanka Tsūjin he contributed an instalment of Enoshima miyage: Kokkei kai byōbu to each issue but the sixth.[15] Under various other pen-names he contributed to the first issue a poem in Chinese, a preface to Bimyō's Tategoto sōshi, and a few other short pieces of prose. And most of the following seven issues contained several small items written by Kōyō, from poems in Chinese and shintaishi poems to dodoitsu and advertisements. Nevertheless, the greater part by far of all the small pieces which gave Garakuta bunko its miscellaneous character were written by those members of the Ken'yūsha who are now forgotten, and none of the small pieces Kōyō wrote equals Kokkei kai byōbu in importance. They can, however, serve to remind us that Kōyō was never exclusively a novelist and that he continued to publish poems for the rest of his life.

Only the first three instalments of Kokkei kai byōbu and part of the fourth have been reprinted. This amounts to about one half of the text, but it is possible to glean from this some idea of the character of the whole.[16]

In the first three instalments Kōyō's pseudonym Hanka Tsūjin

15 The sixth issue is missing, but the fifth instalment appeared in the fifth issue while the sixth instalment appeared in the seventh issue, so it seems that there was no instalment in the sixth issue. Since the first eight issues are not accessible the lists of their contents in Tanimura, op. cit., and Katsumoto's two articles afford the only glimpse of most of the contributions. Both lists (that by Katsumoto is not complete) make some attempt to reveal the identities that lay behind the welter of pen-names used by the members.

16 The first three are contained in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', pp. 15-16, and 'Ken'yūsha no seiritsu', pp. 17-21. Part of the fourth and part of an unidentified instalment appear in Honma Hisao, Meiji bungaku shi, fifteenth edition, 2 vols (Tōkyōdō, 1965), I, 370-3.

is followed by the word 'gecho' (戯著). The fourth, sixth, and seventh instalments omit 'gecho' and the fifth replaces it with 'gesaku' (戯作). One or other of these two words appears after the author's name in most works of Edo fiction from the second half of the eighteenth century onwards. The usage persisted into the early Meiji period, so that 'gecho' follows Kanagaki Robun's (1829-1894) name after the table of contents of his Ushiya zōdan: Aguranabe (1871). Yet other works by Robun, and works by Baitei Kinga, Mantei Ōga, and other early Meiji writers leave out the character ge, which literally connotes 'frivolity' and which came to stand for the conventional self-depreciation of writers of fiction in the late Tokugawa period. By 1885, when the first instalment of Kokkei kai byōbu appeared, the use of 'gecho' or 'gesaku' after an author's name was no longer so usual that it was automatic. Kōyō's use of these words, therefore, seems to have been a conscious choice. The pen-name he chose, Hanka Tsūjin, has similar associations with Edo fiction. A hankatsū was a would-be tsū (man about town) who lacked the refinement, self-restraint, and integrity that characterized the tsū in public opinion. The hankatsū appeared particularly often in sharebon, where he was used as a foil to the tsū. The first sharebon to ridicule the hankatsū seems to have been Yūshi hōgen (c.1770) by the pseudonymous Inaka-rōjin Tada-no-jijii, and many subsequent sharebon found it more convenient to depict the pretensions and faux pas of the hankatsū than the elusive virtues of the tsū.[17] Kōyō cannot have been unaware of these associations when he coined his pen-name.

The available text of Kokkei kai byōbu confirms the impression

17 Mizuno Minoru, Kibyōshi-Sharebon no sekai (Iwanami Shoten, 1976), pp.3, 18-26, and 102-107.

of a close relationship with the fiction of the Tokugawa period. The subject is a journey that three idle young men make to Enoshima, near Kamakura. Their names, Gujirō, Dontarō, and Chobisuke, imply that they are stupid, thick-witted, and meddlesome respectively, so the reader knows not to expect much of them from the beginning. According to a note by Maruoka Kyūka in Hatsukawazu, the story is based on a trip to Enoshima which Kōyō, Shian, and one Ikeda Eizan made in July 1884, and this is confirmed by Kōyō himself in his preface. An additional note in Hatsukawazu in Shian's hand records that Gujirō stands for Shian himself, Dontarō for Ikeda, and Chobisuke for Kōyō.[18]

To escape the heat of the summer, the three set off from Shiba-ura in Tokyo and make their way to Enoshima by train, foot, and boat. There they do some sight-seeing and then proceed to Shichiri-ga-hama.[19] The narrative is sparse and laden with abstruse metaphors, while the dialogue conveys the humour indicated by the word 'kokkei' in the title. One of the humorous scenes takes place in a compartment of a railway carriage. Gujirō has been fooling about and refuses to stop, so Chobisuke aims a kick at him. By mistake, he kicks an old woman instead, and she immediately pulls him off his seat and joins with great gusto in a heated exchange of insults. Gujirō and Dontarō eventually manage to apologize on Chobisuke's behalf to the old woman's satisfaction and, with the help of other passengers, to bring the incident to a close. The narrator concludes, 'it all led to a lot of laughter'.

In the third instalment the three of them are walking through heavy rain. Chobisuke is lagging behind and as he rounds a corner

18 See Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 16.
19 According to the summary of the whole work in Honma, I, 369.

he bumps into a horse and ends up in the mud. To his dismay, a policeman approaches to investigate. Confused but polite, Chobisuke pleads for forgiveness and seems convinced that he is going to be imprisoned, although the policeman only wants to offer him shelter until the rain passes. Meanwhile, the other two have noticed that Chobisuke is missing and they head back for 'the autopsy'. At the scene of the accident they learn from a witness that Chobisuke has gone off with a policeman. They stand in astonishment as the sun comes out at last, and the instalment comes to an end.

The members of the Ken'yūsha were encouraged to write their comments in beside the various contributions. All the instalments that have been reprinted prompted several such comments and these help make it possible to identify the antecedents of Kokkei kai byōbu. In a comment on the first episode, one member noted a resemblance to the style of Shikitei Sanba (1776-1822), the author of Ukiyoburo and a number of other kokkeibon. A member calling himself Nisei Ikku after Jippensha Ikku (1765-1831), another kokkeibon writer, constantly voiced his admiration in the margins of the second instalment, and another member noted resemblances to Ikku in the third instalment.[20] Thus the general indications of some connection with the comic fiction of the Tokugawa period are corroborated by the impressions of the members of the Ken'yūsha themselves.

Further corroboration comes from Kōyō himself. In the first place, the title he gave the work is similar to that of a kokkeibon by Jippensha Ikku entitled Kokkei: Enoshima miyage. This was

20 The marginal comments are included in the reprints in Katsumoto's two articles.

published in 1809 and 1810 and it tells of a journey that the two main characters, Tontarō and Nesuke, make to Enoshima and of their return to Edo. The presence of Tontarō in Ikku's work and of Dontarō in Kōyō's work, and the overall similarity of the two works, leave little room for doubting that Kōyō was familiar with Ikku's Enoshima miyage.

Secondly, Kōyō added a belated preface to Kokkei kai byōbu in the fourth issue of Garakuta bunko (24 October 1885). This reads as follows.

> For kokkei (humour) on the road, Ikku's Hizakurige beats the work of all other writers. And for the share (comic speech) of the dissolute life, Rijō's Hasshōjin makes a mockery of the work of other writers. These are major works and their style is famed. They loosen the jaws of their readers. Ah, these are dangerous works indeed. Your servant here made a light-hearted trip to Enoshima last July along with two other buffoons. Boneheads all of us, with plenty of brains missing.[21] . . . The two of them have already made their way in the world and have passed on to the innermost chambers of kokkei and to the hidden halls of share. Someone like your servant here, a virgin writer still on his ABC, can only borrow their eaves and lick their skilled brushes, so I am not going to raise any stout shield against those two teachers of mine. But, determined ant as I am, I am going to build a mountain of wastepaper that will reach up to the heavens and make a mound of dead brushes, and if I can do that I may in the end get the better of Hizakurige and kick Hasshōjin over with a 'Make way there! Make way there!' Provided I give up eating plums and pray to Tenjin-sama that this may happen.[22]

The ambitious but conventionally self-depreciatory tone and the contrived humour Kōyō brings into play here are characteristic of the Edo preface from Santō Kyōden (1761-1816) to Kanagaki Robun and beyond. It is, however, of much greater importance that Kōyō singled out two kokkeibon for praise in his preface, Jippensha Ikku's Dōchū hizakurige and Ryūtei Rijō's Hanagoyomi: Hasshōjin.

21 The original here reads, ' . . . sanninzure. Monju no chie nai gubutsudomo'. This is a reversal for comic effect of the expression, 'sannin yoreba monju no chie', which refers to the combined wisdom of three people.

22 The preface is quoted, presumably complete, in Honma, op. cit., pp. 369-70. It should be mentioned here that the partial translation of the preface in James R. Morita, 'Garakuta bunko', Monumenta Nipponica, XXIV, No. 3 (1969), p.226, is mistaken in several important respects.

Several of the marginal comments written in by members of the Ken'yūsha had mentioned kokkeibon and the very title Kōyō had chosen had betrayed the influence of another of Ikku's kokkeibon. In addition, Kōyō recalled in 1890 that Shikitei Sanba's kokkeibon had been amongst his favourite reading matter at about this time.[23] If Kōyō's debt to the kokkeibon tradition seems well established, it remains to discuss the place of Kokkei kai byōbu in that tradition.

Hizakurige was first published between 1802 and 1822 and its success prompted Ikku to spend much of his life writing sequels to it. It takes the form of a comic travelogue, much like Kokkei kai byōbu. There are two travellers, Yajirōbei and Kitahachi, and a lot of the humour depends upon their ignorance of the local customs and unusual meals they encounter on their journeys. Examples of this are the episodes in which they fail to understand how to use a Goemon bath and in which they try to eat the hot stones which are used in Kumotsu to steam the water out of konnyaku.[24] So far as can be judged from the available portions of Kokkei kai byōbu, Kōyō was not attempting to reproduce this kind of humour. On the other hand, Ryūtei Rijō's (?-1841) Hasshōjin is not a travelogue and is set entirely in Edo. It was published between 1820 and 1848; the fifth and last volume, which was published seven years after Rijō's death, was written partly by Ippitsuan Shujin and partly by Yohōtei Shisai. The comic scenes in Hasshōjin arise either from sheer clumsiness or from

23 See 'Kōyō Sanjin ryakuden', Kokumin shinbun, 5 October 1890; quoted in Mori Senzō, Meiji jinbutsu yowa (Kōdansha, 1973), pp. 137-8.

24 Tōkaidōchū hizakurige (NKBT 62), pp. 72-4 and 265-7.

misunderstandings that have nothing to do with local customs. In the first few pages, one of the characters slips during rehearsals for a farce and ends up covered with ash from the brazier. A little further on, a character called Zuburoku, who is wearing a priest's outfit for his part in the farce, meets an acquaintance in the street who takes him for a real priest. Since the acquaintance is stone-deaf he can make nothing of Zuburoku's attempts to explain and is convinced that Zuburoku has abandoned his family to take holy orders.[25]

Inasmuch as Kokkei kai byōbu is built around a journey, Kōyō seems to have been inspired by the travelogues Ikku wrote. The comic scenes, on the other hand, have more in common with Rijō's Hasshōjin than with Ikku's works. So Kokkei kai byōbu is an amalgam of these two strands in Edo comic fiction, just as Kōyō implied in his preface. However, the general ingredients of his humour, the shippai (mistake or misunderstanding) scene and the constant word-play, are identical to those favoured by all the Edo humorists, including Sanba. Were it not for the few references to the railway, there would be very little to distinguish Kokkei kai byōbu from the kokkeibon written at the end of the Tokugawa period. The three travellers are concerned only with their immediate experiences, much the same as Yaji and Kita in Hizakurige and all the characters that appear in the kokkeibon of Rijō and Sanba. Many of Kanagaki Robun's kokkeibon, although written and published well before the founding of the Ken'yūsha, show far more awareness of the changing times. This is obvious from Aguranabe alone, which satirizes current fads and the

25 Hanagoyomi: Hasshōjin, edited by Koike Tōgorō (Iwanami Shoten, 1942), p. 34 and pp. 39-42.

enthusiasm for western manners. This type of humour, with its awareness of the changing times, is foreign both to Kokkei kai byōbu and to Edo no mizu, another comic travelogue which Kōyō wrote in 1889. Edo no mizu is based on a trip Kōyō made to see the wisteria at Kamado with Kawakami Bizan (1869-1908), another member of the Ken'yūsha. It ends with a shippai scene as Fūri (i.e., Kōyō) falls over and his companion laughs.[26] The factual basis of both Edo no mizu and Kokkei kai byōbu is reminiscent of the literary activities of the Bun'yūkai and of the close relationship between the worlds of fiction and fact which is found in most kokkeibon. Few of the characters in Hasshōjin seem to be fictitious and the identities of some are not even cloaked with pseudonyms.[27] And although Yaji and Kita are fictitious, the places they visit and the customs they encounter are not.

Kōyō's next attempt at fiction, Nise murasaki: Ikari no hachimaki, appeared in the eighth handwritten issue of Garakuta bunko alongside the last instalment of Kokkei kai byōbu and in the ninth issue, the first printed for private distribution. A third part appeared in the eleventh issue (16 January 1887) under the name Aitai Dōshi, which Tanimura glosses as a pseudonym for Kōyō.[28] However, Aitai Dōshi was introduced as a new member of the

26 Edo no mizu first appeared in Bunko, Nos 24 and 25 (July and August 1889). The title was the name of a face lotion sold by Shikitei Sanba, who also ran a toiletries and cosmetics shop in Nihonbashi. Kōyō mentions Sanba in the first few lines.

27 See the accompanying essay by Koike in Hanagoyomi: Hasshōjin, pp. 320-321.

28 Tanimura Hisako, 'Garakuta bunko katsuji hibaibon mokuroku', Gakuen, No 243 (June 1960), p. 73. Most of the first instalment is reprinted in Honma, op.cit., I, 365-68. All the surviving copies of the printed but privately distributed issues of Garakuta bunko were thought until recently to be in the possession of the Katsumoto family. However, Professor Oka Yasuo has kindly drawn my attention to the existence of a complete set in the Sankō Toshokan in Shiba, Tokyo.

Ken'yūsha on the last page of the tenth issue of Garakuta bunko (December 1886). Also in the postscript which follows this third instalment the writer notes that Kōyō wrote only two instalments of Ikari no hachimaki before abandoning it. The last lines of the postscript read as follows.

> Who do you think picked up the hachimaki that Sanjin [i.e., Kōyō] discarded and produced this third part? Silly old Aitai Dōshi of Kōjimachi. Come closer readers and see me for the fool I am.[29]

Whoever Aitai Dōshi was, all the available evidence suggests that he was not Kōyō.[30] It is, however, possible that Aitai Dōshi wrote the third instalment on the basis of either a draft or a plan made by Kōyō himself. This is implied in the passage quoted above, and the facts that no fourth instalment of Ikari no hachimaki ever appeared and that Aitai Dōshi made no other contributions to Garakuta bunko support this interpretation.

The first two instalments of Ikari no hachimaki consist entirely of narrative. In the opening lines the narrator uses kakekotoba to adapt a section of the preface to the Kokinshū. He then proceeds to deploy an array of parallel constructions, engo, and kakekotoba to describe 'iro no michi' (the way of love) in general and the brothel Uramiya in particular. The second instalment starts with a passage on the fickleness of courtesans and, having thus hinted at the events that are to follow, then turns to Agemaki, one of the courtesans at the Uramiya. Tsumeroku, the son of a pickle dealer, has been visiting her regularly but his money has now run out and so Agemaki loses interest in him and transfers her attentions to a boy who 'gleams with gold'.

There is no explicit indication of time or place in Ikari no

29 Garakuta bunko, No 11 (16 January 1887), p. 12.
30 For Aitai Dōshi's possible identity, see Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū (Tōkyōdo, 1953), pp. 4-5 and note 3 on p. 10.

hachimaki, nor is there any mention of the trains and other tokens of the Meiji period that served to make the setting obvious in Kokkei kai byōbu. With only two or three instalments of a work that was probably intended to be at least as long as Kokkei kai byōbu, there is not much that can be said. However, it does seem that Ikari no hachimaki is fiction and not based, as Kokkei kai byōbu was, on Kōyō's own experiences. Also, Kōyō's choice of the pleasure quarters as the setting of Ikari no hachimaki implies some connection with the ninjōbon and sharebon of the second half of the Tokugawa period. Both these genres of fiction dealt primarily with the pleasure quarters, usually of Edo, and their transient population, and ninjōbon survived until several years after the Meiji Restoration.[31] There is little to distinguish Ikari no hachimaki from most works in the ninjōbon tradition, particularly as there is no indication of time. Furthermore, the opening sections of Kōyō's work closely resemble the kind of preface that was usual in ninjōbon: a typical ninjōbon preface was aphoristic and allusive and was an attempt at a stylistic tour de force. We shall return later to the subject of ninjōbon, for the genre has considerable bearing on much of Kōyō's oeuvre.

Kōyō's next projected novel, Musume hakase, lasted for only one instalment, which appeared in the fourteenth issue of Garakuta bunko (October 1887). The title refers, with evident sarcasm, to the subject of education for women, and the one and only chapter heading, 'With voices like those, how can they eat lizards? - Social reform by beauties', reinforces the sarcasm. The first

31 See Okitsu Kaname, Tenkanki no bungaku (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1960), pp. 5-9 and passim.

sentence provides the setting: 'When you think about that ancient place Musashino, can that famous moon really live there, where the gas-works are now?'[32] The contrast with the rhetorical display at the beginning of Ikari no hachimaki is immediately obvious. Kōyō's narrator goes on to describe a large western-style residence, drawing the reader's attention to the presumed wealth of the owner. He then turns to three young girls standing at the gate. We learn that they are pupils at a girls' college and that the two wearing Japanese dress are speaking in a mixture of English and Japanese. Once they have gone, the third girl, whose western dress is carefully described, enters the gate of the large house and goes up to her room. The narrator makes a point of mentioning everything that is 'western-style' in her room, and then he introduces a maid and allows dialogue to take over from the narrative for the rest of the instalment. In the course of their conversation, the girl mentions the Rokumeikan several times and asserts that only the brainless go there. She also shows the maid how westerners dance and criticizes Japanese theatre for the poor quality of the actors and playwrights alike. The maid then leaves to make way for two visitors. The girl chatters with her visitors for a short while and then the three of them get down to writing a declaration, the nature of which is not made clear.

Unlike its predecessors, Musume hakase is set firmly in the Meiji period. For the contemporary reader, the references to the gas-works in Musashino and to the Rokumeikan would have sufficed to place this first instalment in the Tokyo of the 1880s. The

32 Garakuta bunko, No 14 (October 1887), p. 1. The import of this sentence is remarkably similar to that of the opening lines of Yamada Bimyō's Musashino, which was serialized one month later in the Yomiuri shinbun (20 and 23 November and 6 December 1887).

Rokumeikan was established in Kōjimachi, Tokyo, in 1883; it was a social club, but membership was limited to the aristocracy and foreign diplomatic representatives. The mention of Shinbashi railway station in Kokkei kai byōbu has much the same effect as that of the Rokumeikan in Musume hakase, but the effect is very much enhanced in Musume hakase by the appearance in the dialogue of the word 'kairyō' (reform), which was one of the catchwords of the early Meiji period, and by the introduction of such contemporary issues as the state of the theatre in Japan.[33] And, of course, the college girls and their western tastes have their part to play in anchoring the work in the Meiji period. If they were to be successful caricatures and embody Kōyō's satire, it was essential for their manners and tastes to be an accurate reflection of those of their contemporaries.

It will be evident by now that Kōyō's first three attempts at fiction have very little in common. This calls for some explanation, particularly in view of the fact that his second and third attempts remained unfinished. For two full years, from the appearance of the last instalment of Kokkei kai byōbu on 25 May 1886 to the publication of the first instalment of Fūryū: Kyō ningyō on 25 May 1888, Kōyō wrote no fiction apart from those two unfinished works. The rest of this chapter will attempt to account for this lean period and Kōyō's apparent uncertainty about the kind of fiction he should write.

In the postscript to the third instalment of Ikari no hachimaki,

33 Newspapers in the 1880s frequently carried editorials or articles advocating the reform of anything from the theatre and fiction to the Japanese race and young ladies. The word 'kairyō' was so widely used that Takada Sanae, under the pseudonym Matsuya Shujin, wrote an editorial entitled 'Kairyō no kairyō' which appeared in two parts on the front page of the Yomiuri shinbun on 12 and 13 November 1886.

Aitai Dōshi reported Kōyō's own explanation of his failure to finish Ikari no hachimaki and this offers an important clue.

> The plot of this [Ikari no] hachimaki of mine is very poor. What is more, it is full of rakes saying improper things and courtesans acting seductively. This is just the same as if I were to demean my own character. And now that these are the times of shōsetsu kairyō (reform of the novel), people pay even less attention to the gesaku of the Tenpō era [1830-1844] than they do to a glimpse of the beard of Agemaki's [lover] Ikkyū.[34]

As we have seen, Ikari no hachimaki does indeed depict a courtesan and several rakes, so it is no surprise to find that in Musume hakase Kōyō heeded his own strictures and substituted schoolgirls for courtesans.

Kōyō's use of the term 'shōsetsu kairyō' in the passage above contrasts strongly with the tenor of his preface to Kokkei kai byōbu. Instead of eulogizing Ikku and Rijō, he is now aware of new literary currents. Proposals for the reform of the novel date back to several years before the formation of the Ken'yūsha. The earliest instance known to me consists of a simple suggestion that the novel be reformed so as to exclude the lewdness that has characterized it hitherto.[35] This was in June 1876, but it was not until 1883 that the first articles and editorials on shōsetsu kairyō began to appear. On 9 and 29 June of that year an unsigned article appeared in the Nippon rikken seitō shinbun arguing, as the title put it, that 'one means of sewing the seeds of freedom in our country is to reform fiction and drama'. In October and November of the same year, Akabane Manjirō published two articles on the reform of fiction, drama, and kōdan story-telling in the Tōkyō yoron shinshi (Nos 141 and 144), and a steady trickle of

34 Garakuta bunko, No 11 (16 January 1887), p. 11. Agemaki is one of the characters in the kabuki play Sukeroku yukari no Edozakura and Ikkyū is her ~~secret~~ lover.

35 Mondō shinbun, No 4 (19 June 1876), p. 8b.

articles on similar subjects appeared over the next couple of years. Amongst these was 'Nippon shōsetsu kairyō ron'. This was a transcript of a speech delivered by Seki Naohiko at the Dai Nippon Kyōikukai on 9 January 1887 and it appeared both in the Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun and the Yamato shinbun. In his speech Seki Naohiko addressed himself to such topics as the immorality of ninjōbon and the poor quality of contemporary fiction, which he said had made very little progress; the terms he used and the arguments he deployed were quite obviously derived from Tsubouchi Shōyō's (1859-1935) Shōsetsu shinzui, which was first published in nine fascicles between September 1885 and April 1886.[36] Also in January 1887, the 'Gaidan kōsetsu' column first appeared in Garakuta bunko. This contained the Ken'yūsha's first attempts at literary criticism and it is to this that we shall now turn, in order to demonstrate the growing awareness in the Ken'yūsha of the new ideas that were shaping literary opinion in the 1880s.

The eighth and last item in the 'Ken'yūsha gesoku', a policy statement by the members of the Ken'yūsha, announced the creation of the new column as follows.

> From the eleventh issue we shall include a new column to be called 'Akkō zōgon'. Anybody who detects in any item from the shōsetsu to the kyōbun, kyōka, and dodoitsu poor workmanship that sullies the pages of [Garakuta]bunko, or any rehashes of old stews, is requested to send us their criticism as soon as possible. It will be printed in the 'Akkō zōgon' column of the next issue, and moxa will be applied to ensure that the same worm-trouble does not occur again. If we receive any rebuttals they too will be printed and we shall let the two of them fight it out on the stage of the literary world.

As the editor explained in the next issue, the name of the column

36 'Nippon shōsetsu kairyō ron', Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun, 12 January (pp. 1-2) and 13 January (p. 1) 1887. I have not seen the Yamato shinbun version, which apparently appeared between the issues of 16 and 22 January.

was changed from 'Akkō zōgon' to 'Gaidan kōsetsu' in time for its first appearance. The magazine, he said, did not want only the slander and abuse implicit in the original title.[37] 'Gaidan kōsetsu' appeared in all the subsequent privately distributed issues of Garakuta bunko and most of the issues that were publicly sold. It also made the occasional appearance in Bunko, the successor to Garakuta bunko. In time, the contents came to take on the form of normal reviews, but at first they seemed to be transcripts of remarks made at a Ken'yūsha discussion group.

Throughout the privately distributed issues of Garakuta bunko the works discussed in the 'Gaidan kōsetsu' column came without exception from the previous issue. Contributions to the first 'Gaidan kōsetsu' column included one from a 'kairyō shōsetsuka' (writer of reformed novels), who criticized the tendency of Japanese descriptive prose to exaggerate. Another contributor criticized Ishibashi Shian's Shunshō kiwa hanagoyomi for its hackneyed description and reminded the author that it was now the age of kairyō shōsetsu. Although the column contained no reviews of works outside Garakuta bunko at this stage, it showed from its inception that the Ken'yūsha were aware of outside literary opinion favouring the reform of the novel. This awareness, it seems, only began to take shape after the last instalment of Kokkei kai byōbu, and perhaps during the composition of Ikari no hachimaki. At any rate, the decision to inaugurate the new column was taken before the end of 1886. It is reasonable to assume that Kōyō was party to this decision and agreeable to the changes that were slowly taking place in the Ken'yūsha. He was,

37 The passage quoted from the 'Ken'yūsha gesoku' is to be found in Garakuta bunko, No 10 (1 December 1886), pp. 16-17. 'Akkō zōgon' and 'Gaidan kōsetsu' mean 'abuse and insults' and 'common talk and rumours' respectively.

after all, one of the three main members of the Ken'yūsha whose names appeared at the end of each issue of Garakuta bunko, and it even seems from Maruoka's recollections that he was responsible for the editing of the new column, at least at the outset.[38]

Nothing has yet been said of Tsubouchi Shōyō, the doyen of the shōsetsu kairyō advocates.[39] This is because the evidence for Kōyō's familiarity with Shōyō's work and ideas at this stage is somewhat tenuous, although it is clear that he was impressed by the general call for shōsetsu kairyō and abandoned his second novel as a result. The evidence is, however, worth reviewing, for its cumulative effect is persuasive. It is true that Kōyō made no specific reference to Shōsetsu shinzui or its author in anything he wrote at this time, but in the early part of his career he rarely put his literary views on paper. It is only Aitai Dōshi's diligence that has preserved for us his comments on shōsetsu kairyō, and nothing similar has survived to give us Kōyō's impressions of Shōsetsu shinzui.

There is just one mention of Shōyō in 'Gaidan kōsetsu'. One of the critics found fault with Bimyō's Chōkai shōsetsu tengu on the ground that it was too imitative of the works of Harunoya-ō (Harunoya Oboro, or Harunoya Shujin, were pen-names Shōyō used at this time).[40] It is not clear from this what the critic's opinion was of Shōyō, but it does point to Bimyō as a possible link between Shōyō and the Ken'yūsha.

As we have seen, Bimyō showed Kōyō the complete manuscript of his first novel, Tategoto sōshi, several months before the

38 Maruoka, 'Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku', p. 37.
39 In his preface to Shōsetsu shinzui, Shōyō stated that one of his objectives was 'shōsetsu no kairyō-shinpo' (the reform and progress of the novel): Tsubouchi Shōyō shū (NKinBT 3), p. 42.
40 Garakuta bunko, No 12 (June 1887), p. 24.

founding of the Ken'yūsha. Instalments of Tategoto sōshi appeared in the first two issues of Garakuta bunko, but for some reason Bimyō declined to serialize any more of his novel. The manuscript, however, has survived and has been partly reprinted. From this it is clear that Bimyō derived his inspiration from the yomihon of Kyokutei Bakin (1767-1848), which best exemplify the shichigo-chō (seven-five rhythm), kanzen-chōaku didacticism, and neglect of character for plot that are to be found in Tategoto sōshi.[41] He made his literary sympathies clearer in subsequent issues of Garakuta bunko. The third issue contained a piece by him titled 'Kaigō hirō', in which he announced that his new pen-name was to be Nisei Kyokutei Bakin, and he made several contributions under that name to the third, fourth, and fifth issues.

Bimyō's Chōkai shōsetsu tengu appeared in Garakuta bunko from the ninth issue to the thirteenth (November 1886 to July 1887). It is a satire on a vain and pretentious writer and although it remained unfinished it has the distinction of being the first genbun-itchi novel that appeared in print. It contains no trace of Bakin's rhythmical style or moralism. There is the occasional reference to Bakin but these are not satirical in intent: the writer is made to cite Shakespeare as well as Bakin and the point is to show up the shallow pretensions of his knowledge, not to ridicule Bakin and Shakespeare themselves.[42] It was very likely the

41 The first eight chapters of the manuscript are reprinted in Bimyō senshū, 2 vols (Ritsumeikan shuppanbu, 1935), II, 1125-1168. The editors did not receive permission to reprint the second half of the work, which was discovered by Honma Hisao. There are substantial differences between the Garakuta bunko and manuscript versions of the first two chapters.

42 For the opinion, mistaken in my view, that Bimyō's purpose was to ridicule Bakin, see James R. Morita, 'Yamada Bimyō as Novelist' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968), pp. 43-50.

publication of Shōsetsu shinzui, in which Shōyō was particularly critical of Bakin's didacticism and poor characterization, that led Bimyō to turn away from Bakin in Chōkai shōsetsu tengu. It is clear from a letter Bimyō wrote, probably in December 1885, to an unknown correspondent that he was familiar with the contents of Shōsetsu shinzui. In the opening paragraphs of his letter, Bimyō was critical of the quality of most translations from western works of literature, and he attributed this shortcoming to the widespread ignorance among translators of the fact that 'it is the received opinion among scholars that the novel's primary concern (shugan) is with ninjō alone . . .'. He then went on to deplore the inadequacy of contemporary fiction in terms which leave no doubt that he had read those fascicles of Shōsetsu shinzui that had appeared by December 1885. His emphasis on ninjō and his use of such expressions as 'shōsetsu no shugan' and 'zenjin no sōhaku' leave no doubt about the influence Shōsetsu shinzui had exerted upon him.[43]

Iwaya Sazanami (1870-1933) was another member of the Ken'yūsha who definitely read Shōsetsu shinzui within a few months of its appearance. In December 1886, when it had become clear that Shōyō had abandoned his novel Mirai no yume, Sazanami wrote a letter to the Yomiuri shinbun in which he chided Shōyō for having failed to complete his novel and warned him that his reputation would suffer

43 Compare Shōyō's own wording in Shōsetsu shinzui (NKinBT 3, p. 41): 'Bakin, Tanehiko no sōhaku' and 'kojin no sōhaku'. The letter is in Honma's possession and most of it is quoted by him in Meiji bungaku shi, I, 360-364. The last page is apparently missing but his arguments for assigning the date of the letter to the end of 1885 appear to be sound.

if he disappointed his readers in this way.[44] He opened the letter with a passage describing Shōyō's influence in the literary world.

> . . . you are quite the Luther of the world of fiction. Ever since you made your case for shōsetsu kairyō, novels have been a little bit different. And there's no novelist who has not learnt from you.

Sazanami went on to say that he had great faith in Shōyō, and that there was not one of Shōyō's works he had not read and admired. Within a month of writing this letter, Sazanami was a member of the Ken'yūsha. Since there is nothing in Sazanami's diary to suggest that his opinion of Shōyō underwent any change in the intervening weeks, it must be supposed that he knew the Ken'yūsha to be receptive to Shōyō's works and ideas, or at least not hostile to them.[45]

Shōyō seems to have been admired by other members of the Ken'yūsha as well, if we may judge from the pen-names they chose. From the first handwritten issue of Garakuta bunko, which preceded the publication of Shōsetsu shinzui by four months but followed the publication of the first of Shōyō's preliminary studies by two months, Maruoka Kyūka used the pen-name Harunoya Kaoru.[46] That he did so in conscious imitation of Shōyō's pen-name Harunoya Ohoro is evident from a waka poem he contributed to the first issue which confuses the two pen-names. A number of other members of the Ken'yūsha also used pen-names that suggested their admiration for Shōyō by imitating his pen-name. Garakuta bunko contains contributions from, among others, Matsunoya Midori, Tsukinoya

44 'Aete Harunoya no goshujin ni tataku', Yomiuri shinbun, 25 December 1886, p. 3. The first ten fascicles of Mirai no yume appeared between April and October 1886, but it remained unfinished.

45 For the relevant section of Sazanami's diary, see Kawakami Bizan Iwaya Sazanami shū (MBZ, 20), pp. 248-249.

46 The first of these preliminary studies was 'Kasaku monogatari no henkan', Chūō gakujutsu zasshi, Nos 1,2, and 5 (March 1885).

Madoka, and Yumenoya Utsutsu. All of these names mirror the unusual '-noya' ending of Shōyō's pen-name.[47]

From the above it seems that Bimyō and Sasanami at least were familiar with the views Shōyō had expressed in the pages of Shōsetsu shinzui and in sympathy with them, and that other members of the Ken'yūsha were inspired with a measure of admiration for Shōyō even when he was known only for his translations. Some years later Kōyō himself made an unqualified reference to the popularity of Shōyō's Tōsei shosei katagi and this suggests, in the absence of anything to the contrary, that its popularity spread to the Ken'yūsha.[48] In these circumstances, and in view of the fact that the Ken'yusha were clearly familiar with the demands for shōsetsu kairyō, it is inconceivable that Kōyō or any other member knew nothing of Shōsetsu shinzui, the work that argued the case for the reform of the novel.

As Kōyō was himself aware, it was the growing pressure for the reform of the novel that led him to abandon Ikari no hachimaki. His next novel, Musume hakase, may well owe its subject matter to Tōsei shosei katagi (see the following chapter), but Kōyō was unable to sustain the effort beyond one instalment. The immediate reason for abandoning it may be ascribed to the joint review which appeared in the following issue of Garakuta bunko. In spite of Kōyō's pleas for praise, the other speakers have trouble finding anything to praise in Musume hakase, although they have several criticisms.[49] The discussion which formed the basis for the

47 Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no seiritsu', pp. 15-16.
48 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 58. Tōsei shosei katagi was published in seventeen fascicles between June 1885 and January 1886.
49 Garakuta bunko, No 15 (December 1887), pp. 25-27.

review must have taken place some time before the publication of that issue, so Kōyō may well have decided to discontinue the serial after hearing what the other members thought of it.

The lack of confidence that prompted him to abandon Musume hakase probably had its roots in the fact that it represented his first attempt to respond to the calls for shōsetsu kairyō. The arguments put forward by the advocates of shōsetsu kairyō were explicit enough to ensure that writers wishing to heed them knew what to avoid when writing fiction. But it was quite a different matter to grasp the positive implications of these arguments and put them into practice, as Shōyō himself found.[50] It is only after he had started on Ikari no hachimaki that Kōyō seems to have felt he should pay more attention to the question of shōsetsu kairyō. So at the time he wrote Musume hakase he had had less than a year in which to digest the arguments its advocates had put forward.

Kōyō's earliest fiction coincides with the period in which he became more self-conscious about his attitudes towards fiction. He abandoned Ikari no hachimaki because he had realised that it was not in keeping with the ideals of the shōsetsu kairyō movement. Musume hakase came closer to those ideals but he was evidently not satisfied with the result. Before undertaking another novel he waited until the public appearance of Garakuta bunko, and perhaps until he was sure he could complete one, and the novel he then wrote attracted the attention of the best known critics of the day.

50 Marleigh Grayer Ryan, Japan's First Modern Novel (Columbia University Press, New York, 1967), p. 53.

CHAPTER TWO

A ninjōbon with a Meiji setting

Kōyō's next work of fiction was Fūryū: Kyō ningyō. This appeared in the pages of Garakuta bunko and its sequel, Bunko, between May 1888 and March 1889. It will be helpful, before turning to examine Kyō ningyō itself, to consider the changes the magazine underwent in those years, for it is only through the magazine that it is possible to appreciate the aspirations that were shaping the literary activities of the Ken'yūsha at the time.

After the sixteenth issue of February 1888, Kōyō and the others decided to put Garakuta bunko on sale to the general public. They agreed to go ahead with this plan even if they barely managed to recover their expenses. The first published issue appeared on 25 May 1888 and to mark the occasion the numbering of the issues was returned to one. The list of members that appeared at the end of this first issue comprised eighty-five names; most of the members were resident in Tokyo, but some came from places as far afield as Himeji and Niigata, and three of the names were of Japanese living in North America or Belgium.[1] A further six people were listed as friends of the Ken'yūsha and one of these was Aeba Kōson (1855-1922), who had joined the Yomiuri shinbun in 1874 and had by 1887 made his name as a writer with Tōsei akiudo katagi, Hito no uwasa and

1 Garakuta bunko, No 1 (25 May 1888), pp. 15-16.

other novels, which were serialized in the Yomiuri. From all this it seems that Garakuta bunko had come to arouse a considerable amount of interest, sufficient to justify publication and general sale.

In the event, Garakuta bunko sold well and it was not long before three thousand copies of each issue were being printed.[2] This was some achievement, for the largest of the daily newspapers at the time, the Yūbin hōchi shinbun, had in the previous year, 1887, sold only an average of thirteen thousand copies a day.[3] Nevertheless, it is probable that fellow students bought most copies of the magazine: Kōyō and Shian hawked it around the Yobimon and the Gakushūin, at which Shian had once been a pupil.

The contents of the first issue included Ken'yūsha shasoku, a revised set of rules for the Ken'yūsha which reflects their growing literary ambitions.[4] As well as giving the membership fee and the recommended method of applying to join the Ken'yūsha, this states that the Ken'yūsha's aim is "to promote the broad development of the literature of Japan". Another section of the rules asks writers who are not members to send in copies of their published works, which will be reviewed in the 'Gaidan kōsetsu' column, and the following section requests newspapers and magazines all over the country to send in copies of reviews of Garakuta bunko appearing in their pages. There is no mention in Ken'yūsha shasoku of any literary ideal, although there is a section which rejects anything to do with politics and which may

2 Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 61.
3 Shuppan geppyō, No 11 (30 June 1888), pp. 195-196.
4 According to Maruoka ('Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku', p. 46), Kōyō himself wrote this set of rules, which appeared in Garakuta bunko, No 1, pp. 14-15.

be an indication that the Ken'yūsha had no time for the political novel.[5] But in spite of this lack of a positive literary ideal, it is clear that Kōyō was determined to make more of Garakuta bunko than the esoteric coterie magazine it had so far been; his references to the "development of the literature of Japan" and "the newspapers and magazines of the whole country" show how much broader his horizons had become.

The aspirations held by Kōyō and the other members bred certain changes in the contents of the magazine. The 'Gaidan kōsetsu' column began to include reviews of works not written by members of the Ken'yūsha and fiction came to play an increasingly important part in each issue at the expense of kyōka and dodoitsu. Just before the publication of the twelfth issue on 25 November 1888 the members of the Ken'yūsha held a meeting and decided that there would in the future be no room in the magazine for dodoitsu. Behind this decision lay the feeling that the dodoitsu was too vulgar to be worthy of consideration as a literary form, especially for a group like the Ken'yūsha that was anxious to be in the vanguard of new literary developments.[6] By the sixteenth issue of 16 February 1889 fiction seems to have become the members' overriding interest: the issue contained instalments of serialized fiction from five different members, which occupied more than two-thirds of the total number of pages. The remaining pages contained a piece about Ise monogatari, a translated extract from a biography of Sir Walter Scott, three

5 In 1888 the political novel was at the height of its popularity, but to my knowledge the Ken'yūsha made no reference to the genre whatsoever. Since, what is more, the fiction they wrote at around this time ignores political events and hardly touches upon contemporary social issues, it is likely that the political novel did in fact hold little attraction for the Ken'yūsha.

6 Maruoka, 'Ken'yūsha no bungaku undō', pp. 113-114. Shian's was the sole dissenting voice.

other literary extracts, and a few advertisements and announcements.

The sixteenth issue of Garakuta bunko was the last in that form, for the seventeenth issue of 11 March 1889 had the title Bunko. The loss of the word 'garakuta' from the title was in itself a sign of the changes the magazine was undergoing. Kōyō and the others evidently felt that this humble word was not equal to the literary works they were now producing, and considered that the magazine was no longer solely a means of amusing themselves. The announcements at the end of the sixteenth issue of Garakuta bunko heralded some of the changes that were about to take place and declared that Bunko would be the leading literary magazine in Japan.[7] So their literary ambitions were continuing to grow.

In the event only eleven issues of Bunko appeared and when the last, number twenty-seven, was published on 18 October 1889 the magazine came to an end. The principal reasons for its demise seem to have been financial difficulties and the success of several competing magazines published by the Kinkōdō, notably Miyako no hana.[8] The Ken'yūsha went on to publish a number of other literary magazines, amongst them Edo murasaki and Shōbungaku. However, the pointsI wish to emphasize here are the increasing emphasis the Ken'yūsha placed on fiction in Garakuta bunko, the increasing interest in what other writers were writing at the time, and the growing conviction that the magazine they published had an important part to play in the literary world.

Kōyō's Fūryū: Kyō ningyō accompanied the rise of the

7 Garakuta bunko, No 16 (16 February 1889), p. 385.
8 Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 64. Miyako no hana first appeared in October 1888 and it lasted until June 1893. It was edited for part of that time by Yamada Bimyō, who left the Ken'yūsha at the end of 1888.

aspirations I have described above. The last of its sixteen instalments appeared in Bunko in March 1889 and the novel was published complete that September by the Shinshindō of Osaka. There are substantial differences between the serialized version and the later one, but the discussion of Kyō ningyō that follows is based on the former in order to highlight Kōyō's initial conception of the work.[9]

In brief, the plot of Kyō ningyō is as follows. The first two chapters depict the lovesickness of an idle but cultured young man, whose name we later learn to be Takeda Hishirō, and the indifference of the object of his affections, whose name is Tatsumi Nagayo. Nagayo is Takeda's neighbour, and in the course of a game of croquet she knocks a ball into his garden by mistake. Takeda's dog soon returns the ball, wrapped up in a handkerchief, but Nagayo shows no interest in reading what Takeda has written on the handkerchief, in spite of the remonstrances of her maid, Sode. The third chapter is set in Nagayo's school. Her fellow pupils, who seem to hold her in low esteem, learn to their delight that the handsome Mr Takeda has moved for a period of convalescence to the villa next door to that of the Tatsumi family. To her own chagrin, Nagayo is artless enough to tell them about the croquet ball and the handkerchief, and the others soon convince her that it was rude of her to offer no thanks to her neighbour. The conversation is interrupted by the arrival of Niyake Kyōnosuke, their young calligraphy teacher. In the next chapter it transpires that Niyake is a lodger at the home of Sode's parents. Sode visits her parents and Niyake persuades her

9 In the pages that follow I shall refer to textual variations as and when they arise. For a detailed discussion of the differences between the two versions, see Appendix One.

to contrive an opportunity for him to meet Nagayo alone: she is one of his pupils and the narrator makes a point of extolling her beauty. In the fifth and sixth chapters Sode manages to see to it that Niyake and Nagayo are alone together at Ibumura, but Niyake becomes angry when Nagayo destroys the rose he has given her and his anger frightens her so much that she cries for help. Niyake succeeds in getting away, but Sode panics when she hears a rumour that Nagayo has been seduced and rushes off home. The seventh chapter returns the reader briefly to Takeda who, in answer to a letter from Nagayo, accompanies Sode to the Tatsumi household. On the way they meet Sode's father, who berates her and drags her off, leaving Takeda standing in the street. In the next chapter the Tatsumis forgive Sode for her part in the affair, although they are angry with her father, who has threatened to disinherit her in order to punish her suitably. The concluding chapters, nine and ten, follow Niyake on a train from Tokyo to Oiso. On the way he overhears two men talking about an incident he finds unpleasantly similar to his recent adventure at Ibumura and he is bewidered to learn from them that the girl involved is weak in the head. Takeda, who also chances to be at Oiso with one of Nagayo's fellow pupils, is surprised to hear her say that Nagayo is a 'fool'. Finally Niyake and Takeda commiserate with each other, and the narrator comments that both were blinded by her physical beauty.

The first point of interest in Kyō ningyō lies in the fact that Nagayo is a schoolgirl and that the other characters include one of the teachers at her school and several of her fellow pupils. Education in the early Meiji period had developed rapidly both with public and private support and a number of schools had appeared, especially in Tokyo, to cater to the growing demand for

education. One product of these changes was the emergence of a new social animal, the boy or girl undergoing full-time education. It was not long before this phenomenon attracted the attention of writers and playwrights. To my knowledge, the earliest work to feature characters from the educational world was a play by Kawatake Mokuami (1816-1893) with the title Fujibitai Tsukuba no shigeyama. This was first performed in 1877, and is more familiarly known as Onna shosei shigeru.[10] The subject seems to have become more popular with writers of fiction, for a steady stream of so-called 'shosei-shōsetsu' (student novels) began to appear in the second decade of the Meiji era. The earliest of these I have been able to trace is Tanaka Ichirō's Kokkei shinwa: Shosei kimotsubushi, which was published in 1883. Tanaka wrote in his preface that if the conduct of students were above reproach and their behaviour unexceptionable it would be difficult to find material for works such as his. The preoccupation with scandal that is suggested here was to become a standard feature of shosei-shōsetsu. Shosei kimotsubushi does include some discussion of contemporary political and social issues but its principal concern is with the lecherous activities of three students in lodgings in Kanda.

Undoubtedly the most famous shosei-shōsetsu, and the first to prompt a critical review, was Tsubouchi Shōyō's Tōsei shosei katagi (1885-6). It may be inferred from a reference in Kōyō's 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku' to the widespread popularity of this book at the time of its publication that it was familiar to the members of the Ken'yūsha, but it is in any case a fact that they were interested

10 Meisaku kabuki zenshū, 25 volumes (Tōkyō Sōgensha, 1968-1971), XXIII, pp. 215-289.

in the student theme in general.[11] In 1887 Ishibashi Shien contributed to the first series of Garakuta bunko two instalments of an unfinished novel with the title Joseito katagi: Bonnō no yami. From what little he wrote of this it seems that he intended to portray the private, and by implication sinful, life of a schoolgirl. Schoolgirls also figure in Iwaya Sazanami's Satsuki no koi, which was serialized in Garakuta bunko alongside Kyō ningyō, and, as we have already seen, Kōyō was concerned in Musume hakase to depict the lives of contemporary schoolgirls, albeit with a satirical eye. Kōyō turned to the same subject in the second part of his Sarumakura (1890), which exposes a scandal in a girls' school.[12] By 1889, however, the first voices were being raised against the writers of shosei-shōsetsu and accusing them of leading Japanese literature down a path to ruin.[13]

Kōyō wrote Kyō ningyō before the glut of shosei-shōsetsu had provoked such complaints, but a reference in the third chapter makes it clear that he was familiar with previous works on the same theme. While the other girls in the classroom are talking all around her, Miss Kasetsu is deep in a copy of Miyake Kaho's (1868-1943) Yabu no uguisu.[14] She has apparently read the book twice before and plans to write a novel of her own, which prompts some advice from her fellow pupils.

Yabu no uguisu was first published in June 1888, and it

11 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 58.

12 Sarumakura was serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun from 1 to 5 February 1890. On 18 February the newspaper carried an editorial on the morals of schoolgirls and female students titled 'Jogakusei no hinkō', which suggests in passing that Kōyō's story was based on fact. See Tosa Tōru, 'Kōyō shoki shōsetsu no hōhō', Nihon bungaku, XXII, No 5 (1973), pp. 4-6.

13 Such views were expressed in an article by Nakanishi Baike (1866-1898): Rakka Hyōjo (pseud.), 'Shincho hyakushu daigogō Fūryūbutsu hihyō', Yomiuri shinbun, 17 October 1889, supplement, p. 1. See Hiraoka Toshio, 'Kōyō no shoki shōsetsu', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLV, No 4 (1968), p. 25.

14 Garakuta bunko, No 4, p. 59.

appears from the first lines of Ishibashi Ningetsu's largely hostile review in Kokumin no tomo that it enjoyed an enthusiastic reception and favourable reviews in contemporary journals and newspapers.[15] The first edition bore on the cover the words 'Harunoya etsu, Kaho joshi cho'. Since that edition also contained a facsimile of a letter from Shōyō which gave his favourable opinion of the work as a whole and mentioned several recommended changes, it seems, as the word 'etsu' (閲) implies, that Shōyō did in fact look over Kaho's novel before publication.[16] In her preface Miyake Kaho made the connection between Yabu no uguisu and Shōyō more explicit by expressing her admiration for his Tōsei shosei katagi and her intention of basing her style on that used by Shōyō. Yabu no uguisu in fact approximates to a version of Tōsei shosei katagi in which all the characters are not male students but schoolgirls, for it traces the fortunes of several pupils at a college for young women in Tokyo.

Soon after Yabu no uguisu appeared, and nearly two weeks before Kokumin no tomo published Ishibashi's review, Garakuta bunko carried its own review of the work, and Kōyō may well have written this himself.[17] It is, however, hard to justify calling it a review, for it takes the form of a short dialogue between a schoolgirl and a gentleman. The girl applauds the emergence of the first woman to make a name for herself in modern Japan (i.e., Miyake Kaho) and praises the way in which she has depicted the girls at college, reminding her listener that Harunoya-sensei

15 Ishibashi Ningetsu, 'Yabu no uguisu no seihyō', Kokumin no tomo, No 25 (6 July 1888), supplement, pp. 23-27.
16 Yabu no uguisu, unnumbered pages before p. 1.
17 See Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū (Tōkyōdō, 1953), p. 14, for the question of authorship. The review appeared in Garakuta bunko, No 3 (25 June 1888), p. 49.

thought the sixth chapter particularly good. The gentleman concedes that the plot may have some merit, but he deplores the style and argues that the work is not really worthy of attention. Although the piece does not amount to much it does confirm that Yabu no uguisu was known to the members of the Ken'yūsha very soon after its publication and that they were aware of Shōyō's favourable critical evaluation. And the few discernible points it does make suggest that it was not the theme but the style that disappointed the writer.

Further evidence that members of the Ken'yūsha were familiar with this work is in the form of a response to Ningetsu's review. It came from Ishibashi Shian and it also appeared in Kokumin no tomo. After saluting Ningetsu as one of the leaders of the movement for the reform of fiction, Shian dealt with some of the points Ningetsu had raised, and showed himself acquainted both with the novel and with the review.[18] It was within a few weeks of the publication of Yabu no uguisu that this article and the Garakuta bunko review appeared, and it may be observed in passing that this fact suggests the Ken'yūsha were more sensitive to current literary trends and aware of recent publications than they have been assumed to be. This point is supported by some of the findings of the previous chapter.

It is possible that Kōyō changed his plans once he had read or heard of Yabu no uguisu. The first instalment of Kyō ningyō preceded the publication of Yabu no uguisu by one month and it makes no mention of the fact that Nagayo is attending one of the colleges for girls. And the first part of the long classroom

18 Ishibashi Shian, "'Yabu no uguisu no saihyō' o yomu", Kokumin no tomo, No 27 (3 July 1888), pp. 36-37.

scene in chapter three appeared in the issue of Garakuta bunko immediately following the issue that contained the so-called review. Nevertheless, Kōyō and other members of the Ken'yūsha had already evinced an interest by this time in novels about schoolgirls, as we have seen, and so it seems reasonable to assume that the serialized text more or less coincides with Kōyō's original intentions.

The schoolgirl theme, which he chose both for his abortive Musume hakase and for Kyō ningyō, differs greatly from the subjects with which he had been concerned in his first two attempts at fiction, Kokkei kai byōbu and Ikari no hachimaki. It can also be traced without difficulty back to Yabu no uguisu and Shōyō's Tōsei shosei katagi, and this strongly suggests that Kyō ningyō represents Kōyō's response to current trends in fiction. The novel was a token of his growing literary ambitions, which were also reflected in the changed form and content of the new series of Garakuta bunko.

It was some justification of his ambitions that Kyō ningyō was the first of his works to attract reviews in magazines other that Garakuta bunko. Nevertheless, both Ishibashi Ningetsu, writing under the name Fukushū Gakujin in Kokumin no tomo, and Uchida Roan (1868-1929), writing under the name Fuchian Shujin in Jogaku zasshi, dealt with Kōyō's novel unfavourably.[19] Ishibashi expressed his disappointment with the work now that it was complete, and supposed that Kōyō was either drunk or dreaming when he wrote it. Uchida, while recognising the quality of

19 Ishibashi Ningetsu, 'Bunko no Kyō ningyō', Kokumin no tomo, No 47 (12 April 1889), pp. 39-40, and Uchida Roan, 'Kōyō Senjin no Fūryū: Kyō ningyō', Jogaku zasshi, No 157 (13 April 1889), pp. 405-406.

individual chapters, was similarly disappointed with the completed work and criticised in particular the inadequate preparation for the ending. I shall return to some of their criticisms later in the chapter.

It is clear even from the summary that the ten chapters of which Kyō ningyō consists cover frequent changes of scene and that the connections between them are sometimes a little obscure. For example, we are not told anywhere in the first two chapters that Nagayo is a pupil at a girls' school and the first of the three instalments of chapter three, which is set in her classroom at school, contains no mention of her. It is only in the second of the instalments that the narrator identifies a 'gentle flower' of a girl called Tatsumi Nagayo with the girl in the previous chapters. These oddities are related to others that are better illustrated then listed, so there follows a translation of the opening section of chapter four.

Summer, so it is barely cool at the break of day: morning glories blooming conspicuously in two or three baked clay pots lined up on the verandah - some of them purple, others of a blue lapis lazuli colour. The shōji are wide open, so a morning breeze steals its way in, without the scroll in the tokonoma noticing. But a fan complains resentfully for a moment.

A small room of just six mats, and in it a desk of imported wood, facing east. In front of a printed cotton cushion there is a Noshiro-lacquer tray[20], and strong whiffs of spring onion, each with an expectant look, are escaping under the lid of a soup bowl. Freshly pickled aubergines mourn the loss of their colour to the bowl they are in. Where, then, is the owner of all this? A man is squatting on the verandah: his hair is in a mess now that it is free of his pillow, and it reminds you of an autumn gale. He looks effeminate and untidy just in his nightclothes. He starts murmuring a song in a sleepy voice, but he continues holding a toothpick and a small mirror in his hands and suits out some red saliva from time to time.

"When you're promising yourself to someone,
don't be too hasty about it.
But once you've made that promise,

20 Noshiro is a maritime city in Akita Prefecture famous for its lacquer ware.

be sure to keep it forever.
Just look at the leaves of the maple:
they may be thin, but . . ."
So he begins, and then he stares at the morning glories.
"Tut, you've really lost your colour, haven't you? . . .
Blow that flower shop."
After a bit, he rinses out his mouth and washes his face. Then he sprinkles two or three drops of scent into some water and gets some Pears [soap] to do his hair. When you think about it, he must have some reason for doing all this.
" . . . thin, but do they fall?
See for yourself:
leaves fall first that are thicker."[21]
He hums the accompanying samisen tune and is just washing his hair when someone thumps him on the back. Wondering who it can be, he looks around. But there is nobody there, so he starts washing his hair again, only to be thumped again. When he looks around, nobody is there. I'll forestall him and get the better of him, he thinks, and faces inside waiting expectantly. A head pops out unawares from behind the shoji - with a Shimada chignon on top.[22] And it flies back a foot or two.
Woman: "Oh! Ha, ha . . . good, er, morning."
The man just manages to keep smiling pleasantly: "What's the idea, then, playing tricks at this ungodly hour? You gave me quite a start."
Woman: "Well, I was quite surprised by all this smartening yourself up."
Man: "But I've got no one to smarten myself up for, anyway. And I dread to think what I'd look like if I didn't bother."
Woman: "People say that it's because of you and all the nice things you say that morals have got a lot worse at the school."
Man: "Thank you for bringing all this so early in the morning."[23]
Woman: "Not at all. I don't think it will be very tasty, but it has just come in, so I . . . ha, ha, ha!"
An old woman's voice from within: "Sode, Sode!"
Woman: "Yes?"
Mother: "The soup's probably cold, so change it . . . and serve it up for him, will you?"
Sode: "Yes . . . I hope you won't mind if I serve you, Niyake-san?"
Ni[yake]: "Watch what you say!"
Sode: "Now, now! What do you mean by that!" And hits him lightly on the back again, so Niyake cowers.
Ni: "Ouch! . . . Stop hitting me and get me that towel . . . that one . . . the western one."
Sode gets the towel and passes around behind the man.
Sode: "Let me dry your hair for you."

21 There is a play on words here. Usui (thin) and koi (thick) can also be used to refer to the shallowness or depth of a relationship, and chiru can mean 'scatter' or 'part' as well as 'fall'. The point of the song is that shallower relationships last longer.
22 This is a trudional style of hairdressing worn by unmarried women.
23 This remark refers to the food mentioned in the second paragraph, lines 10-14.

Sode, while drying his wet hair: "Your hair's so dark and you've got such a lot of it! If you did it up in a Shimada style your sidelocks would look really good!"
Ni: "Then I'd have everybody stroking my face and body."
Sode: "Why?"
Ni: "I'd be another Obinzuru.[24] Ha, ha, ha!"
Sode: "Ha, ha, ha! How silly!"
Kyōnosuke then gets himself properly seated on a cushion, so Sode brings him his soup and goes off to the kitchen door.

Now then, who are this man and woman? The man is Niyake Kyōnosuke, and Sode is the Tatsumis' maid.[25]

In the remainder of this instalment, which is the first of the two comprising chapter four, the narrator explains how Niyake comes to be staying in the home of Sode's parents and then lets some more light-hearted dialogue take over. Before the dialogue commences, however, he adds that her visit home that day will have a lot of significance for Sode and refers the reader to subsequent instalments. In the next instalment, Sode agrees to contrive for Niyake an opportunity to spend some time alone with Nagayo Tatsumi, for whom he is stated to have very tender feelings. The point, therefore, of this half of the chapter is to demonstrate that Niyake knows Sode well enough to be able to solicit her help in this delicate enterprise. Their conversation is of little consequence but familiar in tone and therefore well suited to serve this end.

The first fourteen lines of the translated section, until the narrator interrupts with a rhetorical question, have evident pretensions to be a purple passage. The few strokes with which Kōyō sets the scene are bold ones that personify, rather than describe, a fan, an aubergine and a few other insentient

24 Another play on words. 'Obinzuru' could be understood to mean 'the sidelocks (bin) stick out', but it usually refers to Pindola, a disciple of the Buddha whose images in Japan are stroked by those seeking recovery from an illness.
25 Translated from Garakuta bunko, No 7 (10 September 1888), pp. 108-110.

objects.[26] Attention then turns to the man on the verandah, although the narrator declines to tell the reader who he is. There is no attempt whatsoever to clarify the connection between this chapter and the one that precedes, and the scene is set in no broader perspective than that of the immediate surroundings of the man on the balcony. The constricted range of the narrator's vision that stands out here, and the lack of background, are striking features of Kyō ningyō, and there are many examples to hand. In the first two chapters the narrator's attention is focussed only on the gardens of the Tatsumi and Takeda households, and in the third chapter on one classroom of a school. The passing references in other chapters to Ryōgoku, the Rokumeikan and a few other places make it clear that the setting is contemporary Tokyo, but the narrator chooses not to be particular about time or place and excludes his awareness of current political events and social trends. In Musume hakase, by contrast, not only had the characters been schoolgirls, but they had also been talking about such contemporary issues as the importation of western customs and the poor state of the theatre in Japan.

The man on the verandah the narrator turns to is Niyake Kyōnosuke, whom he introduced at the very end of chapter three as a teacher of calligraphy at the school Nagayo attends. And the woman who disturbs his morning toilet and stays to chat is Sode, whom the reader first met in the opening chapters. Nevertheless, the narrator does not disclose their identities and the reader

26 Kōyō seems to have been dissatisfied with the references to an imperceptive scroll and a resentful fan, for he removed them when Kyō ningyō was published complete: see Fūryū: Kyō ningyō (Shinshindō, Osaka, 1889), p. 51.

only discovers who they are when the dialogue makes their identities clear. Until then it might well be assumed that the young man is Nagayo's neighbour, Takeda.

The dialogue in this passage, as elsewhere in Kyō ningyō, is visually distinguished from the narrative by means of a form of quotation marks resembling vertical parentheses and the use of separate lines for speech. Also, in most cases a single kanji stands at the head of the first line of speech each time a character speaks and this is either an abbreviation of the speaker's name or some indication of the kind of person the speaker is. In the translated passage above Niyake and Sode are represented by the kanji for 'man' and 'woman', which conceal their identities. This is until an old woman, who turns out to be Sode's mother, calls her by name. The 'woman' answers the call, which confirms that she, and not someone else in the house, is Sode and so thenceforward the kanji for 'woman' is replaced by that for Sode's name. Then Sode addresses a remark to Niyake-san, who can now only be the 'man', and so above his reply the kanji for the first part of his name appears for the first time. Thus the speakers are introduced to the reader not directly by the narrator but by the person they are conversing with, even when the reader has already met them in an earlier chapter.

There comes a point, of course, when the narrator must add some information, if only because the dialogue cannot convey it conveniently. An example of this is the narrator's interruption at the end of the translated passage. Having realised from the familiar conversation that Niyake and Sode are on close and friendly terms, the reader needs to know why Niyake should be staying in Sode's parents' house. As soon becomes clear, the circumstances are in fact complex and to have explained them

through the dialogue would have required establishing a pretext for doing so. This in turn would deflect the conversation from the light and familiar course it has so far been following and which is leading to the plan for Niyake's romantic advancement. Nor would it have done to suppose that Niyake had only just moved in, for while this would have presented an opportunity for revealing the circumstances it would at the same time have created difficulties with the friendly but not intimate or romantic relationship Niyake is supposed to enjoy with Sode. So within his chosen framework, Kōyō had to bring his narrator into play again. When Sode goes off to the kitchen, he breaks in with a digest of the necessary information and reinforces the impression of familiarity by adding that Niyake has been living in the home of Sode's parents, whose name we never learn, for over a year. Similarly, at the beginning of chapter nine, the narrator is forced to introduce Niyake to the reader again after a few lines of concealment, for the plot at this point requires that Niyake be alone.

So far, then, it appears that Kōyō does not use narrative to make clear the connections between different scenes and uses it only sparingly to identify the participants in a conversation. On the other hand, he does use it to convey information that the reader needs to know if the credibility of the plot is to be sustained. Occasionally, he also uses it to summarise dialogue. For example, in the second half of chapter four the narrator takes advantage of what he calls a lull in the conversation to give evidence of Nagayo's physical attractions and then, before the dialogue starts again, he mentions that Niyake has now asked Sode to help him find an opportunity to be alone with

Negayo for a while.[27]

More important, however, is one thing the narrator hardly does at all, and that is to afford any insight into the minds of the characters as they speak. In the section of dialogue translated above, as throughout the extensive dialogue in Kyō ningyō, the narrator is noticeable for the rarity of his appearances. The use of a single kanji to indicate the speaker precludes adding even an adverb to a 'he said' to hint at inner feelings. So after the reference to Niyake's barely sustained smile in l. 49, with its suggestion of his displeasure, the narrator disappears except to characterize the voice that calls for Sode (l. 63) and to mention the characters' movements (ll. 74, 76, 83-85). He does not choose to comment on tones of voice or unexpressed feelings.

In effect, so long as he can maintain the pretence, the narrator affects to be an observer with no more knowledge of the characters than the readers have. He describes, as we have seen, only what would be visible to his characters and postpones revealing his knowledge of the connections between scenes as long as possible. He pretends not to know the ages of the characters and gives only an approximate age based on appearance.[28] He introduces rhetorical questions that suggest he shares the readers' ignorance. He records all he hears, including the dog's barks in chapter two, which are faithfully set down in quotation marks, but he declines to identify the speakers for the reader or to delineate their emotions as they

27 Garakuta bunko, No 8 (25 September 1888), p. 122.
28 For example, ibid., No 2, p. 33. For a study of features similar to those described in this paragraph, see the author's 'Nishiki no Ura: An Instance of Censorship and the Structure of a Shorebon', Monumenta Nipponica, XXXII, No 2 (1977), pp. 163-166.

speak or listen.

The characteristics of the narrator in Kyō ningyō were no invention of Kōyō's. The layout of the dialogue shows us where to look for the antecedents of his narrative style, for it is very similar to that encountered in the kokkeibon, sharebon and ninjōbon of the late Tokugawa period. In all three of these genres the narrative has a much smaller part to play than the dialogue and consists mainly of description or something akin to stage directions. In the original wood-block texts it is visually distinguished from the dialogue by being cramped into narrow columns, a pair of which takes up the space of one column of speech. Kōyō achieved the visual distinction in a different way, but the end result was the same. And the use of a single kanji to indicate the speaker or to distinguish one speaker from another is common to both Kōyō and kokkeibon, sharebon and ninjōbon.

The type of narration that Kyō ningyō exemplifies is to be found in all three of the genres mentioned above, but plots involving several characters and a denouement of some kind were a rarity in both sharebon and kokkeibon, and so the narrative was generally put to descriptive or comic uses which relied heavily on the accompanying dialogue. It probably reached the limit of its possibilities in such contexts in Shikitei Sanba's Odokebanashi: Ukiyofuro (1809-1813). In Ukiyofuro Sanba eschewed any form of imposed plot or story and simply recorded the conversation at a public bath house, reserving the narrative for precise description and mentions of movement or action. Ninjōbon, on the other hand, differed, like Kyō ningyō, from sharebon and kokkeibon in the relative importance of plot and

the predominantly sentimental themes, so it is fitting to look for the antecedents of Kōyō's narrative style among the ninjōbon.

It is likely that Kōyō had read a large number of ninjōbon in the years before he wrote Kyō ningyō, but there are only two ninjōbon which he is known for certain to have read by this time. These are (Nisei) Umebori Kokuga's (1826-1886) Shunshoku renri no ume (1852-1858), which he copied out by hand in 1884, and Tamenaga Shunsui's (1790-1843) Shunshoku umegoyomi (1832-1833), which he mentioned at the beginning of Kyō ningyō.[29]

In the opening chapter of Shunshoku renri no ume the narrator argues that beauty is superficial and that the man who realises this will cause his family no trouble, but he goes on to say that not to know the deep feeling of love is to be without emotions and insensitive to aware. A conversation follows between a woman called Okiku and one Fusajirō, which shows the reader their intimacy. It is, however, a conversation that takes place in a dream seen by Okiku, as becomes clear when her mother wakes her up. After an exchange of words between the mother and daughter, the narrator breaks in again to sketch in the background, which he does with evident sympathy. The second chapter opens as follows:

> In Yokohama-chō of famed Kamakura[30] there is a pawnshop with lattice work at the front and a tall row of storerooms. The owner has only recently left this

29 See Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 14, and Gerkuto bunko, No 12 (25 November 1888), p. 223, respectively.

30 This is a conventional attempt to disguise the contemporary setting. After Shunsui's punishment during the reforms of the Tenpō era, ninjōbon writers diligently avoided the brazenly contemporary settings and the preoccupation with the pleasure quarters that had offended the bakufu in Shunsui's case.

> world but his son is sickly and in any case too young, so the shop has for the time being been entrusted to Kanpachi, the head clerk, on instructions from the head of the family. The mother of that son is behind the shōji in a small detached cottage, pondering about something that is troubling her. It is not a retirement home for her, but it is in the inner garden between the shop and the living quarters and is marked off by a row of evergreen bushes. Beside her is her maid, Otoyo, who has grown old in service to the family. Though mistress and maid, they are fellow women and are so close that the widow discusses matters with her whenever things get too much for her. So, heaping coals on the brazier, Otoyo: I've enquired around a bit myself and what people tell me is that it's no use trying to get them to break it off, even with money. That woman's fallen for the young master, and he's very much taken with her himself, so they are pretty well taken with each other! It's going to be quite a problem. Mother: That's what I'm worried about. Not only is the girl older than Fusa, but her family even teach music, so the relatives won't agree to having her in as a bride. And anyway, the people at the main shop are saying that Fusa should marry Oyuki . . .[31]

Kōyō's initial descriptive efforts are wanting here partly because the illustrations that decorated every ninjōbon rendered them more or less superfluous. Nevertheless, there are equivalents to Kōyō's purple passage in the opening section of the first chapter and in the prefaces, which in ninjōbon commonly served as an opportunity for a display of literary dexterity. The preface to the first volume of Renri no ume relies on kakekotoba and sustained metaphor to establish a close connection between plum blossoms and romance, and the prefaces to the ninjōbon of Tamenaga Shunsui are with few exceptions complex webs of allusions, puns and kakekotoba.

The narrator of Renri no ume does give the reader slightly more background information than Kōyō, but he declines to

31 Translated from Shunshoku renri no ume, edited by Murakami Shizuo (volume twenty-five of the unnamed series published by the Ninjōbon Kankō Kai; 1923), pp. 9-10.

mention that the 'son' he refers to is in fact Fusajirō who appeared in the dream in the first chapter. Once again, it is left to the reader, once he has enough information at his disposal, to infer the connections between chapters. It is only through the dialogue that we learn that the 'mother' is in fact Fusajirō's mother, and that we hear of Fusajirō's personal predicament, which is to be the focus of attention throughout the book. The narrator explains enough (but rather more than would be found in earlier ninjōbon) to enable the reader to understand why Fusa's mother should be discussing such personal matters with her maid, and then he lets the dialogue take over. After this he disappears from view even more effectively than does Kōyō's narrator, leaving only kanji to indicate the speakers and forbearing to notice movement, tones of voice, or feelings. As a result the dialogue becomes an important means of conveying information. In the second chapter of Renri no ume the maid's literary role is to elicit the mother's thoughts, which are thus conveyed not by narrative but by dialogue. Sode in the first chapters of Kyō ningyō serves a similar function, and the coincidental meeting of Takeda and Niyake at the end of Kyō ningyō enables their emotional reactions to be aired without resorting to narrative.

In both works the narrator is given an objective pose, and this entails that the connections between scenes are rarely made explicit and that characters are rarely identified for the reader. Just as Niyake and Sode are not named until circumstances make their identities clear and as the man on the train is not identified as Niyake until the narrator has asked himself who he is, so in Renri no ume the woman who recognises Fusa in the street

with Okiku is not revealed as his mother's maid Otoyo until the next chapter.[32] For the same reason, anonymous characters appear in both works. They exist solely as voices in the dialogue and are either numbered, as in the classroom scene in Kyō ningyō, or represented merely by the kanji for such words as 'man', 'old woman', and so on. In some cases, for example the excited anonymous voices at Ibumura in Kyō ningyō and the remarks of various members of the audience during the amateur dramatics scene in Renri no ume, the snatches of dialogue help to characterize a scene and to convey the impression of a large number of people. But the anonymous voices have a more important role to play when the remarks they make are overheard by one or more of the main characters. In Kyō ningyō it is only by eavesdropping on the conversation of two other passengers on his train that Niyake discovers the truth about Nagayo, and in Renri no ume Okiku and Fusajirō are encouraged when they overhear some people talking about them and discussing what a good match they would make. The element of coincidence here is characteristic both of ninjōbon and of many of Kōyō's early works of fiction. In Renri no ume coincidental meetings result in Fusajirō being dragged off by the chief clerk to marry Oyuki and in several other unexpected turns of plot, and in Kyō ningyō there are similar coincidences in Sode's meeting with her father and Takeda's encounter with Niyake at the end.[33]

The above are the major areas of similarity between Kyō ningyō

32 Shunshoku renri no ume, p. 56.
33 Garakuta bunko, No 14 (2 January 1889), p. 269, and Bunko, No 18 (25 March 1889), pp. 390-400.

and ninjōbon. From these it is apparent that Kōyō's narrative and dialogue and the uses he makes of them owe a great deal to the ninjōbon tradition. This was probably a matter of conscious choice, for he was quite ready to diverge from ninjōbon practice in other important respects, as will be clear from what follows.

In Musume hakase Kōyō had already made an attempt to anchor his fiction firmly in the Meiji period. The appearance in that work of schoolgirls and the mention of current issues do far more to furnish a Meiji setting than do the references to trains and other artefacts in Kokkei kai byōbu, in which the characters and their conversation are quite divorced from the Meiji period. In Kyō ningyō Kōyō followed the same path as in Musume hakase, deriving all his characters from an educational institution new to Meiji Japan and giving them characteristics foreign to the late Tokugawa period, such as a fondness for scattering English words throughout their conversation or a strong and evangelistic sense of Christian piety.[34] Thus Kyō ningyō differs from the ninjōbon of the Tamenaga school in that courtesans and the pleasure quarters have no part to play. This may have something to do with Shōsetsu shinzui, in which Shōyō regretted the prominence of the pleasure quarters in most ninjōbon.[35] Nevertheless, this was also an aspect in which Renri no ume differed from the Tamenaga school of ninjōbon. Umebori Kokuga apologizes in the middle of Renri no ume for his choice of ordinary city families to replace the exciting world of the pleasure quarters, but he defends the quality of the ninjō he has chosen to depict.[36] Similarly,

34 See, for example, Garakuta bunko, No 4, pp. 58-63.
35 Tsubouchi Shōyo shū (NKinBT, vol. 3), pp. 134-139 and passim.
36 Shunshoku renri no ume, p. 175.

during the conversation in chapter three of Kyō ningyō about Kasetsu's plans to write a novel, one of the girls urges her not to write about 'kajō' (下情, the conditions of the common people) or vulgar matters, but to write about 'yūbi' (優美, elegant beauty) and musume (娘, young girls; i.e., girls who are not courtesans).[37] Kōyō heeded this advice himself, for musume and their preoccupations are at the centre of Kyō ningyō.

So although the schoolgirls were foreign to ninjōbon practice, the use of musume rather than courtesans had a precedent in a ninjōbon Kōyō had definitely read. Furthermore, while the individual characters may have certain features that mark them out as products of the Meiji era, their lives as Kōyō depicts them have no more conneetion with the social and political events of the time than do the courtesans and other characters that people the ninjōbon. We see none of the characters at their daily occupations, and even the classroom scene takes place between lessons. We never learn Takeda's occupation and the abundant free time he seems to have at his disposal makes him a close counterpart of the waka-inkyo, the young man of leisure to be found in most ninjōbon.

On the other hand, the language Kōyō uses to describe the preoccupations of his musume differs both from Renri no ume and from the ninjōbon of the Tamenaga school. Whereas it is extremely rare for a musume or a narrator in a ninjōbon to be explicit about love or even to use the word, Kōyō introduces the subject in Kyō ningyō a number of times. When Nagayo shows no interest in reading the message on the handkerchief, the narrator

37 Garakuta bunko, No 4, p. 57.

comments that she knows no love (koi) to speak of and has never kissed anyone; and in another passage the narrator ridicules old-fashioned and long-winded ways of courting.[38] This innovation probably reflects contemporary language fads as well as the influence of the western fiction available in Japan at the time.

However, these and other mentions of love in Kyō ningyō are also evidence of Kōyō's growing interest in the thoughts and feelings of his characters. Ninjōbon writers rarely made any attempt to reveal the thoughts of their characters in the narrative, partly because they used subsidiary characters to draw out the thoughts in the form of dialogue. Kōyō, on the other hand, had judgements to make on his characters as well as thoughts to reveal, and it was the narrative he chose for this purpose. On several occasions he introduces these thoughts with such formulae as, "Wakamono ga omou mama o fude ni utsuseba kaku koso" (If I were to describe what the young man is thinking, this [is how it would be]) and "Takeda mo mugon . . . naredo jimon jitō no mune no naka" (Takeda is silent too . . . but inside his chest he asks himself questions and answers them), and these suggest that he was not accustomed to the technique.[39] It does, of course, do violence to the narrator's objective pose if he is enabled to have insight into the minds of the characters, and this may well be the reason that characters' thoughts are so rarely encountered in ninjōbon. One way out of this problem was to represent thought as if it were monologue, without translating

38 Respectively, Garakuta bunko, No 3, p. 41, and No 8, p. 122.
39 Ibid., No 2, p. 30, and No 14, p. 267.

it into coherent sentences: if the thoughts seem to come direct from the characters' minds and not by way of the narrator, then the narrator's pose is a little more credible than it would otherwise be. One example of this technique occurs in the final instalment, when Takeda is talking with one of Nagayo's fellow pupils.

> "Are you really keen on her, then?"
> Keen . . . well, Niyake is. Is it because of him that my love for her is getting me nowhere? But keenness alone . . . one-sided love? She keen too? Well, it must be because of him.[40]

There is no indication here either of the speaker or of the character whose thoughts we are shown. Both can be inferred from the circumstances without much difficulty, but the complete absence of the narrator implies that Kōyō is seeking, whether consciously or otherwise, to avoid conflict between the objectivity he has bestowed on his narrator and his decision to represent the thoughts of his characters.

There remains one important problem, and it concerns the ending of Kyō ningyō. The novel finishes where it does simply because Nagayo's two admirers have finally realised that she is a 'fool' (Kōyō uses the English word spelt out in katakana), and this seems to mean that she is a simpleton.[41] Takeda and Niyake are then given an opportunity to voice their remorse, and the narrator brings the intended irony of the title (which may be translated 'An Elegant Kyōto Doll') to the reader's attention by

40 Bunko, No 18, p. 395.
41 This is clear from the conversation on the train in Bunko, No 17, pp. 354-356.

concluding that Niyake had after all given his love to nothing more than a doll. But the consequences are left for the reader to imagine, and the focus is instead on the discovery that Nagayo is a simpleton. This discovery comes as a surprise both to the reader and to Takeda and Niyake, although there is the occasional hint. In chapter three, the language used by the other girls in Nagayo's class suggests that their opinion of her is low, and at Ibumura in chapter six Niyake interprets as girlish innocence what he initially took for stupidity.[42] Such hints as these serve to make the ending a little more plausible, but in his review Uchida Roan complained that there was not enough evidence to support the revelation that Nagayo is a fool.[43] His complaint is a reasonable one, for in order to retain the element of surprise Kōyō had to reveal far less of Nagayo than of the other characters. Even the hints he gives the reader derive from the opinions of other characters rather than from the kind of psychological insight he is able to exercise with Sode and Niyake. Ishibashi Ningetsu's complaint that Nagayo appears in the novel far too infrequently seems to be concerned with precisely the same point.[44] Nagayo's last appearance is in the eighth of the ten chapters, when she consoles Sode for her father's rude and angry behaviour. This follows the incident at Ibumura but the reader is given no clue as to her reactions to the incident. Thus even when she does appear we learn very little about her.

The ending leaves a number of loose ends. Kōyō's interest

42 Respectively, Garakuta bunko, No 6 (25 August 1888), pp. 87-90, and No 12, p. 223.
43 'Koyo Sanjin no Fūryū Kyō ningyō', Jogaku zasshi, No 157, p. 405.
44 'Bunko no Kyō ningyō', Kokumin no tomo, No 47, p. 40.

does not extend to the repercussions of Niyake's behaviour on his career or to what becomes of Nagayo. The emphasis on the blunder at the expense of the consequences calls to mind the shippai of Edo comic fiction, although here the comic element is lacking. Kōyō may have been making a conscious attempt to avoid the neat and tidy endings common in ninjōbon, but it is also possible that haste had a part to play. On the back cover of the fifteenth issue of Garakuta bunko (25 January 1889) an advertisement appeared for a new novel by Kōyō, stating that the novel was to be titled Ninin bikuni: Irozange and to be published towards the end of February. In the event, Irozange was not published until April, but the advertisement indicates that Kōyō had started work on a new novel well before the last three instalments of Kyō ningyō had appeared in print. In the two instalments that followed the advertisement Kōyō made use of two coincidences and an unexplained relationship to draw the novel to a close, and the total lack of preparation for the events in the last instalments suggests that they were written to cut the novel short and possibly to enable him to turn all his attention to Irozange.

At any rate, it is clear that Kōyō's ideas were changing as he came to the end of Kyō ningyō. In the latter instalments the dialogue came to do without the kanji that had formerly been used to indicate the speakers, and the first suggestions of characters' thoughts during a conversation began to appear, although they remained rare. The first such example occurs in chapter six and several occur in the following chapter. In each case Kōyō used quotation marks for the thoughts, as if they were dialogue, but made it clear that they were not spoken by prefacing

them with such phrases as "kokoro no naka de wa" (and in his heart).[45]

At the beginning of this chapter I showed that in 1888 and 1889 Kōyō and the Ken'yūsha nurtured growing literary ambitions. Kyō ningyō was an apt expression of those ambitions, partly because it demonstrated an interest in such current literary trends as the shosei-shōsetsu, and partly because it represented an attempt to depict the Japan of the late 1880s. At the same time it must be recognised that Kyō ningyō owes a major debt to the ninjōbon tradition. This debt is especially apparent in the importance of dialogue in Kyō ningyō, the relative invisibility and objective pose of the narrator, and the reliance on a complex plot complete with coincidences and surprising twists. But Kyō ningyō did not owe as much to ninjōbon as did Ikari no hachimaki, and it was, as we have seen, the problems caused by the desire to reveal the workings of characters' minds that caused the most important departures from ninjōbon practice. These problems were to remain at the centre of Kōyō's concerns, as we shall see in the following chapters.

45 When Kōyō came to revise the text of Kyō ningyō for publication as a book he made as many changes in the later chapters as he did in the earlier ones and he made no attempt to make the dialogue conform to a single pattern. Thus the differences between the dialogue in the early and the late chapters are the same in the serialized and book versions.

CHAPTER THREE

History and sentiment in an historical novel

Some time towards the end of 1888 Kōyō received a visit from one Yoshioka Tetsutarō, who was a friend and contemporary of Tsubouchi Shōyō. Yoshioka was planning to publish a series of books under the title Shincho hyakushu and hoped that Kōyō would contribute the first volume.[1] His original intention was for the series to include works on politics, art and other subjects in addition to works of fiction, but the success of the first volume, Kōyō's Ninin bikuni: Irozange, persuaded him to make the series a purely literary one after all.[2] Yoshioka's connection with the Ken'yūsha remained a close one for some time, for he took over the publication and distribution of Bunko from 11 March 1889 and published a number of works by other members of the Ken'yūsha in subsequent volumes of the Shincho hyakushu series.[3]

It was in connection with the publication of Irozange on 1 April 1889 that Kōyō first met Tsubouchi Shōyō and Aeba Kōson, whose Horidashimono was published as the second volume of the series in May 1889. At Yoshioka's request, Shōyō wrote a preface to the series, which appeared at the beginning of the first

1 For the meetings with Yoshioka, Shōyō, and Kōson, see Ozaki Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', pp. 64-65.
2 Yoshioka's plans for the series appear in an advertisement for Shincho hyakushu in Garakuta bunko, No 16 (16 February 1889), p. 386.
3 Thus No 3 (June 1889) consisted of Ishibashi Shian's Otomegokoro and Kōyō's Fūgamusume, and No 4 (August 1889) of Iwaya Sazanami's Imosegai. Works by Hirotsu Ryūrō (1861-1928), Kawakami Bizan (1869-1908), and other members appeared in later volumes.

volume. Advertisements for Irozange appearing on the back of the March issues of Bunko made prominent mention of Shōyō's preface, and it is fair to say that Shōyō's name was expected to draw attention to the series. Nevertheless, Shōyō did not confine himself in his preface to remarks of a general nature. Since, as he claimed, Yoshioka refused to show him the manuscript of Irozange on the grounds that it was too important a secret to be lightly given away, Shōyō addressed himself instead to the literary prospects of Kōyō and the Ken'yūsha, and he spoke very highly of them.

> . . . not for a moment can I bring myself to think of [the Ken'yūsha] as men who write novels for their own amusement. Without exception, the Ken'yūsha are one and all men of hope and promise for the future of the novel and of Japanese literature.[4]

As I concluded in the first chapter, it is extremely unlikely that Kōyō knew nothing of the ideas Shōyō had put forward in Shōsetsu shinzui. Kōyō's meeting with Shōyō in 1889 and the praise Shōyō subsequently lavished on both him and his confederates make this conclusion even more certain. Shōyō had, after all, expounded in Shōsetsu shinzui the principles he thought essential for the development of fiction in Japan, and now he was expressing confidence in their literary prospects. Furthermore, several sections of Kōyō's own preface to Irozange suggest that Kōyō had begun to give consideration to some specific

4 Ninin bikuni: Irozange, p. A4. The prefaces are paginated separately from the rest of the book, and I have used the letter A before a page reference to the prefatory section of the book. No subsequent edition of Irozange contains all the prefaces, with the exception of the facsimile of the first edition published by the Kindai Bungaku Kan in 1973.

points that Shōyō had made. In one place he insists that he is as capable of writing tragic as comic fiction, and then continues:

> And I'm not the only one. England's Shakespeare was neither a demon nor a deity, but at a stroke he could depict ninjō and setai of every conceivable kind and could write with tears of laughter, so I hear.[5]

Several lines further on he wrote with more humility, but at the same time with such exaggeration as to raise doubts about his sincerity:

> Naturally I believe that my ability and learning are too poor to enable me to depict the wondrous variety of ninjō even to the most infinitesimal degree.[6]

And in the explanatory 'Sakusha iwaku' passage that follows his preface, Kōyō stated that the shugan (focus, or main point) of Irozange was to be tears.[7] Given the stress that Shōyō laid on the concept of ninjō in Shōsetsu shinzui and his concern to bring home to writers what the shugan of a novel should be, it is worth considering the meaning of ninjō as Shōyō used it and trying to understand what Kōyō may have made of it.

In the section of Shōsetsu shinzui titled 'Shōsetsu no shugan' Shōyō put forward his view that the primary concern of the novel was to depict ninjō and not to illustrate a didactic message. The section starts with the following words, which are as near as he gets to a definition of ninjō.

5 Irozange, pp. A8-9.
6 Ibid., p. A10.
7 Ibid., p. A11.

> The essence of the novel is ninjō, and after that comes setai and fūzoku. What do I mean by ninjō? Well, ninjō is the human passions, the so-called one hundred and eight lusts.[8]

Its importance for the novel lay in the fact that "[a book] which has set out to depict ninjō but has only depicted its surface cannot be called a true novel".[9] Shōyō went on to advocate a psychologist's attitude towards the portrayal of character in fiction. He used Bakin's Hakkenden to illustrate the psychologically unsound characters that he thought necessarily resulted from a didactic framework, and argued that character should be depicted just as it is found in real life.

> A novel always bases its entire self on imitation (mogi); it imitates ninjō and it imitates setai, striving earnestly to bring the imitation close to the truth.[10]

Since novelists are attempting to capture "truth" in their work, he argued, they must not flinch from depicting the ugly or unattractive; yet, he reminded his reader, a novel is a work of art and so it must not sink to the level of the lewd or vulgar.

Shōyō was evidently not thinking of ninjō solely in terms of psychology. His definition of it as "ningen no jōyoku" (the human passions) makes this obvious. In an earlier version of 'Shōsetsu no shugan', which appeared in the newspaper Jiyū no tomoshibi in 1885 as 'Shōsetsuron no ippan - shōsetsu no shugan', Shōyō

8 Shōsetsu shinzui, pp. 68-69.
9 Ibid., p. 70.
10 Ibid., p. 73.

glossed the same word jōyoku with an approximation in katakana to the English word 'passion'; and in his Tōsei shosei katagi, jōyoku appeared with the word 'sex' spelt out in katakana beside it.[11] Thus Shōyō did not intend ninjō to stand only for psychology. In addition, he made no attempt to distinguish his use of ninjō from the literary connotations it had acquired in the previous sixty years. Ninjō was not alone in this respect, for terms such as goraku, fūryū, ugachi and hyōbanki appear in Shōsetsu shinzui without any attempt to dissociate them from the implications they had acquired in connection with various genres of Tokugawa fiction.

At the close of the Tokugawa period, the most explicit link between literature and ninjō was embodied in the ninjōbon. Several ninjōbon writers, including Tamenaga Shunsui, sought to express their understanding of ninjō, and what they had to say affords some insight into the connotations of the word in the middle of the nineteenth-century. Possibly the most well-known of these passages is to be found in Shunsui's preface to his Shungyō hachiman gane.

> What does this ninjō mean? It does not refer to the paths of love alone. We can only say that a man has truly understood ninjō if he declines to ridicule the constant foolish laments of men and women, their momentary anxieties, and all the troubles of ordinary people in the world, and if he sincerely appreciates the sadness of it all through becoming close and familiar with those people he happens to like. If you do not do me the favour of reading this poor work of mine in such a frame of mind, you will probably not be able to come to grips with it.[12]

11 See Ochi Haruo, 'Shōsetsu shinzui no botai', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XXXIII, No 2 (1956), p. 32.

12 Yamaguchi Takeshi, 'Ninjōbonshū kaisetsu', in Nihon meicho zenshū Edo bungei no bu 15 (1928), quotes this passage on p. 89 and on the following pages discusses the issue at length.

Here Shunsui seems to have been trying to suggest that he understood by ninjō something akin to the whole gamut of human emotions. Yamaguchi has argued, however, that such an understanding did not inform any of Shunsui's ninjōbon and that in practice Shunsui cared little for ninjō in any sense other than ren'ai (love). Shunsui's pretensions to the contrary, he maintains, were merely an attempt to forestall critics who might charge that his writings were immoral.[13] It is, of course, true that Shunsui's ninjōbon tend to revolve around the progress of several concurrent love-affairs, but in his defence it must be said that within the framework of his romantic plots 'laments' and 'anxieties' do have quite a conspicuous part to play. Fūgetsu kajō: Harutsugedori, which Shunsui wrote at about the same time as the passage quoted above, contains a number of passages in which grief and distress are prominent, notably in the scenes depicting the fragile relationship between Chōga and the courtesan Usugumo.[14] And in the opening chapter of his most celebrated work, Shunshoku Umegoyomi, Shunsui depicted the loneliness of Tanjirō with considerable pathos: Tanjirō has been forced by circumstances beyond his control to avoid the public eye for a while and is nursing himself through an illness in a broken-down hovel.[15] On balance, the evidence suggests that it

13 Yamaguchi, 'Ninjōbon shū kaisetsu', p. 91. Shunsui had good reason to fear such criticism. In 1841 he was arraigned on a charge of obscenity and sentenced to a period of house-arrest in handcuffs. See Kyokutei Bakin, Chosakudō zakki, in Kyokutei ikō (Kokusho kankōkai, 1911), pp. 476 and 511.

14 Harutsugedori was first published in five volumes in 1837. See for example the edition contained in Nihon koten bungaku zenshū, vol. 47 (Shōgakkan, 1971), pp. 525-531.

15 Shunshoku Umegoyomi, edited by Nakamura Yukihiko (NKBT 64), pp. 47-55.

is misleading to accuse Shunsui of hypocrisy and that Shunsui was at least sincere in this respect.

Shōtei Kinsui (1795-1862), Shunsui's leading disciple, seems to have had a similar understanding of ninjō. He wrote as follows in the preface to the third volume of his Shunshoku: Yodo no Akebono.

> Why are ninjōbon so called? Every single book, Japanese or Chinese, ancient or modern, even the precious canons of holy scripture and the biographies of the sages, all are based on ninjō. Discard ninjō and what would you have left? Here I would like to suggest that it would be possible to refer to all books as ukiyozōshi.[16]

Kinsui's choice of words here makes it certain that he interpreted ninjō as the emotions. Later in the same preface he made it clear that he was not using the word ukiyo in the 'floating world' sense that has been seen as the hallmark of the Genroku period. He intended instead the 'sorrowful world' sense and so the word ukiyozōshi in the passage above refers not to the ukiyozōshi of Ihara Saikaku (1642-1693) and his successors but, as Yamaguchi put it, to a concept approximating to "namida no bungaku" (the literature of tears).[17] In other words, Kinsui's idea of ninjō was principally concerned with the darker emotions.

While Kinsui drew tragic rather than romantic implications from ninjō, another follower of Shunsui, Tamenaga Shunga, had a more exclusively psychological understanding of the word. In the preface to the second volume of his Rogetsu kien: Imosedori

16 Quoted in Yamaguchi, pp. 89-90. The work is of uncertain date.
17 Yamaguchi, 'Ninjōbon shū kaisetsu', p. 90.

he wrote:

> Ninjō permeates the ways of the world. This little book has been written after carefully searching for the innermost heart of men . . .[18]

If the ninjō of the ninjōbon stood for the human emotions as well as for passion or romantic love, it differed little from the ninjō Shōyō stressed in Shōsetsu shinzui, for, as we have seen, Shōyō's ninjō included both of these elements. That Shōyō did not reject the close association between ninjō and romantic love is evident from the preface to his Shin migaki: Imotosekagami, where he wrote:

> Novels concentrate on ninjō. Ninjō is most acute in love . . . For ardent love, it is hard to find anything better than the love between a man and a woman.[19]

Furthermore, Shōyō was not the first to insist on the importance of ninjō and setai. One of the first ninjōbon, Shunsui's Akegarasu nochi no masayume, contained an announcement in the preface to the effect that the author would "pursue ninjō-setai to the depths".[20] It is worth noting that Akegarasu nochi no masayume was reprinted in March 1886, just one month after Shōsetsu shinzui was first published in book form.[21]

18 Quoted in Mutō Motoaki, 'Shunsui igo', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVIII, No 10 (1971), p. 147. Imosedori was first published in two volumes towards the end of the Tempō era (1830-1844).

19 Imotosekagami, fascicle one (December 1885), unpaginated prefatory pages. The work was published in twelve fascicles between December 1885 and September 1886.

20 Quoted in Hiraoka Toshio, Nihon kindai bungaku no shuppatsu, (Kinokuniya shoten, 1973), p. 16.

21 Ibid., pp. 15-16.

Shōyō's understanding of ninjō and the kind of novel he thought best suited to express it have so much in common with the ninjōbon that it is as well to consider his opinion of the genre. At the end of the 'Shōsetsu no shurui' section of Shōsetsu shinzui, he cited Tamenaga Shunsui's ninjōbon as his first example of what he termed gensei monogatari (contemporary tales) and pointed out that they depicted lower-class society more often than they depicted upper-class.[22] Under the same head he referred by name to two ninjōbon by Shōtei Kinsui and Murasaki Shikibu's Genji monogatari, and it appears that he approved of these works to the extent that they depicted contemporary society just as they found it. Later, in the 'Shōsetsu no hieki' section, he argued that sensual passages, such as those that were to be found in ninjōbon, had no place in a true novel.[23] This seems to have been his main criticism of the genre. He was eager for the novel to gain the respect of scholars and intellectuals, as he made transparently clear, and so he felt it appropriate to deplore those aspects of fiction that had in the past aroused their contempt and critical slights.

On the question of style in the section 'Buntairon', he opined that Shunsui's colloquial style was suitable for works with a contemporary setting, but only for the dialogue. At the same time he felt that Shōtei Kinsui's use of the gabuntai (elegant style) for the narrative created too great a gulf between narrative and dialogue.[24] In the section 'Shōsetsu

22 Shōsetsu shinzui, p. 82.
23 Ibid., p. 88.
24 Ibid., pp. 107-111.

kyakushoku no hossoku', he argued that the main difference between the novels of Bulwer Lytton and the ninjōbon of the Tamenaga school was the preoccupation in the latter with sensual particulars.[25] He went on to cite Kyoku Sanjin's (?-1836) celebrated ninjōbon, Kosan Kingorō: Kana majiri musume setsuyō, as the most well-known example of a successfully constructed hiai shōsetsu (tragic novel). He wrote that "the final scene, for example, is very quietly narrated but for that reason it is even more full of pathos".[26] His unmistakable approval and his reference to its fame are worth noting, for Kōyō had a similarly high opinion of Musume setsuyō, as we shall see shortly.

The last important reference to ninjōbon in Shōsetsu shinzui comes in 'Shujinkō no setchi', the penultimate section, in which Shōyō drew a distinction between 'real' and 'ideal' characters. The latter, he said, were based on an ideal derived either from the values of the past or from the author's own values.[27] He did not believe the ideal type was necessarily bad, particularly when in the right hands, but since he defined a real character as one that was fictional but based on the range of human personalities encountered in everyday life, it would have been against all that he had said so far for him to have preferred the ideal type. He gave only two examples of 'real' characters, Tanjirō from Shunsui's Shunshoku Umegoyomi and the hero of Genji monogatari, and he expressed his approval by saying that they

25 Shōsetsu shinzui, p. 137.
26 Ibid., p. 140.
27 Ibid., p. 157.

were representative of the contemporaries of their authors.[28]

To sum up, Shōyō disapproved of the sensuality he found in ninjōbon.[29] On the other hand, he applauded the faithfulness with which their authors depicted the society in which they lived. And for all his criticisms of Shunsui, Shōyō did feel that none of the novels produced by the shōsetsu kairyō movement portrayed ninjō as well as Shunsui's ninjōbon.[30] Shōyō was primarily concerned to protect Shunsui's reputation as a writer. He agreed that there was much sensuality in Shunsui's ninjōbon, but he was at pains to point out that the worth of a novel is not determined by the morality of its contents but by the conception (ishō) that lies behind it, and he argued that in some respects Samuel Richardson was Shunsui's inferior.[31] It seems from this, then, that Shōyō was prepared to defend ninjōbon because they appeared to him to be the closest of all the genres of Tokugawa fiction to what he demanded of the novel.

It was against this background that Kōyō chose to mention ninjō and ninjō setai in his preface to Irozange. These words had an important part to play in Shōyō's arguments and Kōyō cannot have been unaware of this at the time he wrote the preface.[32] Kōyō evidently accepted the importance of ninjō but, as we shall

28 Shōsetsu shinzui, p. 159.
29 Only Shunsui's works can fairly support such a charge. After the reforms of the Tenpō era ninjōbon writers were careful to avoid anything that might give rise to a charge of obscenity. See Okitsu Kaname, Tenkanki no bungaku (Waseda Daigaku shuppanbu, 1960), pp. 5-9.
30 'Haishika ryakuden tomo ni hihyō', in Yoshida Seiichi et al., editors, Kindai bungaku hyōron taikei, ten volumes (Kadokawa shoten, 1971-1975), I, 417. This originally appeared in Chūō gakujutsu zasshi, No 21 (January 1886).
31 'Tamenaga Shunsui no hihyō', Yoshida et al., Kindai bungaku hyōron taikei, I, 418-423. This originally appeared in Chūō gakujutsu zasshi, Nos 22-25, February to March 1886.
32 The preface is dated February 1889. Irozange, p. A10.

now see, his understanding of the word differed slightly from that of Shōyō.

In March 1889, one month before the publication of Irozange, the editor of Kokumin no tomo, Tokutomi Sohō (1863-1957), sent out a questionnaire to a number of prominent writers, scholars and thinkers asking them to list the ten books they enjoyed reading most. The responses appeared in three successive issues of the magazine, but only two of those who replied mentioned a ninjōbon. It was the same work in each case, Kyoku Sanjin's Musume setsuyō, which Shōyō had praised as a specimen of the hiai shōsetsu. One of the two was Kōyō, and he retained a life-long interest in the work, for in 1903, the year of his death, he prepared an edition of Musume setsuyō for publication.[33] Musume setsuyō was a popular work around the turn of the third decade of the Meiji period. At least eleven different reprints of the work were issued between 1886 and 1889, more than half of them in the year 1887 alone.[34] And in 1889 the critic Uchida Roan referred to Musume setsuyō as one of the four great books of Japan and accused Ishibashi Ningetsu of plagiarizing it in his novel Oyae.[35]

Musume setsuyō was first published between 1831 and 1834, and it concentrates on the close relationship between Kingorō and

33 Tokutomi Sohō, ed., 'Shomoku jisshu', Kokumin no tomo, No 48 (22 April 1889), p. 637. The other was Miura Moriharu in ibid., No 49 (2 May 1889), p. 684. Kōyō's edition of Musume setsuyō appeared as the fourth volume of the Shūchin meicho bunko series in May 1903. It has been suggested that Kōyō did little of the editorial work himself: see Tosa Tōru, 'Konjiki yasha no sōbō - zenpen to ninjōbon Musume setsuyō', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVI, No 12 (1969), pp. 42-43.

34 See Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan zō: Meiji ki kankō tosho mokuroku, six vols (Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan, 1971-1976), IV, 463 and 477.

35 Tosa Tōru, 'Konjiki yasha no sōbō', pp. 38-42.

Kosan, his sister by adoption. Kingorō's father has long since been disinherited on account of the hasty elopement that led to the birth of his son, but Kingorō himself is adopted back into the main family once he becomes of age. He moves in with his uncle, who expects him to marry his daughter, Oyuki. The difficulties mount as Kingorō tries to remain a filial adoptive son while at the same time looking after Kosan and the young son she has given birth to in the meantime. The problem is resolved when Kosan kills herself in order to ease matters for Kingorō and their son.

The story has several points in common with Irozange and coincides with certain tragic and biographical tendencies in the late ninjōbon published in the 1850s and the 1860s. The most extreme example of these late ninjōbon is without doubt Kakutei Shūga's Shiraito mondo: Ayamegusa, at the end of which all three main characters kill themselves.[36] The popularity Musume setsuyō enjoyed in the early Meiji period compares well with that enjoyed even by Shunsui's more famous ninjōbon and this can be attributed to two related factors.[37] In the first place, Musume setsuyō lacks the sensual scenes that both Bakin and Shōyō found objectionable in Shunsui's ninjōbon. In the case of one of the reprints of Musume setsuyō, the editor gave the lack of such scenes as a compelling reason for issuing the reprint.[38] Secondly, Shunsui's ninjōbon commonly ended on an auspicious and contrived

36 Ayamegusa was published from 1858 to 1859. See Mutō Motoaki, 'Shunsui igo', pp. 149-150.

37 I have come across only six reprints of Shunshoku Umegoyomi dating from the years 1886 to 1889. See Meiji ki kankō tosho mokuroku, IV, 456-479.

38 'Honkoku Musume setsuyō jo', in Musume setsuyō, fourth printing (Shunyōdō, 1886), pp. 1-4. This reprint was first published in 1882.

note. Musume setsuyō, by contrast, substitutes a tragic ending for one that can only be happy by contrived means.

It is probable that it was these same features that attracted Kōyō's attention to the work. In the very short introduction he wrote to his edition of Musume setsuyō he said that it "cannot be ranked together with the lewd sensuality and filth of other ninjōbon".[39] And just as Shōyō had described Musume setsuyō as a hiai shōsetsu, so Kōyō described Irozange as a "jidaimono no hiai shōsetsu" (tragic novel set in the past).[40]

Kōyō made these connections between ninjō and the tragic more explicit in the 'Sakusha iwaku' passage that follows the preface of Irozange. The first item under the 'Sakusha iwaku' heading states that "kono shōsetsu wa namida o shugan to su" (this novel is primarily concerned with tears).[41] From the wording it seems likely that Kōyō had consciously chosen to adapt Shōyō's argument linking the shugan of a novel with ninjō. As we have seen, namida or tragic overtones were important to the concept of ninjō held by the ninjōbon writers who followed Shunsui and avoided the sensuality that characterized his works. Kōyō's faith in ninjō as an important aspect of the novel certainly owed a lot to Shōyō and like Shōyō he derived his understanding of ninjō from the ninjōbon. Nevertheless, that understanding differed from Shōyō's in that it inclined towards the tragic and this was epitomized by the word namida. This is apparent from other works

39 Ozaki Kōyō, ed., Musume setsuyō, Shūchin meicho bunko No 4 (Fuzanbō, 1903), unnumbered page preceding text.
40 Advertisement in Garakuta bunko, No 16 (16 February 1889), p. 386.
41 Irozange, p. All.

he wrote at about the same time as well as from Irozange. Tears and weeping figure prominently both in Irozange and in Namu Amida Butsu, which he wrote the same year.[42]

Kōyō accepted the importance of ninjō and developed his own interpretation of it, but how did he put it into practice? In order to answer this question it is necessary to look at Irozange more closely and to consider its relationship with the sources on which it is said to have been based.

The plot is a simple one, albeit with some hidden complications. In the first section an itinerant nun comes across a shack deep in the mountains and asks the nun who lives there for shelter. During the night she wakes up and learns from an old letter used to patch up a paper mosquito screen that her host had once been married: the letter is from her husband and in it he says that he is about to leave for battle fully expecting to be killed. In the morning she hears the full story of the husband's death and his widow's decision to take the tonsure. Then, at her host's request, she undertakes to tell her own story. By the end of this first section Kōyō has already given the reader a hint of what is to happen, for the visitor noticed when reading the letter that the script closely resembled the hand of a certain Koshirō, about whom the reader is told no more. The remainder of the book, with the exception of the last few lines, consists of what is supposed to be the visitor's story. It is, however, not told from her point of view and there is much in it she could not have known. Thus the second section opens

42 Matsushita Munehiko, 'Kōyō no "namida"', Seishin Joshi Daigaku ronsō, No 4 (March 1954), pp. 76-90. As Matsushita has pointed out, namida have a prominent part to play in Kōyō's later works as well, especially Tajō takon and Konjiki yasha.

with a young soldier, who is not identified for the reader, lying wounded on a snow-covered battlefield. A man he addresses as 'uncle' and who is on the opposing side comes upon him by chance and persuades him not to kill himself but to return home with him and recover. It appears that the warrior, Koshirō, is an orphan and that this 'uncle' raised him from childhood. Koshirō was to have married the man's daughter Yoshino, but when war broke out Koshirō was already a liegeman and found himself on the opposite side to that of his 'uncle'. His feudal lord required him to prove his loyalty by marrying not Yoshino but Wakaba, a lady-in-waiting whose love for Koshirō has been no secret to their lord. In the third section Koshirō is recovering from his injuries in his old adoptive home. Yoshino is resentful and says that Koshirō has betrayed her love. Koshirō tries to argue that his feudal obligations left him with no choice, but he does not convince her and seems to be barely convinced himself. In the final section Koshirō thinks over his discussion with Yoshino and then kills himself. The last two lines of the book merely give the two nuns the opportunity to show that they realise they both loved the same man: the owner of the shack is Wakaba and the nun who visits her is Yoshino.

All of Kōyō's previous works had at least been nominally set in the Meiji period, with the exception of Ikari no hachimaki, and had dealt with aspects of contemporary city life. And for the most part his writing had been based exclusively on the literature of the Bunka-Bunsei period (1804-1830) and the Tenpō era that followed it. Irozange was at least superficially different and as a result the question of Kōyō's sources has been a matter of

interest to commentators since the year the work appeared.

In the first of his two reviews of Irozange, Ishibashi Ningetsu remarked upon the similarity between Kōyō's work and Sannin hōshi monogatari, a sixteenth-century otogizōshi more commonly known as Sannin hōshi.[43] As the title suggests, Sannin hōshi is a tale of three monks. By turns, they tell of the circumstances that led each to turn to religion, and the stories of the first two monks bear an unmistakable likeness to parts of Irozange. The first monk recounts the sad story of the death of his wife at the hands of a brigand. The second reveals that he was the brigand, and adds that he took the dead woman's clothes home to his wife, who fled in horror once she realised what he had done. The second monk thereupon asks the first to kill him, but the latter refuses to comply and declares that his wife must have been a divine messenger sent to bring both of them to salvation. As Ishibashi Ningetsu pointed out, there are a number of specific points of similarity between this work and Irozange. The marriages of both the first monk and of Wakaba are brought to an untimely end by death; in Sannin hōshi two monks meet and while talking learn that the death of the same woman led both to take religious orders, while in Irozange it is two nuns who meet, and they learn that the death of the same man led both to take the tonsure. So the sexual roles are simply reversed. Ningetsu was right to wonder if Kōyō had made use of this work, but it does not seem to have been the only source Kōyō drew upon.

43 Ishibashi Ningetsu, 'Shincho hyakushu no Irozange', Kokumin no tomo, No 48 (22 April 1889), p. 36.

Several years later Kōyō touched upon the subject of his sources in a published conversation with Ihara Seiseien and Gotō Chūgai. Asked about the background to Irozange, he stated that he had come across a passage in a book describing the death of a soldier on a snowy battlefield and had resolved to weave a romantic plot around such a scene. The work in question, he said, was "Shinchōki or some such thing".[44] This Shinchōki is an historical account of matters relating to Oda Nobunaga: it contains no scene similar to that described by Kōyō, but it does contain, as Oka Yasuo has pointed out, a short passage that suggests Kōyō's memory was not at fault.[45] The passage briefly recounts the heroism of a youth named Koshirō: he used his "2 shaku 5 sun Sanjō Yoshinori [sword]" to cut down several enemy soldiers threatening the life of his lord, and then he made a cut in his belly in the shape of a cross and so brought his own death. The circumstances are different from those of Koshirō's death in Irozange, but their names are identical, and the sword that Koshirō wields in Irozange is a "2 shaku 8 sun Yoshinori".[46]

A further source Kōyō may have used is an early seventeenth-century kanazōshi called Ninin bikuni, the title of which appears as the tsunogaki (subsidiary title) of Irozange. This was written by Suzuki Shōsan, a former samurai turned priest, and it seems

44 Ihara Seiseien and Gotō Chūgai, Dagyokushū (Shunyōdō, 1906), p. 26. The conversation first appeared in print in Shincho gekkan, Nos 3 and 4 (July 1897).
45 Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū, pp. 24-25.
46 Irozange, p. 31.

from the many editions it went through in the seventeenth-century that it remained popular long after 1640, when it is thought to have been first published.[47] Ninin bikuni is a pessimistic work that was evidently intended to give the reader some religious insight into life. It relates the spiritual awakening of a young woman who has lost her husband in battle. She lives for a while with another war-widow, but then her companion dies and is left by the sexton to decay in the open. She takes the tonsure and as an itinerant nun comes across the dwelling of another nun, and the two discuss together the evanescent quality of life. There are two points that this work has in common with Irozange. In both a war-widow seeks the consolation of religion and takes to the life of a nun. And in both the meeting of two nuns leads to reflections on their past lives.

There are, therefore, areas of similarity between Irozange and each of these three works, and the likelihood is that Kōyō consulted them. But Kōyō's researches did not stop there. Maruoka Kyūka later recalled that he had often visited Kōyō while Irozange was in progress and that Kōyō had "read as extensively as he could among detailed reference books, not to mention familiar and obvious things like Heike monogatari and Hōjōki".[48] It is, therefore, not a difficult task to multiply the parallels and detect, for example, a resemblance in Irozange to the Giō chapter of Heike monogatari. In both two women who have loved the same man take the tonsure and spend the rest of their lives together.[49]

47 See Richard Lane, 'The Beginnings of the Modern Japanese Novel: Kanazōshi, 1600-1682', Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 20 (1957), pp. 644-701.
48 Quoted in Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū, p.28-29.
49 Matsushita Munehiko, 'Kōyō no "namida"', p. 77.

It is important not so much to assess the precise debt of Kōyō to each of these works as to recognize the fact that he had turned back to an age of warring and Buddhist fatalism, at least in some of the externals. I shall return to this issue later and the significance of Kōyō's choice of an historical subject, and consider now what lay behind those externals.

Even in his enthusiastic first review, Ishibashi Ningetsu found points to criticize. He observed for example, that it was odd for the two nuns to swear sisterhood to each other in the first section when they do not yet know of the link that will bind them together. In his second review he took Kōyō to task for the final part of Irozange. Just before he kills himself, Koshirō recalls his parting from Wakaba when he set out for battle, and Ishibashi justly reproves Kōyō for including details of which Koshirō could not possibly have known, such as Wakaba's words and behaviour once he had vanished from the skyline. There is nothing to indicate that the narrative at this point is intended to show how Koshirō imagined the scene rather than what is actually supposed to have happened. The absurdity provoked Ishibashi, but he missed the point when he recommended that these details should have been included in the first section when Wakaba herself tells Yoshino of Koshirō's departure. [50] The last three sections of Irozange were intended to represent Yoshino's narrative: so much is clear from what immediately precedes it and from the few lines that follow at the end. Yet in those three sections Koshirō, and not Yoshino, is the central figure: Kōyō has constructed a

50 See Ishibashi Ningetsu, 'Shincho hyakushu no Irozange', Kokumin no tomo, Nos 48 (22 April 1889), pp. 35-36, and 49 (2 May 1889), pp. 38-39.

narrative that conflicts with what we know to be the limits of Yoshino's knowledge.

So it was not just that Kōyō was oblivious to minor inconsistencies. Rather, he presents as Yoshino's narrative something that is clearly quite different. Shōyō had done much the same sort of thing in Tōsei shosei katagi, and Kōyō certainly had a reason for constructing Irozange in this way.[51] His use of an omniscient narrator instead of Yoshino for the last three sections afforded him the possibility of bringing to the reader's attention the thoughts and behaviour of both Yoshino and Koshirō. This he could not otherwise have done without radically departing from the structure of the plot as it now stands. If Kōyō's main interest had lain in the coincidental meeting of the two nuns and their discovery of the love they have in common, then Yoshino's own account of her past would have sufficed by itself, and Irozange would have had much more in common with Ninin bikuni and the other works mentioned above than it actually has. But Kōyō's interest lay elsewhere, in the dilemma confronting Koshirō and its consequences, and that is why he needed a narrator who could give the reader some insight into Koshirō's mind, which Yoshino could not do.

Let us look for a moment at the nature of Koshirō's dilemma as it is presented in Irozange. Koshirō is torn between giri, the

51 In chapters four and five of Tōsei shosei katagi, Sanji is supposed to be relating to his friend Moriyama Tomoyoshi the history of the Komachidas' connection with Tanoji, but Shōyō substituted a narrative account instead. See Marleigh Ryan, The Development of Realism in the Fiction of Tsubouchi Shōyō (University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1975), p. 38.

obligation he has to his acknowledged lord to demonstrate his loyalty and obedience by marrying Wakaba, and ninjō, the human feeling that ties him by choice to his foster parents and to their daughter Yoshino. There is also the giri he has to his foster parents to repay them for their years of kindness to him. This is how Koshirō himself sees the dilemma that confronted him, as is clear from the following passage in which he looks back on what happened.

> Yoshino. The name reminded him of his intended bride with her childish hair long and parted, of the intimate friend of his childhood. And 'uncle' and 'aunt' were her parents, who had bestowed on him hidden depths of kindness. Could he forget this giri just because he was in a difficult situation he had not expected? . . . When he went off to battle not very long ago, he had had two aims. The first was to repay the kindness of his lord. As for the second . . It was an order from his lord that had made him marry Wakaba, and he had had no escape, in spite of the kindness of Tōyama and his wife and in spite of the agreement that Yoshino was to be his wife. He only needed to be married to Wakaba for half a day in order not to disobey the order he had been given or hurt her feelings. So he thought he would abandon his life as an apology to Tōyama and his wife, and to his unmarried wife Yoshino.[52]

Such conflicts as these were a recurrent theme in Tokugawa fiction, but they were foreign to the three works on which Irozange seems to have been based. They made their first appearance in some of Saikaku's works, often in an homosexual context, and were a marked characteristic of the domestic plays of Chikamatsu Monzaemon (1653-1725).

The works of Saikaku were attracting Kōyō's attention at this

52 Irozange, pp. 73-74.

time, as will be seen in the following chapter, and it may be that Kōyō's interest in the giri-ninjō conflict derived at least in part from Saikaku. It is difficult, however, to detect any other similarities between any of Saikaku's works and Irozange. The ninjōbon Musume setsuyō, on the other hand, contains several such similarities in addition to the giri-ninjō conflict, which is common to both works. Both Koshirō in Irozange and Kingorō in Musume setsuyō are of samurai birth and obliged by duties beyond their control to forsake the girls to whom they have been informally betrothed since childhood. The marriage dutifully contracted is in both cases a socially desirable one: it demonstrates Koshirō's loyalty and preserves his social position, and it restores the unity of Kingorō's family as well as ensuring its continuity. Neither questions the propriety of the obligation under which he labours, nor does he at any time seriously contemplate the alternative course of action. Unlike the characters who people Saikaku's Kōshoku gonin onna and others of his ukiyozōshi, or Chikamatsu's sewamono, Koshirō and Kingorō choose not to follow ninjō and opt instead for the socially safer, if personally less satisfying, course open to them. Kingorō does not hesitate to obey his father: he leaves home to be adopted into his uncle's household and eventually to marry his cousin. Similarly, Koshirō obeys his orders and marries Wakaba.

It goes without saying that there are differences between the two works. Kōyō, as we have seen, was more interested in Koshirō's plight, whilst Kyoku Sanjin stressed the nobility of Kosan's decision to sacrifice her life for her lover and his

family. A reason for this difference lay in the readership commonly anticipated for ninjōbon. With few exceptions, if any, ninjōbon writers presupposed an audience composed mainly of young women. This is clear from casual remarks encountered throughout the genre.[53] This was particularly so in the case of Kyoku Sanjin, and in addition his works had didactic undertones.[54] So it was to be expected that he would concentrate on Kosan and add a moral twist to the story, while Kōyō's preface shows that he expected a different kind of reader.[55]

Irozange, Kōyō had stated, was to be "primarily concerned with tears", and this is manifested in his story of foundering love, a theme to be found in Musume setsuyō and later ninjōbon but not in those of the Tamenaga school. Tragic love in one form or another appears in most of Kōyō's works and is particularly strong in the works he wrote around this time. In Namu Amida Butsu a dying girl, cruelly ignored by her family, falls in love with her nurse's nephew after corresponding with him for several weeks, but she dies before they have a chance to meet. Nenge mishō tells of a junior government official who becomes infatuated with a woman he passes every day on his way to work. By the time he has summoned up enough courage to address her, she has already agreed to marry someone else: she was attracted by the young official, but mistakenly assumed that he was already married when she saw him with his sister. And in Uzumagawa, the hesitant but growing intimacy of a traveller and the daughter of an

53 See for example Tamenaga Shunsui's Harutsugedori, chapter fifteen and the preface to volume four (preceding chapter nineteen).

54 This is evident from the titles of his few other works, amongst which are Ninjō sono mama: Onna daigaku (1830) and Musume Taiheiki misao no hayabiki (1837).

55 Irozange, pp. A10-A12.

innkeeper is destroyed by her suicide: in a note she reveals that she has had sexual intercourse once before and on that occasion caught an "abominable illness".[56] In each case something stands in the way to prevent the fulfilment of romantic wishes and so to play the same role as Koshirō's feudal obligations in Irozange. So too 'namida' figures in each of these works, particularly the first.[57]

It is undeniable that Irozange, Namu Amida Butsu, Nenge mishō and Uzumagawa have a great deal in common with the tragic ninjōbon published towards the end of the Tokugawa period and with the earlier Musume setsuyō. On the other hand, these works diverge from the normal practices of almost all ninjōbon in three important respects. In the first place, neither Tamenaga Shunsui nor Kyoku Sanjin attempted to conceal the sexual relationships between their characters. Of the two, Kyoku Sanjin, along with many later ninjōbon writers, was more reticent about such matters, but it needs no more than Kosan's pregnancy to show that her relationship with Kingorō is not just a platonic one. The sensual scenes Shōyō criticised in Shunsui's ninjōbon are quite without trace in Kōyō's works, and so is any suggestion that a sexual relationship exists between, for example, Koshirō and Yoshino. This may or may not reflect Kōyō's personal moral scruples, but it certainly harmonizes with Shōyō's concern in Shōsetsu shinzui for the moral quality of fiction, which he hoped would make fiction a more acceptable literary form to intellect-

56 These works first appeared in Hyakkaen, Nos 1-4 (May to June 1889), Kokumin no tomo, No 69, supplement (3 January 1890), and Shincho hyakushu, unnumbered volume (December 1890), respectively.

57 In his review in Kokumin no tomo, No 71 (23 January 1890), pp. 38-39, Ishibashi Ningetsu described Namu Amida Butsu as a "namida shōsetsu", so his contemporaries evidently saw his works in this light too.

uals.[58]

The second point concerns the depiction of character in fiction, which we have already touched upon in the case of Kyō ningyō. In his second review of Irozange Ishibashi Ningetsu criticised Kōyō's representation of ninjō and linked this with what he described as the low quality of the characterization. In spite of the title Kōyō had given the work, he argued, it was in effect the tale of just one nun, for Wakaba and Yoshino were different in name alone. Kōyō had failed to understand the principle that characters in a novel had to exist independently of the requirements of the plot.[59] This is fair criticism, for it is true that there is little to distinguish the nuns from each other. The importance of Yoshino and Wakaba lies in the simple fact that there are two of them, which forces Koshirō to make a choice, rather than in their personalities, which are irrelevant to his choice.

Be that as it may, Kōyō relies far less on dialogue in Irozange than he did in his previous works, and this distinguished the work from ninjōbon of all types. He also eliminated the secondary characters whose function in Kyō ningyō and much of late Tokugawa fiction was to draw out the thoughts and feelings of the main characters in conversation. To compensate for this he devoted more attention to revealing the thoughts of his characters by other means, with which he had experimented in Kyō ningyō. This is particularly apparent in the final section, in which Koshirō is alone with his resolve to kill himself. But

58 Shōsetsu shinzui, p. 138.
59 'Shincho hyakushu no Irozange', Kokumin no tomo, No 49, pp. 38-39.

even in the first section Kōyō tried to represent the states of mind of the two nuns. He did so in a form that is close to the interior monologue, but he wove it into the narrative. There is no clear distinction between the first and the third person, but from the wording it is clear that Kōyō was attempting to represent thoughts directly rather than obliquely through the mouth of the narrator. The first instance occurs just after the nuns have met and Wakaba has offered Yoshino shelter for the night.

> The visitor hurriedly approached the verandah, untying her hat strings impatiently with her frozen fingers. She bathed her tired feet in the tepid water her host had offered her and took a seat by the hearth as she had been directed. They introduced themselves to each other and were soon drinking from bowls of bitter tea. To show her hospitality, the host built up the fire with twigs. She looked idly at the other's face, which was turned away from the flames of the blazing fire. If I was in the world as I used to be, how envious I would be of her beauty! Seeing her now, I can't believe that beauty is just an ornament on a stinking corpse. Is this what you get, then, when all the elements are put together properly? I'm twenty-one myself, so she must be about two years younger. What fine looks, what youthfulness![60]

What starts off in this extract as narrative merges barely perceptibly into a reflection of the first nun's thoughts as she looks at her visitor's face.

Kōyō's choice of an historical setting is the third point of difference. Shōyō had expressed no clear preference in Shōsetsu shinzui either for historical or contemporary novels. On the one hand he valued historical novels for the light they could throw on the unrecorded aspects of history and he defended

60 Irozange, p. 4.

them against the charge of falsehood.[61] On the other hand, he did suggest that it was better for writers to look to the society and age in which they lived.[62] He put this last recommendation into practice in his own published fiction, all of which he set in the Meiji period.

There were, however, factors which probably influenced Kōyō in the direction of the historical novel. It is a commonplace of Japanese history that the third decade of the Meiji period was marked by a widespread reaction against the westernization and rapid modernization of the preceding decades.[63] Signs of this were the founding of the Seikyōsha in 1888 and the publication of the magazine Nipponjin, the publication of such series as Nippon bungaku zensho and Nippon kagaku zensho, and perhaps also the appearance of such magazines as Edo kai zasshi. It is not unreasonable to associate Irozange with these trends, particularly because they seem to have had an effect on other writers as well. This was apparent in a vogue for historical novels that developed around this time. There were the popular historical novels of Yamada Bimyō; Aeba Kōson's Kachidoki, a historical novel published in the wood-block series Shinsaku jūniban no uchi in 1890; and the works of Tsukahara Jūshien (1848-1917) and others who later became best known for their historical novels.

It is probable that Bimyō's current literary activities and success exerted a particularly strong influence on Kōyō in this

61 Shōsetsu shinzui, pp. 91-92 and 148-153.
62 Ibid., p. 127.
63 For the literary aspect of this phenomenon, see Ikari Akira, Ken'yūsha no bungaku (Hanawa Shobō, 1961), pp. 13-16. For a study of the whole issue and the conflicting viewpoints that prevailed in Japan at the time, see Kenneth B. Pyle, The New Generation in Meiji Japan (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1969).

connection. While still a member of the Ken'yūsha, Bimyō had published a number of short stories in various magazines and newspapers. Musashino was the first of these that he completed and it was also the first of his works to attract the attention of the reading public.[64] It is evident from several references in the text that Musashino is set in 1357 when Nitta Yoshioki was killed by the Ashikaga: there are real historical events in the background but the plot and the characters are fictitious, albeit faithfully derived from the fourteenth-century.
It describes the deaths of two warriors fighting for Nitta and the effects of their deaths on their family at home. The younger of the two, an orphan, is the adopted son of the older warrior and the husband of the latter's daughter. Musashino was included in Natsukodachi, a collection of Bimyō's shorter works which was published by the Kinkōdō in August 1888. The collection was highly praised and the anonymous reviewer writing for Jogaku zasshi declared that it was superior to Shōyō's Imotose kagami, Futabatei Shimei's Ukigumo and Ishibashi Ningetsu's Suteobune.[65] And in the second part of his rather confused review in Garakuta bunko, Kōyō averred that Musashino was the best of the works in the collection.[66]

Meanwhile, however, Bimyō had produced no more instalments of his novel Jōshijin since the fourth issue of Garakuta bunko, which had appeared on 25 July 1888. On the back page of the fifth issue (10 August 1888), he apologized for the lack of an

64 Uchida Roan, Meiji no sakka (Chikuma Shobō, 1941), p. 20. Musashino was first serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun in the supplements to the issues of 20 and 23 November and 6 December.
65 Jogaku zasshi, No 126 (8 September 1888), p. 129.
66 'Bimyōsai cho Natsukodachi no hyōban', Garakuta bunko, No 9 (10 October 1888), pp. 145-146.

instalment and claimed to be suffering from rheumatism. Similar excuses appeared in subsequent issues, but Kōyō was well aware that Bimyō was too busy with editorial work for Iratsume and with other journalistic activities to have time for Garakuta bunko. In October 1888, without a word to any of his Garakuta bunko colleagues, Bimyō joined the Kinkōdō to become the editor of its new magazine, Miyako no hana. He then let it be known that he wanted to leave the Ken'yūsha and in spite of an agreement to do so refused to send the remaining instalments of Jōshijin for serialization. According to Kōyō's recollections, both he and Shian felt that they had been betrayed by Bimyō and were incensed.[67] At any rate, from the thirteenth issue of Garakuta bunko (10 December 1888) Bimyō's name ceased to appear in its accustomed place inside the front cover as one of the three editors.

Between his break with the Ken'yūsha and the publication of Kōyō's Irozange in April 1889, Bimyō published several other works, including another historical novel, which served to make his name still more widely known. Thus Shōyō's preface to Irozange mentioned Bimyō as the most famous member of the Ken'yūsha.[68] Irozange was an opportunity for Kōyō to make his name in the literary world and to challenge the pre-eminence Bimyō had won for himself. Bimyō's historical novels had been a success, particularly Musashino, and so Kōyō turned back to the same age and wrote a novel with a similar kind of tragic

67 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', p. 64.
68 Irozange, p. A3.

theme.[69]

Nevertheless, Kōyō's version of the historical novel was quite different from that of Bimyō, as he made clear in the second of the explanatory passages under the 'Sakusha iwaku' heading after the preface in Irozange.

> No time is given or place fixed. There are few such novels in Japan. I have made the experiment because I am curious to see what kind of a flavour a work like this will have. If I have any critics, I can answer that it is the story of the lives of certain people, at a certain time, and in a certain place.[70]

These are puzzling remarks, although clearly coloured by the ambitious desire to experiment. Bimyō had chosen to depict fictitious characters in a specific historical setting: Kōyō chose to do without the specific historical setting. When Ishibashi Ningetsu took up the subject of Kōyō's historicism in the second of his reviews, it was not to the uncertainty of time or place that he objected but to Kōyō's incompetent use of material from several different eras. Ishibashi gave no examples of what he had in mind, but another reviewer complained that the description of the battle and the arms suggested the time was the end of the Ashikaga period, while Yoshino's make-up and hair-style in one of the illustrations were anachronistically modern.[71] The most obvious example, however, is the contradiction between the time of unrest in which Irozange

69 Kawazoe Kunimoto, 'Bimyō Kōyō no gunkiteki rekishishōsetsu', in Gunkimono to sono shūhen, essays in honour of Sasaki Hachirō (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1969), p. 778.
70 Irozange, p. All.
71 Kōjibashi Ichinin, 'Ninin bikuni irozange', p. 81.

is set and which can only precede the founding of the Tokugawa shogunate, and the giri-ninjō terms in which Koshirō's dilemma is posed and which derive from the literature of the early Tokugawa period.

In Shōsetsu shinzui Shōyō had warned writers of historical novels against making chronological discrepancies, factual errors and anachronisms, which, as he pointed out, were often to be found in Edo fiction.[72] Bimyō heeded the warning, but the extent to which Kōyō chose to ignore Bimyō's example and experiment is a measure of how little importance he attached to the historical nature of his setting and, conversely, of how much importance he attached to the confrontation between giri and ninjō and its aftermath. Many years later Kōyō recalled that with Irozange he had intended to write something romantic not historical. He explained that he had long since given up historical novels as a writer was now required to know all about the customs and manners of the age he was writing about and to avoid anachronisms. The implication is that this was not so at the time he wrote Irozange, or that he had thought it was not so.[73]

In spite of the criticism which Ishibashi Ningetsu and other critics had levelled against it, over ten thousand copies of Irozange had been sold before five months had passed and it was thought important enough to warrant critical notices in most newspapers and magazines.[74] Musashino had been a success too,

72 Shōsetsu shinzui, pp. 152-153.
73 Gotō and Ihara, Dagyokushū, p. 26.
74 The number of sales appears in an advertisement for the third impression in Iwaya Sazanami, Imosegai (Shincho hyakushu, No 4, 12 August 1889), p. 119. A selection of the reviews was reprinted in Aeba Kōson's Horidashimono (Shincho hyakushu No 2, 28 May 1889) on fifty-two separately paginated pages following p. 82 of the text.

so the reading public of the time was evidently ready for novels set in Japan's past in spite of the youth of the Meiji era and the changes it had seen. Perhaps this was a symptom of the reaction against modernization and westernization. At any rate, Bimyō's success with a story of war and sentimental tragedy drew Kōyō along the same path, but Kōyō developed his own idea of the namida-shōsetsu, which soon became a recognized genre in his hands. He appreciated the importance currently attached to ninjō, as his preface made clear, but he gave it tragic overtones and turned to the most well-known example of a tragic ninjōbon, Musume setsuyō, which suggested a combination of tears, sentimental tragedy and giri-ninjō. It was these factors that Kōyō was concerned with in Irozange, not history or religion.

So the general influence of ninjōbon remained strong. It was apparent in Kōyō's sentimental themes, where it may have been reinforced by such romantic western fiction as was known to Kōyō, in the narrator's reluctance to let the reader know of the relationships between the characters, and in the prominent use of coincidence. All these are to be found in Irozange. But his increasing interest in portraying the reactions of his characters to the tragedies he created was an important departure from ninjōbon practice and one that was to shape a number of his later works.

CHAPTER FOUR

Kōyō and the Saikaku revival

Tsubouchi Shōyō joined the Yomiuri shinbun towards the end of 1889 as its new literary editor. In January 1890 he contributed several pieces to the newspaper's supplement reviewing the literary events of the preceding year and tracing the development of fiction. In one of these he referred a number of times to the enthusiasm for the works of Ihara Saikaku and for Genroku literature in general that had begun to arouse attention during the year. In March 1889, he wrote, "the world begins to hear the sound of Saikaku's wings"; in September, "Saikaku's style becomes more and more popular and genbun-itchi wanes slightly"; and in November, "the Genroku style, and particularly the enthusiasm for Saikaku, reaches a peak".[1]

Shōyō was writing of the public aspect of the Saikaku revival. Its roots extended several years further back. It was probably Awashima Kangetsu (1859-1926) who was the first in the Meiji period to be impressed by the quality of Saikaku's prose. Many years later he wrote of his first encounter with Saikaku's fiction as follows.

> The first one I looked at was [Saikaku] Okimiyage.[2] As

1 'Meiji nijūninen bungaku-jō no dekigoto geppyō', Yomiuri shinbun, 13 January 1890, p. 5.

2 For the bibliographical details of Saikaku okimiyage and the other works by Saikaku mentioned in this chapter, the reader is adivsed to consult Richard Lane, 'Saikaku's Prose Works: A Bibliographical Study', Monumenta Nipponica, XIV, Nos 1-2 (1959), pp. 1-26.

> soon as I looked at it I thought it was interesting - the style was good and he had depicted society well. I searched here and there for lots of his books and read them. Kōda [Rohan] and Ozaki [Kōyō] were both impressed too. They said he was first rate and that something interesting would come of writing about the present day in an imitation of Saikaku's style. And that was how works in Saikaku's style first began to get popular.[3]

Awashima omitted to give the relevant dates in this instance, but it seems from other sources that he first read Saikaku okimiyage in or about 1880.[4] He subsequently became acquainted with Kōda Rohan (1867-1947) and Ishibashi Shian through chance meetings at the Teikoku Toshokan in Tokyo, and later still Shian introduced him to Kōyō. Awashima told such literary figures as Nakanishi Baika, Uchida Roan, Ishibashi Ningetsu and Yoda Gakkai, as well as Kōyō, Shian and Rohan, of his discovery, and took the pen-name Aikakkan (愛鶴軒: the second character is that for the 'kaku' in Saikaku) to show his admiration for Saikaku. Under this name he contributed several articles to the Yomiuri shinbun and in 1889 had a novel, Hyakubijin, serialized in Bunko.[5]

It is not clear if Aeba Kōson's interest in Saikaku developed independently of Awashima or not, but by 1887 he too had been reading some of Saikaku's works. In the preface to his Hasuhamusume he implied that he had been influenced by Saikaku's Kōshoku ichidai onna.[6] And a review of volume five of Kōson's

3 'Zatsu', Waseda bungaku, VII, No 12 (1906), p. 74.
4 For the dating of Awashima's encounter with Saikaku okimiyage and his first meeting with Kōyō, see Appendix Two.
5 Bunko, 20 (2 May 1889) to 27 (18 October 1889).
6 For Kōson and Saikaku, see Teruoka Yasutaka, Saikaku - hyōron to kenkyū, 2 volumes (Chūō Kōronsha, 1948-1950), I, 18-19. Hasuhamusume was serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun from 10 November to 30 December 1887.

Shōsetsu muratake that appeared in the Tōkyō asahi shinbun on 20 September 1889 stated that some criticism had been directed at him on the ground that he was nothing more than a "Meiji-Saikaku".[7] In May 1888 he had been listed as one of the 'friends' of Garakuta bunko, so it is clear that by 1889 at least Kōyō had two writers in his acquaintance who were familiar with Saikaku's works.

It was the Ken'yūsha's Bunko that carried the first reprints of Saikaku's fiction to appear in the Meiji period. A short extract from Kōshoku ichidai onna in July 1889 was the first, and this was followed by an extract from Kōshoku gonin onna in September.[8] But even before this Garakuta bunko and Bunko had reprinted several works by Saikaku's contemporary Ejima Kiseki (1666-1735).[9] After Kōshoku gonin onna the next of Saikaku's works to be reprinted was Shoen ōkagami, which appeared under its alternative title, Kōshoku nidai otoko, in the first twelve issues of Shigarami zōshi from October 1889 onwards. One month later, Awashima Kangetsu and Kōda Rohan collaborated to produce an essay titled 'Ihara Saikaku o tomurau bun', which appeared in the Ken'yūsha magazine Shōbungaku.[10] That was in November, the month in which, according to Shōyō, the enthusiasm for Saikaku reached its peak.

7 Mori Senzō, Meiji jinbutsu yowa (Kōdansha, 1973), p. 129.
8 Bunko, 24 (23 July), pp. 47-50, and 26 (12 September), pp. 45-47. The latter appeared under the title Shokoku gonin onna.
9 The first of these was Keisei utajamisen, part of which was serialized in Garakuta bunko, Nos 10 (25 October 1888) to 14 (2 January 1889). The earliest Meiji reprint of Kiseki known to me is a wood-block edition of Seken tedai katagi published in May 1886 by Takeda Den'emon.
10 Shōbungaku, 1 (21 November 1889), pp. 9-10, and 2 (28 November), pp. 13-14.

It was without doubt principally Kōyō's interest that led the Ken'yūsha to play such a prominent role in the Saikaku revival. According to Maruoka Kyūka, it was Kōyō who prepared the text of Ejima Kiseki's Keisei utajamisen for the Garakuta bunko reprint and his reason for doing so was to bring the works of Genroku writers to the attention of the public. Maruoka also records that sometime towards the end of 1888 Kōyō and several other members of the Ken'yūsha copied out Saikaku's Kōshoku ichidai otoko by hand.[11] A few months later, when listing his ten favourite books for Kokumin no tomo's 'Shomoku jisshu', Kōyō included both Kōshoku gonin onna and Kōshoku ichidai otoko. It is interesting to note that none of the other sixty-eight respondents mentioned any of Saikaku's works by name. Sudō Nansui (1857-1920) and Aeba Kōson both mentioned a general liking for Saikaku's works in passing, and Kōson cited Kiseki's Keisei kintanki as one of his favourite books.[12] According to a letter he wrote to Uchida Roan on 18 May 1889, Kōyō had recently borrowed a copy of Saikaku's Nanshoku ōkagami from Aeba Kōson and had been very much impressed with the work, and by 1890 he was probably in possession of a handwritten copy of Kōshoku ichidai onna.[13] Also in 1890 he wrote a short piece for the Kokumin shinbun on what he called the "Genroku craze", part of which reads as follows.

11 Maruoka, 'Ken'yūsha no bungaku undō' (ii), p. 115.
12 Tokutomi Sohō, ed., 'Shomoku jisshu', pp. 637, 649 and 653.
13 The letter is reproduced and reprinted in Honma Hisao, 'Tōsenroku', Meiji Taishō bungaku kenkyū, No 17 (September 1955), pp. 94-95. A handwritten copy of Kōshoku ichidai onna, apparently dated 1890 and containing an imprint of Kōyō's seal is preserved in the library of Tōhoku University. I have not seen this and do not know if the hand is Kōyō's. See Tōhoku Daigaku fuzoku toshokan: Betchibon mokuroku zōteikō bessatsu (1961), p. 58.

> In a world where everything should be new, I am fond of the old Jōkyō and Genroku eras, . . . drunk on Saikaku's spittle, and I won't look at the works of any other writer. When one of those clever genbun-itchi lads gave his amusingly mistaken view that I am covered with the rust of the Genroku period, I spat out a poem . . . and refused to change my heart.[14]

Kōyō was clearly not ashamed of his fascination with Saikaku. He went on in the same article to mention some works by Saikaku that he had read: Kōshoku gonin onna, Nanshoku ōkagami, Kōshoku ichidai otoko and Kōshoku ichidai onna. So Kōyō's familiarity with Saikaku's oeuvre, and particularly his early kōshokumono, is beyond doubt.

It is a sign of Kōyō's lasting admiration for Saikaku's works that in his later years he edited two collections of Saikaku's writings. In 1894 the Hakubunkan issued the first Saikaku zenshū as volumes twenty-three and twenty-four of the Teikoku bunko series: this edition had been prepared by Kōyō and Watanabe Otowa, a member of the Ken'yūsha. However, it seems to have offended the censor in some way.[15] Between 1903, the year of Kōyō's death, and 1905 the Shunyōdō issued a set of three books titled Saikaku bunsui. This was a collection of Saikaku's works supposedly edited by Kōyō and Kōda Rohan, but even if the editing had been complete by 1903 it is unlikely that Kōyō played any great role in the preparation of the text for his stomach cancer was by then in its terminal stages. During his lifetime Kōyō also edited a number of individual works both by Saikaku and Kiseki for publication in book form.[16]

14 'Genroku-gurui', Kokumin shinbun, 8 May 1890 (supplement), p.2.
15 Saitō Shōzō, Gendai hikka bunken dainenpyō (Suihodō Shoten, 1932), pp. 59-60.
16 For the details, see the full but not quite complete bibliography of Kōyō's works in Shōwa Joshi Daigaku Kindai Bungaku Kenkyūshitsu, Kindai bungaku kenkyū sōsho, vol. 7 (Shōwa Joshi Daigaku Kōyōkai, 1957), pp. 27-46.

The first public recognition of Kōyō's interest in Saikaku came in the review of Irozange carried in Shuppan geppyō, to which I have already referred. The author, whose identity I have been unable to trace, expressed his opinion that Saikaku's plots were too simple both in their conception and in their realization, but he was full of admiration for Saikaku's style and his imaginative use of descriptive detail. He suggested that Meiji writers could not equal him in these respects. He was delighted that novels written after the style of Saikaku had begun to appear, and he concluded from the "subtleties of ninjō" he had found in Irozange that Kōyō had "grasped the essence of Saikaku".[17]

It is difficult to know precisely what the reviewer meant by this, but many others have followed him in detecting the influence of Saikaku on the style of Irozange. Honma Hisao attributed part of Irozange's success with the reading public of the time to "the novel flavour of its Genroku-type style", and Itō Sei cited Kōyō's use of punctuation, of Buddhist vocabulary, and of rhythms close to those of the renga as aspects of his stylistic debt to Saikaku.[18] Oka Yasuo has challenged these arguments and drawn attention to Kōyō's imitation of stylistic devices used by Bimyō. He admits the presence of Saikaku's influence in Kōyō's use of ellipsis and the occasional rentaikei ending, but argues that the slow pace and attention to detail in Irozange are foreign to Saikaku.[19]

17 Kōjibashi Ichinin, 'Ninin bikuni: Irozange', Shuppan geppyō, No 19 (25 April 1889), pp. 80-82.

18 Honma, Meiji bungaku shi, II, 210, and Itō, 'Ozaki Kōyō', in Itō Sei zenshū, XIX (Shinchosha, 1973), p. 10.

19 Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū, pp. 38-51. Oka detects the influence of Bimyō in the reversal of the normal subject-predicate order and the use of similes and personification.

In support of Oka's arguments, a comparison may be made between the description of the ruined mountain cottage at the beginning of Irozange and a similar descriptive passage at the beginning of Saikaku's Kōshoku ichidai onna.[20] Of the two, Kōyō's is far more ample, and he digresses to consider the quality of life in the mountains. Saikaku, by contrast, offers just a few details before continuing, as Kōyō does, to ask who lives in the cottage. Another point is the visual distinction between the dialogue and the narrative, which was absent from Saikaku's prose: in Irozange, as in Kyō ningyō, the dialogue is set on separate lines from the narrative. Kōyō was to take up these aspects of Saikaku's style in works like Kantō Gorō and Kyara makura, which are the subject of this chapter, but they were not to be found in Irozange.

It is as well to point out here that Kōyō's alterations to the text of Kyō ningyō had had the effect of reducing the similarity of his style to that of Saikaku.[21] He had made these changes after the publication of Irozange but before the publication of Kantō Gorō and Kyara makura. Kōyō had almost certainly read some of Saikaku's works before the serialization of Kyō ningyō had even begun, and it seems from Awashima Kangetsu's recollections that Kōyō was particularly struck by Saikaku's style. Nevertheless, Irozange and the works that preceded it show only the slightest signs of Saikaku's stylistic influence, and it was only at the end of 1889 that Kōyō began to

20 Respectively, Irozange, p. 2, and Kōshoku ichidai onna, in Saikaku shū, I (NKBT 47), pp. 328-329.
21 See Appendix One.

reproduce Saikaku's style in a systematic way. So it is no surprise to find that the first specific reference to Saikaku's stylistic influence on Kōyō dates from November 1889. In that month Saitō Ryokuu's (1867-1904) 'Shōsetsu hasshū' appeared in the Tōzai shinbun. In it Saitō wrote of Kōyō that " he has raised himself an idol by the name of Saikaku and leads an idle life chanting 'ellipsis, ellipsis' every now and again."[22]

It is necessary at this stage, before looking closely at Kantō Gorō and Kyara makura, to touch upon the main characteristics of Saikaku's prose style. Teruoka Yasutaka has singled out the following points as particularly worthy of attention: a rapid narrative pace with constant changes of subject, probably deriving from the techniques of haikai-renga and yakazu-haikai practised by Saikaku; the omission of particles and other parts of speech, which Teruoka relates to the improvisatory spirit of haikai and the desire to squeeze a maximum of content out of a very small form; and the use of allusions, proverbs and aphorisms, which also serve to expand the possibilities of a brief literary form.[23] Another point to mention is Saikaku's tendency to use a rentaikei ending where a shūshikei ending would normally be expected: this and the omission of particles prompted Miyako no Nishiki (1675-?) to declare at the beginning of his Genroku Taiheiki that Saikaku was illiterate and unsure of his grammar.[24] This account of Saikaku's style, albeit admittedly brief and simplified, will

22 'Shōsetsu hasshū' first appeared in occasional issues of the Tōzai shinbun between 5 and 22 November 1889. It is contained in Saitō Ryokuu shū (MBZ 28), pp. 203-204.
23 Teruoka, Saikaku - hyōron to kenkyū, II, 258-266.
24 Ibid., II, 263-264.

suffice for the time being to make it possible to appreciate some of the changes Kōyō's style underwent in 1889.

Kantō Gorō, a short work serialized in the first five issues of Shōbungaku in November and December 1889, represents one of Kōyō's earliest attempts to reproduce Saikaku's prose style. The setting of the story is a village called Kuribashi on the Nikkōkaidō, but Kōyō was no more explicit about time than he was in Irozange: the references to Edo, stained teeth and ryō suggest only some time in the Tokugawa period. Briefly, the plot is as follows. A merchant's clerk from Edo called Kazō, who is on his way to his home province, stops in at a rest-house in Kuribashi for refreshment and is captivated by the beauty of the owner's wife. He considers beauty more attractive than a large dowry, but he learns from her that she has a husband and so he reluctantly takes to the road again. That evening a man called Kantō Gorō drops in to see the woman, whose name is Oyome, and her husband, Nisuke, and says that a traveller who stopped by earlier is staying at his house. The traveller, it seems, is willing to pay thirty ryō to spend just one night with Oyome and has asked Kantō Gorō to act on his behalf. Oyome is horrified when she hears this, but she resigns herself to the man's proposal when her husband, who is eager for the money, threatens to reward her loyal disobedience with divorce if she refuses to do as he says. Oyome accompanies Kantō Gorō to his house and joins the traveller Kazō upstairs. Later that night she comes down and wakes Kantō up to say that she wants to spend the rest of her life with Kazō, who is kind while her husband is interested only in money. Kantō was unhappy about the scheme from the beginning and only undertook the mission because he had

been asked to do so. He therefore baulks at Oyome's change of heart at first and refuses to help her, but he finally sees the truth of her arguments and sends her away with Kazō before daybreak. Nisuke arrives later in the morning to find that his wife has left and Kantō has disembowelled himself.

As Yamazaki Fumoto first pointed out, Kantō Gorō is without doubt based on 'Kuribashi no otokodate', a tale in the yomihon Tōyū kidan, which was published in 1801.[25] Although Kōyō expanded the tale to about four times its original length, he made no changes to the plot. He retained all the proper names in the original and gave names to the husband and wife, who remain anonymous in 'Kuribashi no otokodate'. As the title shows, he preserved the focus on Kantō Gorō himself, but he devoted more attention than the original to the rolesof Oyome and Nisuke in the story and to Oyome's criteria for making her choice.

It is probable, as Tosa Tōru has suggested, that Kōyō was drawn to the story because of certain similarities to some of Saikaku's earlier works, which Kōyō is known to have read. Thus the clerk's single-minded pursuit of his love in 'Kuribashi no otokodate' has points in common with the episode in Kōshoku ichidai otoko in which a blacksmith forgets all for a coutesan he desires to win over, and Oyome's change of heart after spending

25 See Yamazaki Fumoto, 'Kōyō no Kantō Gorō sono ta', Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō, III, No 8 (1938), pp. 53-56. The author of Tōyū kidan is given as Ichimu Sanjin, who is otherwise unknown. 'Kuribashi no otokodate' is the third story in volume one and is reprinted in Tosa Tōru, 'Kinsei bungaku ni genwa o motsu Kōyō sakuhin nishu', Kashiigata (Fukuoka Joshi Daigaku Kokubungaku Kai), 17 (March 1972), pp. 141-152.

the night with Kazō resembles Osan's change of heart in the third story of Kōshoku gonin onna.[26] The point to be made is that the story and its characters are not far distant from those of Saikaku's kōshokumono, and much less distant than Irozange. Kōyō's main alteration to the original was to rewrite it in a style that was close to that of Saikaku, and the overall similarity to the world of Saikaku's works may well have made 'Kuribashi no otokodate' seem particularly suited to such a stylistic experiment.

One of Kōyō's first steps was to divide the story into three parts, of which the first ends with Kazō's departure from the rest-house. In 'Kuribashi no otokodate' the narrator then describes Kazō's subsequent activities as he looks for someone to help him get what he wants and then explains the situation to Kantō Gorō. Kōyō's version omits all of this, for the second section of Kantō Gorō starts with the appearance of Kantō Gorō at Oyome's rest-house: Kantō mentions that Kazō has enlisted his help, but the reader is told no more about what Kazō has been doing in the meantime. This is reminiscent of Saikaku's technique of omitting parts of a story that were unimportant to him without any further explanation, that is, the technique of ellipsis that Saitō Ryokuu referred to in connection with Kōyō.

But a close comparison of the two texts has more conclusive evidence to provide. What follows is the part of 'Kuribashi no otokodate' that corresponds to the first section of Kantō Gorō.

26 Tosa Tōru, 'Kinsei bungaku ni genwa o motsu Kōyō sakuhin nishu', p. 143. See Saikaku shū, I (NKBT 47), pp. 129-132 and 261-280.

Nikkaidō Kuribashi to ieru tokoro ni, Kadoya no nanigashi to iu kadoyashiki hikimawashitaru tabibito no yasumijaya ari. Kono ie no saijo, mimekatachi hito ni sugurete, aichō yoku kisaku nareba, kotosara ni nadakaku nigiwaikeri. Koko ni Edo honchō nanigashi no tedai Kazō to ieru mono, yōnen yori kyūkō nashite shubi yoku shujin no itoma o koi, honkoku Shimotsuke Kanuma to iu tokoro e kaeru michisuji nareba, Kadoya ni ashi o yasume, tabemono nado totonoetsutsu saijo ga enshoku ni mitorarete koshi o nukashi, sude ni toki o utsushikeru ga, saijo no temae mo kinodoku to omoikiri, shioshio kasa o kafuri, chōdo no mono o senaka ni nashite dete yuku.

(At a place called Kuribashi on the Nikkōkaidō there is a rest-house for travellers called Kadoya somebody-or-other, a place on a corner with an entrance on either side. The owner's wife has exceptional looks and is friendly and open, so it is famous and popular. Now, a man called Kazō, the clerk of some place in Edo honchō, who worked well since his youth and has managed to get his master's consent to leave, is on his way to a place called Kanuma in his home province, Shimotsuke, and he stops at the Kadoya to rest his feet. While buying food and other things he is captivated by the woman's beauty and goes weak at the knees. He has already spent some time there when he gives up his hopes out of respect for her; with a heavy heart he puts on his sedge hat, gets his belongings on his back and sets off.)

By contrast, the first few lines of Kantō Goroō read as follows.

Nikkōkaidō Kuribashi ni Kadoya to iu yasumijaya nadakaku, ryojin ni yasumanu wa naku, yasumite wa cha dake nite yuku wa nashi. Hinaka wa kore o hiyoke no misesaki naru nemu no ha ni irihi usuragi, kanakana semi no koe yūgure o sekite, yuku hito sewashinaku koshi o kakuru mono nakereba, shōgi no goza o maki, chadōgu nado torikatazukuru tokoro e, sanjū tarazu no akiudo kutabireashi o hikinagara, oshimai nasaru tokoro o okinodoku na to aisatsu otonashiki Edo namari.[27]

(At Kuribashi on the Nikkōkaidō a rest-house called the Kadoya is famous: no travellers fail to rest there, and

27 KZ, I, 461.

> none who rest leave after just some tea. The sun enters the leaves of the silk tree in front of the shop, which keeps off the sun in the day, and sinks. The noise of the cicadas hastens evening on, and as nobody's hurriedly sitting down [she] rolls up the mats to sit on and is just putting away the tea things when a merchant of not more than thirty, dragging his tired feet, [says], "Sorry when you're just finishing', a gentle greeting in the Edo dialect.)

The author of the passage from 'Kuribashi no otokodate' is syntactically more scrupulous than Kōyō. He does omit the occasional particle, as for example after the first occurrence of the word saijo, but in this respect he was no different from most writers of fiction in the Tokugawa period. His use of final verb forms is conspicuously orthodox and so the syntactical relations are clear. It is, however, evident from the second passage that Kōyō is prepared to substitute a substantive for a final verb and leave the reader to supply an appropriate verb. By contrast with the plain and explicit style of the original, Kōyō's version makes demands on the reader's intuition. The same relationship between the two versions holds in the case of the dialogue too. Later on in 'Kuribashi no otokodate' there are a few sections of dialogue: in these there are no diacritics to distinguish the dialogue from the narrative, but the consistent use of such expressions as "to katarikereba" and "to tazunereba" render any visual distinction unnecessary. Kōyō retained this lack of a visual distinction, which was foreign to his works up to and including Irozange, but he was far less consistent in his use of such expressions as those mentioned above. More often than not he leaves the reader to supply a verb of statement or question

and relies on the quotative particle to alone. The final sentence of the passage quoted above is an instance of this. In some cases even the particle is omitted. Furthermore, Kōyō rarely gives the name of the speaker or of the character whose actions he is describing, and he declines to offer any other means of identification. In the passage above there is nothing to indicate whom the traveller is addressing: there is no noun, pronoun or name to refer to the person rolling up the mats. And this is in marked contrast to Kōyō's practice in Kyō ningyō and earlier works: Irozange seems to be somewhere between the two. Another point to notice about Kōyō's version is the constant changes of subject. Kazō remains the subject throughout the long sentence at the end of the passage quoted from 'Kuribashi no otokodate', but the subject changes frequently in the opening lines of Kantō Gorō. Frequent changes of subject in narrative passages, a certain amount of syntactical looseness, and a generally elliptical style are, as we have seen, also characteristic of Saikaku's prose style, so it can be stated with conviction that Kōyō fashioned a style for Kantō Gorō that was closer to the style of Saikaku than 'Kuribashi no otokodate' or any of his previous works.

But there is still more to learn from a comparison of the two versions. In the original the narrator sets the scene briefly and authoritatively, stating first that the rest-house is famous and secondly that the woman who runs it is beautiful. Kōyō's narrator is no less authoritative, but he confines his remarks to the fame of the Kadoya and its popularity with travellers. He does not even tell the reader that the person

rolling up the mats is a woman, let alone that she is beautiful. The reader learns of her beauty later, when Kazō becomes aware of it.

> When he looks at the woman's face, 'something charming after coming along mountain roads - violets leaves'. Her looks are so fine that there cannot be another like her even in purpureal Edo, and so he gazes at her with his hand on the tea-bowl, until her hand holding the tray gets weary. Although past her youth, she is embarrassed to be stared at so closely. Nobody calls her but she says [as if] in reply, "All right, coming", and making him take his tea quickly she goes behind the furnace and turns her back to him.[28]

Then the narrator turns to Kazō's mind, telling the reader that he is looking for beauty in a wife rather than a large dowry and adding, "To put it plainly, he wants this woman".[29] So in contrast with the original, which gives the man's infatuation as a fact and adds nothing more, Kōyō tries to place the infatuation within the context of Kazō's circumstances and character. The woman's attraction is the greater for him because he has been travelling and is tired. He would prefer a beautiful wife to a rich one, and in his eyes Oyome is so beautiful that there could be no one to equal her in Edo, where he has been living for a number of years.

In a ninjōbon it would have been difficult to convey Kazō's feelings and opinions. A third person would have been required at some stage to draw out Kazō's thoughts in conversation and the scene would have begun to acquire the length and complexity

28 KZ, I, 461-462.
29 Ibid., 463.

characteristic of the genre. Instead Kōyō let the scene pass in silence and relied not on dialogue but on psychological description of a kind. He had made attempts at this before, in both Kyō ningyō and Irozange, but in each case he had sought to present something akin to an interior monologue, treating thoughts as if they were speech. In Kantō Gorō, however, he uses a different method. The narrator interprets the thoughts and feelings of the characters, as he does for example with Kazō's views on marriage and his desire for Oyome. There are just one or two exceptions: at the end of the second section, when Oyome is walking through the village with Kantō, several neighbours ask where she is going, but she gives no answer. Then these words follow to conclude the section: "Shinchū kikaba, iya na tokoro e mairimasuru" (If you ask her heart, [it would say] 'I'm going somewhere I don't want to go'.).[30] Here the narrator is revealing her thoughts rather than interpreting or explaining them, but instances of this in Kantō Gorō are the exception.

Kōyō's development of what was for him a new method of depicting the thoughts of his characters is not just a matter of technique. The new method gave his narrator a much more important part to play than narrators in ninjōbon had ever played. It also enabled Kōyō to deploy a narrator with the ability to give judgements, opinions and interpretations. Such uses of the narrator were common to Saikaku and to western fiction available in Japan at the time, but the fact that this new development in Kōyō's technique corresponded with his first attempts to reproduce Saikaku's style makes it more likely that

30 KZ, I, 472.

it was Saikaku he was learning from.

Kyara makura was serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun from 5 July to 23 September 1890 and published in book form the following year. In one of the conversations recorded in Dagyokushū, Kōyō spoke at some length of his retrospective opinion of the work and of its origins. He noted first that Kyara makura had appeared in a large number of editions and impressions over the years, had a generally good reputation, and seemed to sell well, but he confessed that he did not regard it as a particularly fine work himself. He said it was not the sort of work that should have been written by a novelist like himself who had gone through the new education system: it should have been written by one of the older writers of the early Meiji period, by whom he probably meant such writers as Sudō Nansui and Aeba Kōson. It is interesting to see here that in later years he was not so well disposed towards the works he wrote in the heat of his enthusiasm for Saikaku, and I shall return to this point in the concluding chapter. Of more immediate concern in this chapter is what Kōyō had to say next. Kyara makura, he went on to say, was the first work he had written based on facts, and he had felt fettered by the facts. He explained what those facts were as follows.

> As for the material I used for it, a member of the Nichijūsha [i.e., the Yomiuri shinbun] told me that there was such-and-such an interesting courtesan with a bold spirit and said that I should go and hear what she had to say. So I met Sadayū and wrote down her story. I took the facts more or less as they were and amplified them in places, so very little of it is my

own creation.[31]

There is no reason to disbelieve Kōyō's account, and at two points in Kyara makura he even intimated that the story had a factual basis. Thus it is stated that Sadayū showed the author the scars left on her arm after rough treatment at the hands of the owner of the brothel at which she is employed. And at the end of the book Kōyō mentioned her address in case, as he said, readers were anxious to go and find out more for themselves.[32] If Kōyō's meeting with Sadayū had never taken place and he had wanted to give the impression that it was all factual and based on a personal interview, he would have had to make much more of this aspect of the fiction than just two brief references. And it is evident from his Namu Amida Butsu, published the year before Kyara makura, that Kōyō understood how to go about giving such an impression of fact and reality.

Notwithstanding the fact that Kyara makura probably took shape as Kōyō said it did, the similarities between the finished work and Saikaku's Kōshoku ichidai onna are undeniable and they suggest that there were forces at work when Kōyō wrote Kyara makura of which he was unaware or which he chose to disregard in later years. A brief summary of Kyara makura will therefore be followed by an examination of these similarities and the differences that naturally accompany them.

The first words of Kyara makura, "Matashite mo onna monogatari" (Yet again a story about a woman), give a good

31 Gotō Chūgai and Ihara Seiseien, Dagyokushū, p. 18.
32 KZ, II, 190 and 266.

indication of the whole. Kyara makura traces the story of Sadayū's life from her birth as the child of a Gion entertainer and a samurai of high rank to her decision at the age of twenty-eight to take the tonsure and lead an ascetic life in order to atone for the sins she committed while a courtesan. The concluding lines state that she has lived a chaste and pious life from that time to the time of writing and that she is now in her sixty-third year. So Kyara makura is concerned with something less than half of her life and is preoccupied with that part of it that preceded her renunciation of the world, her life in the pleasure quarters.

At an early age Sadayū loses her parents, and the depressing poverty of her foster parents finally makes her consent, at the age of fifteen, to be sold to a brothel in the Shimabara pleasure quarter of Kyōto as an apprentice courtesan. The money the brothel will pay will help her foster mother to scrape together a living, and so she feels that it is her duty to agree to the arrangement. She is soon famous and successful as a courtesan, and is before long redeemed by a rich merchant from Osaka shortly before he dies. She then becomes the concubine of a samurai called Maeda Shin'emon, who takes her up to Edo but soon dissipates his wealth in futile chemical experiments he undertakes in the hope of mastering the techniques of making stained glass. After his death Sadayū contacts her father's family in Edo and secretly receives a monthly allowance from her half-sister, who is married to a daimyō. However, she finds that this allowance is only barely

adequate for her needs, and so she sells herself to the Kameizumi, a brothel in the Yoshiwara pleasure quarter of Edo, and takes the professional name Sadayū for the first time. In the following substantial section of the book Kōyō then relates the story of Sadayū's relationship with a fugitive samurai from his first appearance in the Yoshiwara to his execution and Sadayū's interrogation at the office of the machi-bugyō (city magistrate). The next customer to win her favour is soon killed by one of his retainers in order to protect the family from further decline. Next is Kō Tokio, another dissolute samurai. Sadayū manages to circumvent his plans for a double suicide and after a period spent at his home she persuades his uncle to buy her off in order to preserve the unity of the family. Then she discovers that one of her customers is the adopted son of another: rivalry over her causes a rift in the family. The father is punished for his conduct by his clan superiors, and when the son tells Sadayū that he informed on his father to the daimyō she refuses to have anything more to do with him. The remaining chapter follows her relationship with Kōsuke, who belongs to a Kōshū merchant family. He leads a prodigal life in the Yoshiwara and is disinherited as a result. For a while he and Sadayū live together in a rented house, but poverty soon makes its presence felt. By now she is tired of Kōsuke, but she travels around with him taking various jobs connected with her former profession until someone buys Kōsuke off for her. She then looks after an old man who has leprosy. She lavishes care on him, not in the hope of inheriting his money but in order to expiate her past sins.

Finally, she leaves the family and takes the tonsure.

A few years after Kyara makura appeared Kitamura Tōkoku (1868-1894) devoted several essays to the significance of the current popularity of Genroku fiction and to the case of Kyara makura in particular. According to one of these essays critics had already dubbed the work "Kōyō's Ichidai onna".[33] This remained a common epithet to use of Kyara makura and the judgement it implies has come to be regarded as orthodox, in spite of the fact that Kōyō made no mention of Ichidai onna or Saikaku in the relevant section of Dagyokushū.[34] There is certainly a degree of overall similarity and it is as well not to ignore this. At least one novel, Aeba Kōson's Hasuhamusume, had already in the Meiji period been based on Kōshoku ichidai onna, and it is certain from Kōson's contact with the Ken'yūsha that Kōyō knew of this.[35]

Kōshoku ichidai onna is the story of a woman's life through a bewildering number of changes of fortune: at one stage she is a daimyō's concubine, and at another a street-walker. It is mainly concerned with chronicling the vicissitudes of her life. Kyara makura follows a similar pattern with very much the same sort of concerns. In neither work is there a strong sense of background, that is of the accumulation of experience in the woman's mind or of her knowledge of her past. The men who come

33 Kitamura Tōkoku, 'Kyara makura oyobi Shinyō masshū', Tōkoku zenshū, three volumes (Iwanami shoten, 1950), I, 275. The essay first appeared in Jogaku zasshi, Nos 308 and 309 (March 1892).

34 Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō no shōgai to bungaku (Meiji shoin, 1968), p. 35.

35 For the influence of Genroku literature on Aeba Kōson, see Yoshida Seiichi, Gendai bungaku to koten (Shibundō, 1961), p. 28.

and go in both works are immediately forgotten: they are neither recalled nor compared with their successors. For example, at the beginning of Kyara makura Sadayū gives birth to a little boy. Later the fugitive samurai collects him from his foster home to give Sadayū a chance of seeing him once again, but otherwise the child seems to be completely absent from her thoughts. And the same fate awaits all the characters she encounters in the course of the book. Similarly, she is proud of her samurai birth when she regains contact with her paternal relatives, but she seems to forget about it subsequently. This feature is common to Kyara makura and to both Kōshoku ichidai otoko and Kōshoku ichidai onna.

Kōshoku ichidai onna is set in the recent past and the reader at the time would have had no difficulty in recognizing this from the mention of era names and the allusions to past events and fashions. Kyara makura is not set in the time of Kōshoku ichidai onna, that is the Genroku era and the eras that preceded it, but in the recent past, that is the end of the Tokugawa period. This is clear from the authorial comments which imply that Sadayū is still alive in the twenty-third year of the Meiji period and from the mention of Sakuragawa Zenkō, an entertainer in the pleasure quarters of Edo at the end of the Tokugawa period.[36] And connected with this similarity of temporal setting is the fact that both Kyara makura and

36 I have been unable to trace the dates of Zenkō's birth and death. He was a late member of the school of Sakuragawa Jihinari (1762-1833), a prolific writer of kibyōshi and kokkeibon who was also a rakugoka.

Kōshoku ichidai onna either consist of or are based on a first-person account by the heroine as she looks back over her past.

Accompanying these similarities to Kōshoku ichidai onna in Kyara makura were the characteristic features of Saikaku's prose style. Just as he had done in Kantō Gorō, Kōyō omitted particles and other parts of speech, drastically reduced the distinctions between narrative and dialogue, and passed over substantial stretches of time in silence. He also reproduced Saikaku's attention to monetary and personal details: the sums involved in monetary transactions, for example when Sadayū sells herself into the Yoshiwara, are consistently given in detail, and most of the characters are introduced by the narrator complete with status and provenance.

The features of Kyara makura outlined above, when coupled with the certainty that Kōyō had read Kōshoku ichidai onna, argue persuasively that the courtesan's story he heard appealed to him precisely because of its similarity to Saikaku's work. Like 'Kuribashi no otokodate', it was particularly suitable for a version reworked in the manner of Saikaku because it was close to some of Saikaku's works in content. Nevertheless, Kyara makura differed from Kōshoku ichidai onna in a number of respects, and it is to these that we shall turn now.

Although Kyara makura does share with Saikaku's work a basic concern with a succession of events rather than with the character and person of the central figure, the emphases are not quite the same. Saikaku's heroine has an immensely varied career. Although she is for a while a famous and successful

courtesan, at other times, and for most of her life in the book, she is sampling other and less enviable ways of life. The name of her hermitage, Kōshokuan (好色庵), and her ambiguous remarks at the end of the book to the young men who have listened to her story, show that her heart still lies in the world of the pleasure quarters even though she is claiming to have renounced that world. Kyara makura, on the other hand, covers less than half of Sadayū's life and considerably more than half the chapters are concerned with her career as a tayū in the Yoshiwara. It is true that for a while she lives as a merchant's common-law wife and as a samurai's concubine, but on the whole her career is far less varied than that of Saikaku's heroine. And much of Kyara makura is taken up with a few of Sadayū's adventures which manifestly cover only a short part of her life but which are nevertheless narrated at some length. The best example of these is the story of her relationship with the fugitive samurai: the story takes over from the narrative entirely, with the result that Sadayū's other activities and customers are passed over in silence.

The ending of Kyara makura also contrasts with that of Kōshoku ichidai onna, for Sadayū's attitude towards her past is unambiguous. It is in order to atone for her sins that she looks after the leper and then spends some thirty-five years as an ascetic. Kōyō reinforced this moral slant with passages here and there in Kyara makura commenting on the immorality of Sadayū's way of life. One example comes towards the beginning. After being sold into the Shimabara brothel, Sadayū continues to visit a temple every morning and offer up her prayers. The

narrator starts the following chapter by saying that it was not long before her involvement with the world of the pleasure quarters began to change her character for the worse, and that she was soon more interested in becoming a tayū than in fulfilling her duties to her mother by providing her with a son-in-law.[37] These passages were possible because Kyara makura is narrated in the third person, whereas Kōshoku ichidai onna consists almost entirely of the heroine's first-person account of her past. This was just as well, for if Kōyō had gone any further than he did towards suggesting that Kyara makura represented Sadayū's own account of her past, he would have had to make a few changes or allow the same kind of inconsistencies that he had allowed into Irozange. This is because there are a few points at which the narrator relates circumstances that, as far as the reader can tell, Sadayū cannot have known. The details of the fugitive samurai's arrest and capture are the most conspicuous example, for there are no witnesses to the event and Sadayū never meets him again. The bare facts could conceivably have been passed on to her by someone with access to the prisoner or his gaolers. But we are not told this, and, what is more, the account of his capture covers more than just the bare facts. It describes the pleasant air that night and the fugitive Tajima's feelings of freedom and peace of mind, and it does so with such insight into Tajima's mind that there is no doubt the whole episode lies far beyond the limits of Sadayū's knowledge. This passage, therefore, must correspond to one of

37 KZ, II, p. 34.

the points at which Kōyō amplified the story he heard from the old courtesan. This shows that he was not content with the woman's story alone, as was Saikaku with his fictional first-person account in Kōshoku ichidai onna, but sought to depict some of Sadayū's adventures in the round, tracing both sides of a relationship as he had done in Irozange.

It is perhaps possible to detect in Kyara makura some lingering traces of ninjōbon techniques in the relative prominence of dialogue and the preference for self-contained sub-plots over theepisodic method favoured by Saikaku. As we shall see in later chapters, the ninjōbon tradition exerted some influence over most branches of Kōyō's oeuvre, but in Kyara makura at least it was his departures from ninjōbon practice that enabled him to depict character in a way he had been unable to do before.

These departures from ninjōbon practice involved making more use of a narrator, rather than secondary characters, to increase the amount of psychological description. Sadayū's temporary elopement will serve as a good example. At the beginning of the chapter the narrator states that courtesans never see what happens to people who dissipate all their wealth on them, and so have no idea of the tragedy involved. Once she is inside Kō"s house, Sadayū is astonished at how shabby everything is and in what disrepair: "With a look of utter amazement, Sadayū stares all around her . . .".[38] And at the end of the chapter, "Sadayū sits down dumbly and sees the

38 KZ, II, 172.

break-up of a family, the hardship of master and servant alike. Is all this the result of the game she has played with her mouth? . . . In spite of herself, she is astonished at what a terrible thing whoring is".[39] Then in the next chapter Kō's servant Bunshichi implores Sadayū not to abandon his master but to be loyal to him:

> He looks at Sadayū and weeps copious tears, and as he does so his honest devotion digs into Sadayū's breast and tears her up inside, and she wonders if she can trick this god-like man [as planned], take two hundred ryō and then fly back to her old nest.[40]

Once again a ninjōbon writer would have found it difficult to convey Sadayū's reactions and feelings without rearranging the scene. Kōyō overcomes this difficulty not by presenting monologues of thought, as he had done in Kyō ningyō and Irozange, but by making more use of his narrator as an intermediary. There is, of course, no distinction in the Japanese between direct and reported thought, so the sentence in the passage above could equally well be translated, " . . . and she wonders, 'Can I trick this god-like man, take two hundred ryō and then fly back to my old nest?'". Nevertehless, the ability of Kōyō's narrator to afford insight into the minds of the characters is evident from Kōyō's choice of words: "utter amazement", "dumbly", and "tears her up inside" all show some knowledge of Sadayū's mind. And Kōyō uses his narrator as a judge as well as an intermediary, as is clear from the fact that Bunshichi is

39 KZ, II, 173-174.
40 Ibid., 176-177.

possessed of "honest devotion", and from the narrator's moral judgements, mentioned earlier in this chapter.

This development in Kōyō's use of the narrator was foreshadowed in Irozange and was by no means put to extensive use in Kyara makura. The point to notice, however, is that Kōyō now had a new tool with which to shape his fiction. To some extent it is true to say that Kōyō had no choice but to develop a technique of this sort, given the fact that he had decided to model his prose style on that of Saikaku. The rapid pace, frequent changes of subject, and the ready recourse to ellipsis on scales both large and small required the kind of narrator who could summarise thought and convey a state of mind succinctly and economically. This was the kind of narrator Saikaku used and the old woman's story that covers all but a few pages of Kōshoku ichidai onna conforms to this pattern. The technique Kōyō had used in Kyō ningyō and Irozange, that of depicting thought directly as if it were speech, was too long-winded to match a style like Saikaku's, that relies so much on speed and change. The ninjōbon technique of introducing subsidiary characters to draw out the thoughts of the main characters was also out of the question for the same reason. Very occasionally the narrator in a ninjōbon does make an appearance to sum up a state of mind or to reveal thoughts and feelings, but the purpose of this is usually to make the dialogue comprehensible rather than to depict character, a function normally left to the dialogue.[41] Furthermore, the ninjōbon

41 See for example Shunsui's Shunshoku umegoyomi (NKBT 64), p. 57, where the narrator interrupts the dialogue to describe Yonehachi as "tearful [at the thought] that the man she loved might turn cold and say something to reject her" (translation based on Nakamura Yukihiko's emendation).

narrator was never given the powers of abbreviation or the control of the balance between narrative and dialogue that Kōyō, from Kantō Gorō onwards, and Saikaku gave their narrators.

At the time Kōyō was writing however it was not so much his narrative techniques as his general debt to Genroku literature that attracted attention and sometimes censure. Kitamura Tōkoku's essays on the subject have done much to shape attitudes towards Kōyō and his works, and in the following paragraphs I shall consider the arguments he put forward as they pertain to Kyara makura. I shall leave the more general conclusions to the final chapter.

Tōkoku's attitude towards the Genroku period and its literature seems to have contained conflicting elements. In 'Tokugawa-shi jidai no heiminteki risō', which first appeared in Jogaku zasshi in July 1892, he said that "there are many people who despise Genroku literature and say that there is nothing more shameful in Japanese literature". He agreed that some aspects of Genroku literature were regrettable but it did nevertheless echo the voice of the common people and therein lay its value for him.[42] On the other hand, in 'Kyara makura oyobi Shinyōmasshū', published earlier the same year, he found Genroku literature guilty of removing love from its natural setting and presenting to the world the view of love that prevailed in the pleasure quarters. He went on to say that the portrait of Sadayū in Kyara makura made him weep for the future of Meiji literature because she represented a revival of the ideals of

42 Tōkoku zenshū, I, 364-365.

the Genroku pleasure quarters.[43] It seems therefore that his overall evaluation of Genroku literature was negative, although he did detect something positive as well and place some of the blame for its shortcomings on the severity of the bakufu's governance.

Tōkoku dealt with Kyara makura at greater length in 'Sui o ronjite Kyara makura ni oyobu', which he seems to have written in about February 1892 but which did not appear in print until his first 'complete works' was published in 1902. He gave his opinion of Kōyō and Kyara makura in the following passage.[44]

> Kōyō is a writer who has come to the fore in opposition to the Europeanization philosophy of today. It is with Japanese thought in its pure form that he has gained a position of strength in the literary world. I learnt this from his earlier works and first managed to establish it as a theory when confronted with Kyara makura. Since sui (粋) and kyō (俠) have been the ideals of writers hitherto, I didn't expect to be raising a whip to Kōyō today and tackling this very issue. All the same, Kōyō is of a different stamp from the so-called kōshoku writers of the Tokugawa period. Is it not reasonable to say that his work, at heart, depicts not kōshoku but sui and kyō, which he has developed into an ideal in the strict sense of the word?

Kōyō, he hastened to add, was no apologist for the pleasure quarters, but there was no denying that he had made sui and kyō his focus and these were values that had grown up in the pleasure quarters. Sui, according to Tōkoku, differed from ren'ai (戀愛) in that it was not "blind": ren'ai led people astray and caused all the anguish that is always associated with love, but sui was detached and laughed at those who floundered in love. Sui demanded of its adherents that they retain perfect control

43 Tōkoku zenshū, I, 276-278.
44 Ibid., I, 267-268. The editor, Katsumoto Seiichirō, discusses the dating of thi essay on pp. 431-432.

of themselves and so rejected the ideal of mutual love, for it required that at least one side of a relationship be ruled not by lovebut by self-control. As far as Kyara makura was concerned, he argued that Kōyō set out to depict not so much the life of the pleasure quarters as the quintessence of sui as personified by Sadayū. To support his case, he cited Sadayū's steadfast refusal to be swayed by ren'ai or to abandon her level-headed pragmatism in her relationships with the fugitive Tajima and her own son. He thus defended the purity and moral probity of the sui Kōyō depicted while pointing out that it was an ideal from the past; he regretted that Kōyō had chosen to depict sui at all, since it was out of date and opposed to the new ideal of love, with which Tōkoku was concerned in much of his writings.

Tōkoku's arguments have much to commend themselves to our notice, for the ideal of detachment from, rather than blind involvement in, close personal relationships is certainly one that is at work in both Kyara makura and such of Saikaku's works as Kōshoku ichidai onna and Kōshoku ichidai otoko. It is however difficult to detect the working of sui in Kantō Gorō and the other works Kōyō wrote during the period of his enthusiasm for Saikaku. And so although Tōkoku throws interesting light on the nature of Kōyō's debt to Saikaku in the particular case of Kyara makura, the general tenor of his remarks, that Kōyō was obsessed with the past, is of more significance. Most of the other works Kōyō wrote at this time share with Kyara makura and Kantō Gorō an almost total lack of interest in the Meiji period. Not all were set in the

Tokugawa period, as those two works were, and none were set in the Genroku period, but they uniformly refrain from depicting the Tokyo of the 1890s. Natsuyase, which Kōyō serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun from 1 May to 7 June 1890, tells of a woman's loyalty and respect for the family name in the face of her husband's infidelity. It is only clear that the setting is contemporary Tokyo from the occasional reference to the Home Ministry, a lawyer recently returned from America and a rickshaw. Natsuyase is concerned not with the problems of living in Meiji Japan but with family relations and problems and the moral rules and impulses that govern them, and these moral concerns are those that were the norm in the Tokugawa period and those to which most writers of Edo fiction paid at least lip-service. The same is true of Shinirozange (1890), which like Kōshoku ichidai onna consists mainly of a first-person narrative by an old woman recalling a past love.

This examination of the works Kōyō wrote while under the influence of Saikaku points to two conclusions. The first is, as Tōkoku argued, that they owe very little if anything to Meiji Japan and the Europeanized surface of life in the capital around 1890. Even Kyō ningyō had included schoolgirls and teachers among its characters. It may be that Kōyō felt it inappropriate to write of the appurtenances ofthe modern world in the language of the Genroku era, but it also possible that the widespread resurgence of interest in Japan's past that influenced the subject matter of Irozange continued to exert an influence on Kōyō's oeuvre and direct his attention away from the world about him. The second conclusion is that Kōyō's attempts to

reproduce Saikaku's prose style helped him to develop the use of a narrator and to represent the thoughts of his characters. He tried these techniques out in works such as Kyara makura and he went on to develop them further in his subsequent works, which owed less and less to Saikaku.

CHAPTER FIVE

Sanninzuma and the Yomiuri shinbun

The year 1889 marked the beginning of Kōyō's association with the Yomiuri shinbun. At the end of that year, while still at the university, he joined the Nichijūsha, the company that published the newspaper. This was at the invitation of one of the editors, Takada Sanae (1860-1938). He stayed with the Nichijūsha for some thirteen years, until he left the company in the summer of 1902, and during that time most of his works were serialized in the Yomiuri. Sanninzuma was no exception: with many breaks, it appeared in the Yomiuri between 6 March and 11 May 1892, and a second part appeared between 5 July and 4 November 1892.[1] Sanninzuma differed from many of Kōyō's works in that it owed a lot to the policies of the Nichijūsha and to Kōyō's interest in journalism. Consequently, before dealing with Sanninzuma itself, this chapter will deal first of all with the Yomiuri's involvement with literature and then with the relation between the paper's policies and Sanninzuma.

Takada Sanae had originally joined the Yomiuri at the suggestion of Tsubouchi Shōyō, for he and Shōyō had been close

1 Tosa Tōru, 'Kōyō to Yomiuri shinbun sha to no iwa o meguru Meiji niju gonen kugatsu no jiken ni tsuite', Kashiigata, No 20 (March 1975), pp. 27-29, shows how frequent these breaks were in the serialization of Sanninzuma and all of Kōyō's works serialized in the Yomiuri up to Aobudō (1895).

friends since their days at the university. He was at first responsible solely for writing the editorials, but he also helped to raise the standing of the Yomiuri by translating the Reuter's despatches carried in the Japan Mail and publishing them in the Yomiuri just as the other major newspapers did.[2] Once he had been with the Yomiuri for a year or two, he began, with the approval of the head of the Nichijūsha, to evolve a new policy for the newspaper, which he described in his reminiscences as follows.

> This policy was that newspapers should first and foremost be one step ahead of society, but should not be two steps ahead. Newspapers are of course the leaders of society, but if they use difficult language and complicated arguments their social effect will be weak. Anyway, that is the sort of thing they do in the so-called ōshinbun (major newspapers), so rather than imitating them it is better for the Yomiuri to be satisfied with being a 'middle' newspaper, to have editorials written in plain language as far as possible, and gradually to make people read editorials who have until now been unable to read them. Consequently, zappō (miscellaneous items of news, generally of a more or less scandalous nature) should also be written with this thought in mind. At the same time I also insisted that the Yomiuri be something of a literary paper.[3]

Takada therefore invited Shōyō to join the paper as its literary editor, and a friend suggested that since he wanted some promising young writers on his staff he could do no better than secure the services of Kōda Rohan and Ozaki Kōyō. Takada promptly read some of their works and agreed.[4] So at the top

2 Takada Sanae, Hanpō mukashibanashi (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1927), p. 121. Hanpō was a pseudonym Takada used.
3 Ibid., p. 122.
4 Ibid., p. 122-124.

of the front page of the Yomiuri on 13 and 14 December 1889 there was a prominent announcement to the effect that Shōyō, Kōyō and Rohan had joined the staff.

By the end of January 1890 Kōyō had only serialized three short stories in the Yomiuri. But in that month Shōyō published in the Yomiuri an essay in two parts on newspaper fiction.[5] There had, he said in the first part, been criticism of the practice of publishing serialized fiction in the columns of newspapers. This had died down once it had been learnt that newspapers in the western world carried novels too. Shōyō argued that western precedents did not justify political corruption or nudity in art and that a case could be made for shinbun-shōsetsu (newspaper novels) without resorting to the equivocal practice of looking first for western precedents. A newspaper, he said, existed to give its readers pleasure as well as to provide them with information, and this was the end that shinbun-shōsetsu served. He went on to emphasize that newspapers took the whole of society as their audience and that it was therefore necessary for shinbun-shōsetsu to have a wide appeal. He called for a clear moral stance but insisted that he was not intent on the revival of kanzen-chōaku didacticism and only eager that shinbun-shōsetsu should avoid spreading the seeds of harm. In the second part of his essay he said that the shinbun-shōsetsu had more responibility and less freedom than the ordinary novel: in order to appeal to a wide audience and to bring its message home it had to eschew

5 Tsubouchi Shōyō, 'Shinbunshi no shōsetsu', Yomiuri shinbun, 17 (p. 6) and 18 (p. 5) January 1890.

everything remotely esoteric or refined. Its purpose was to bring pleasure and if it achieved this a few artistic shortcomings were of no consequence. Finally he made five demands of the authors of shinbun-shōsetsu.

1 They should see that novels too serve to inform people of contemporary circumstances, should worship the present day as much as possible, and should depict the ninjō, fūzoku and trends of the present age.
2 Whoever reads them should be able to sympathise; at any rate, most people, at least, should be able to understand. So there should be nothing esoteric.
3 There should be nothing to prevent parents and children, and older and younger brothers reading them together.
4 When writing of the past or the future they should inform people today as much as possible of the ways in which things are different today.
5 At the same time as entertaining, they should either convey information about contemporary circumstances or aim to provide guidance of some kind.

Given Sanae's role in the development of the Yomiuri into a literary paper and his long friendship with Shōyō, it is a priori probable that Shōyō's views coincided with those of Sanae and that the five demands were directed at the writers who were producing shinbun-shōsetsu for the Yomiuri, in the first instance Kōyō and Rohan. Certainly Shōyō's emphasis on a wide appeal and a firm grounding in the present correspond closely with Sanae's insistence that the Yomiuri stay close to its readers both in language and in subject matter and opinion.

If Shōyō, and perhaps Sanae as well, intended Kōyō to pay heed to the five demands, it is hard to see how he could have

avoided complying with them, for he was a new employee and formally subordinate to Shōyō. His first work to appear in the Yomiuri was Rabijin, which was published on 22 and 23 November 1889, just before he joined the Nichijūsha. The central figure of this short piece is a man who has become convinced of the artistic value of nudity and it tells what happens when he tries to persuade his wife and maid to appear nude in public. Kōyō then wrote Benikaishi (23-26 December), which has both style and subject matter in common with Saikaku's kōshokumono, and Kazariebi (1-9 January 1890), in which he employed a difficult literary style. Neither of these last two, as Tosa has pointed out, can be said to have been aimed at a wide audience.[6] On the other hand, Sarumakura (1-5 February 1890), which was his first work for the Yomiuri after the publication of Shōyō's essay, tackled the currently topical subject of the morals of female students. An editorial appeared in the Yomiuri on 18 February attacking the immorality of the students at girls' colleges and suggesting in passing that Sarumakura was based on fact. And this editorial was followed by several zappō exposing scandals of s imilar nature.[7] So Sarumakura went some way towards satisfying the demand for topicality at least, and from this it can be concluded that Kōyō either concurred with Shōyō's views or found himself as an employee with little choice but to accept them.

The zappō column, which was found on the third page of every newspaper at the time, consisted of short articles or news

6 Tosa Tōru, 'Sanninzuma no shūhen', Bungei to shisō, No 35 (December 1971), p. 18.
7 Ibid., pp. 16-30.

items culled by roving reporters and rewritten by members of the editorial staff. They were obviously by their nature grounded in the present and it is reasonable to suppose that their appeal was wide. They therefore had something to teach a writer of shinbun-shōsetsu who was trying to conform to the standards Shōyō had laid down, and it seems that Kōyō realised this. According to the recollections of Hori Shizan, who was editor of the zappō column at the Yomiuri from 1892 onwards and one of Kōyō's earliest followers, Kōyō was convinced of the importance of zappō literature.[8] And according to Shōyō and others who knew Kōyō at the time, Kōyō even wrote the occasional zappō himself.[9]

Years after the event Kōyō recalled that he had been inspired to write Sanninzuma by a zappō article that had appeared in the Yomiuri.[10] This zappō, he said, had told of the three mistresses of a wealthy businessman: they had all cut off their hair once he had died and put it in his coffin with the intention of following him in death. This had suggested to Kōyō some interesting possibilities for fiction, for the personalities of the three women would have been quite different and there would have been confrontations as well. Apart from this, he said, Sanninzuma had been the work of his own imagination. The zappō article Kōyō referred to was without doubt 'Meiji shinpen sannin bikuni', which appeared in the

8 Hori Shizan, 'Zappōran', Bunshō sekai, II, No 2 (February 1907), p. 33.
9 See the note by Shōyō to this effect in Takada, Hanpō mukashibanashi, p. 140. For other evidence suggesting that Kōyō wrote zappō while at the Yomiuri, see Tosa, 'Sanninzuma no shūhen', p. 19.
10 Ihara Seiseien and Gotō Chūgai, Dagyokushū, p. 22.

Yomiuri on 14 February 1892. It describes the grief of the three mistresses of a rich and powerful man who has just died and tells of their plan to kill themselves in order to follow him in death.[11] However, Sanninzuma bears little resemblance to this article. The hero of the novel, Katsuragi Yogorō, only dies in the last few pages of the book. The grief of his surviving wife and three mistresses is touched upon but briefly and none of them shows the slightest interest in following Katsuragi in death. So the zappō gave him no more than the germ of an idea. Although the zappō itself was of course topical, Sanninzuma was too distant from it to inherit its topical aura.

Perhaps in order to compensate for this, Kōyō based some aspects of his hero on Iwasaki Yatarō, the founder of the Mitsubishi zaibatsu, who died in 1885. Both Iwasaki and Kōyō's Katsuragi came from poor country backgrounds and rose to great wealth by their own efforts. And both died of stomach cancer. And while Sanninzuma was being serialized and just afterwards, a succession of zappō appeared in the Yomiuri dealing with a lawsuit that one of Iwasaki's former mistresses had brought against his family in the hope of an improved financial settlement.[12] It is probable that Kōyō would have known about these zappō in advance through his friend Hori Shizan, and they serve to show that at least in some respects Sanninzuma could claim to be topical. It may well have been because Iwasaki was too obviously the model for Katsuragi that Sanninzuma

11 Quoted in full in Tosa, 'Sanninzuma no shūhen', pp. 22-23.
12 Katsumoto Seiichirō, 'Ozaki Kōyō', Nihonbungaku shōjiten (Shinchōsha, 1968), p. 195.

encountered some trouble with the censors.[13]

Another source Kōyō used for Sanninzuma was a series of articles that ran in the Yomiuri from June 1891 to April 1892. The articles dealt with notable men and women of the Meiji period, ranging from brief biography to anecdote, and Tosa has demonstrated that several of them provided Kōyō with material that he put to use in Sanninzuma.[14] It is therefore evident that in some respects at least Sanninzuma fulfilled the demands Shōyō had made two years earlier. It was topical and it could be presumed to have a wide appeal inasmuch as the zappō column had contained many articles of a similar nature.

Nevertheless, Sanninzuma prompted not one review and seems to have been ignored by contemporary critics; and this in spite of the fact that a few years earlier even Kōyō's short stories had been reviewed in Kokumin no tomo and Jogaku zasshi as well as many of the less well-known literary magazines flourishing in the 1890s. However, two months before the last instalment of Sanninzuma was published, two anonymous editorials appeared in the Yomiuri criticizing contemporary fiction and calling for new developments in fictional writing. These are worth examining closely, for there are grounds for suspecting that

13 In the year before he died Iwasaki bribed a member of the government to see to the banning of a work published earlier that year which had concerned Iwasaki himself under the guise of Kiyomori: see Saitō Shōzō, 'Meiji kadoki no hikka bungei', Waseda bungaku, No 232 (June 1925), p. 143. I have not been able to discover the nature of the censors' objections to Sanninzuma; serialization was not suspended, but the work certainly encountered some difficulties: see Saitō Shōzō, Gendai hikka bunken dainenpyō (Suikodō shoten, 1932), p. 52.

14 Tosa, 'Sanninzuma no shūhen', pp. 24-27.

both were aimed at Kōyō and they may well have reflected the contemporary opinion of Sanninzuma.[15]

The author of the first, which was called 'Chikagoro no bungakkai', expressed his disappointment with recent fiction, which was all the keener for the promise he had once found in the works of Yamada Bimyō, Kōyō, Aeba Kōson, Kōda Rohan and Sudō Nansui in the years immediately following the publication of Shōyō's Tōsei shosei katagi. One reason he put forward for the atrophy he said had subsequently set in was the failure of writers to examine the society in which they lived. It was no answer, he argued, to say that criticism of this kind could only fairly be laid at the feet of those who purported to be followers of Zola, for it was the duty of all novelists to depict society. Although there was ample material available should a writer wish to depict the political or commercial worlds, or the conditions of the poor or the activities of the lawless, writers persisted, he said, in being preoccupied with the world of the pleasure quarters, young lovers and the student world; and if not these, then dramatic stories set in the feudal past. If writers failed to spend more time away from their desks examining the world around them they would be unable to write like Disraeli, Dickens, Zola, Thackeray or George Eliot. Another reason for the atrophy was the failure of writers to become familiar with works of western literature, and he suggested learning from Sir Walter Scott's Quentin Durward to write of Oda Nobunaga or using the description of Fagin in Oliver Twist to portray the ruthlessness of

15 'Chikagoro no bungakkai', Yomiuri shinbun, 7 and 8 September 1892, and 'Bungaku yoron', ibid., 11 September 1892.

Japanese usurers.

The author of the second article, 'Bungaku yoron', acknowledged the greatly increased popularity of fiction but felt that the Meiji period had yet to produce a great work of literature. There was, he said, only the most superficial of differences between the fiction of the Tokugawa and Meiji periods, and this difference lay in the fact that writers no longer concentrated on revenge stories, family disturbances or the misfortunes of beautiful women and had turned instead to financial disputes, deceit, the secret lives of students, the activities of the wealthy and the love affairs of ordinary people as subjects for fiction. Apart from this, there was little to distinguish Meiji fiction from that of the Tokugawa period. Some writers turned their eyes only to the backwaters of society and others devoted their attention to style at the expense of content, and he attributed these failings to a lack of ideals and perception and to the fact that writers were not sufficiently well-read.

The first of these two editorials did attach a lot of importance to familiarity with western fiction, but both were of the opinion that the subjects and settings writers were interested in were peripheral to Japan in the 1890s and would have been more at home in the fiction of the Tokugawa period. It is highly probable that Kōyō was one of their targets, if he was not their main target. After all, Kyara makura had been set in the pleasure quarters and had virtually ignored the existence of the Meiji period. It is true that the courtesan who told Kōyō her life story may well have told it in just this

way, but the decision to use her story without substantial alteration was Kōyō's, and so this aspect of Kyara makura cannot be attributed to the source he used. The reference in the second editorial to writers who pay too much attention to their style and choice of words was probably directed at Kōyō as well, for it was well known that he devoted painstaking labour to the revision of his manuscripts.[16] Sanninzuma portrayed deceit, the activities of the wealthy and the world of the pleasure quarters, and one or other of the two editorials had explicitly condemned each of these subjects. Since Sanninzuma was being serialized in the Yomiuri at the time these Yomiuri editorials appeared, the novel has the look of an uncomfortably conspicuous target.

In the postscript to the final instalment of Sanninzuma, Kōyō wrote that he had not completed the novel as he had originally planned it. This was because he felt that it was getting monotonous, and he had therefore compressed into one instalment what he had originally planned to cover ten instalments. It is probable that the two editorials prompted Kōyō's dissatisfaction, and it may be that he was aware of opposition to Sanninzuma among members of the Yomiuri staff. While the editorials appeared on 7, 8 and 11 September, not one instalment of the novel appeared between 18 August and 1 October inclusive.[17] But let us now examine Sanninzuma more closely to see how valid the criticisms implicit in the editorials were.

16 See Hori Shizan, 'Zappōran', pp. 32-33, and Kayōsei (pseud.), 'Ko Kōyō Sanjin danpen', Shinshōsetsu, IX, No 2 (1904), p. 164.
17 See Tosa, 'Sanninzuma no shūhen', pp. 28-29. The postscript appeared in the Yomiuri shinbun, 4 November 1892, p. 2.

The plot of Sanninzuma lends itself to a very brief summary. The first part shows how the hero, Katsuragi Yogorō, uses his wealth, his influence, and his readiness to resort to deception in order to acquire three mistresses in addition to his wife Asako. They are Saizō, a former courtesan, Kōbai, once employed as an entertainer by another wealthy businessman, and Oen, a former teacher of the koto. In the second part Kōbai becomes Katsuragi's favourite, and Saizō's jealousy and frustrated boredom lead her to resume her relationship with Kikuzumi, the lover she had before becoming Katsuragi's mistress. When Katsuragi learns of this and realizes that she means to continue seeing Kikuzumi, he banishes her to an old mansion he owns. When Oen gives birth to a son, Katsuragi begins to spend more and more time with her. Kōbai schemes to regain her place in Katsuragi's affections by discrediting Oen and enjoys some success. It is only after Katsuragi's death that her schemes come to light and Asako promptly dismisses her from the house. While Kōbai returns to her former employee, Saizō is free to rejoin her lover. Oen moves in with Asako and the two live together as sisters.

The setting is the Meiji period, as is obvious from the references to Tokyo, newspapers, diamond rings, and many other details of contemporary life. But these were not enough to satisfy Shōyō's demand that the writer of a shinbun-shōsetsu "worship the present day". So in addition Kōyō attempted to portray Katsuragi as a symbol of the risshin shusse ideal of personal advancement and of the growing importance of money as a source of power. The novel starts with a passage on the

universality of the desire for money and the regrettable difficulty of acquiring it. The narrator then introduces Katsuragi to the reader as a man whose name is familiar to everyone in Japan and whose wealth is prodigious. There follows an account of his career from his childhood as the second son of a poor farming family in Kanazawa. He is fortunate enough to indulge in some successful speculation around the time of the Meiji Restoration, and since "money breeds more money" he eventually attains such a position that he can afford to live in idle luxury whilst leaving his business affairs to trusted subordinates.[18] This pedigree gives Katsuragi the right to symbolize the risshin shusse ideal, but this aspect of his life is compressed into one chapter, the first, and the remainder of the book is concerned with his quest for satisfaction and the jealousies of his mistresses. Thus the narrator states next that once a man's needs for clothing, food and a roof over his head have been satisfied, he invariably conceives the desire for pleasure and relaxation, and this usually takes the form of sexual activities.[19] And so after the chapter that has established Katsuragi's wealth, Kōyō loses interest in the source of Katsuragi's money or the nature of his business, and the reader learns nothing more about either of these facets of his life. In chapter twelve, Katsuragi finds himself unable to spend the day with Saizō as planned because he has some business to attend to in his office; in chapter fifteen he spends the morning with his business managers

18 KZ, III, 1-9.
19 Ibid., 10.

making plans; in chapter sixteen, Yukimura, the rich entrepreneur who is Kōbai's employer, learns from one of his subordinates that he has overcome his competitors and won the contract he was seeking; in chapter sixteen of the second part Katsuragi has to go and sort out some trouble at the branch office in Kobe.[20] In each case the reader learns nothing more than the bare fact I have cited. Throughout the book, with the exception of the first chapter, there are only half a dozen lines in all dealing with Katsuragi's business, and in most cases they serve only to explain why Katsuragi has to absent himself from the home of one or other of his mistresses.

Nevertheless, Kōyō's interest in money did not stop with the first chapter. Throughout the first half of the novel the reader witnesses Katsuragi's use of his money to gain his own ends. It is only through the lavish expenditure of money and the preparation of plans requiring the cooperation of other courtesans that he is able to make Saizō doubt the fidelity of her lover Kikuzumi and then to persuade her to become his mistress. Money and costly gifts also help him to have his way with Kōbai and Oen, and in several cases we learn the exact sums involved.

The expenditure of large sums of money on courtesans and entertainers was not new to Meiji Japan. It was a feature of life in the pleasure quarters that lasted from the days of Saikaku to well after the Meiji Restoration. Katsuragi's use of money to bribe and persuade may differ from the prodigality of

20 KZ, III, 97, 128-129, 133-134, and 318 respectively.

the heroes of sharebon and ninjōbon and Kōyō may be far more explicit about money matters than Edo writers were accustomed to be, but it is clear that Kōyō's interest in money was limited to its power to influence sexual relationships. It was the risshin shusse ideal and the image of the entrepreneur that were new to Meiji Japan, but it was precisely these aspects of Katsuragi's career that are not the focus of Kōyō's attention. So Sanninzuma was only topical insofar as the love-lives of wealthy men like Iwasaki were topical. It did not explore the world of commerce as the author of 'Chikagoro no bungakukai' had recommended, and although it depicted the activities of the wealthy, it was preoccupied with what was going on behind the scenes in Katsuragi's personal life.

The other important points to be made about Sanninzuma concern the plot and the characterization. In the first place it is apparent from Kōyō's account in Dagyokushū that the possibilities he saw in the story revolved around the contrasting characters of the three women, their differing relationships with Katsuragi, and the threats of jealousy and intrigue. Kōyō therefore took great pains to bestow an individual personality on each of the three mistresses and Katsuragi's wife, Asako.

Katsuragi first hears about the famed beauty of the courtesan Saizō from Yamase, one of his assistants, who has a reputation for his familiarity with such matters. Yamase tells him that Saizō is in love with an humble company employee and quite scornful of the rich men who risk their names and fortunes in the effort to win her over. Yamase tries but fails

to persuade her to turn her attention to Katsuragi: she insists that she intends to reserve herself for one man alone, her lover Kikuzumi. However, when she learns of Kikuzumi's flirtation with Koshime, the courtesan entrusted by Yamase with the task of luring Kikuzumi away from her, she is both infuriated and contemptuous. Contempt is the stronger emotion: "when she compared Koshime with herself the difference was great. Saizō was the geisha people mentioned these days when they were talking about the Yanagibashi quarter. They didn't mention Koshime".[21] She feels superior to Koshime and reviles Kikuzumi in her heart for "not knowing what true love is". She despises them both and regrets nothing but her bad judgement. As Kōyō depicts her, she is proud of her status as a geisha of high repute. It is assumed that she never learns of Katsuragi's scheme to wean her from Kikuzumi. The rest of the book adds little to the picture of her character. She spurns Kikuzumi's determined efforts to patch up the misunderstanding and moves into the house that Katsuragi has had built for her. When she learns of his growing attachment to Kōbai she is at first not jealous and merely makes Katsuragi promise to visit her as often as he does Kōbai and to pay an hundred yen fine if he breaks his promise. He agrees to this with amusement and appreciates in her the character of a professional Yanagibashi entertainer. Only when it becomes evident that he is neglecting her in favour of Kōbai does she resume her relationship with Kikuzumi.

Kōbai is one of twelve girls under contract to Yukimura to entertain his guests in his private villa. She and Katsuragi are

21 KZ, III, 38.

soon drawn to each other, but she has to cope with the jealousy and intrigue of the other girls. And when she reflects on her future she realises that her position represents a great advance on her humble birth as the daughter of a poor shopkeeper, but she is concerned by the fact that she has no security. Katsuragi is an ideal opportunity for her make good this deficiency, and she decides to ask him to redeem her from her contract with Yukimura. She chooses her moment very carefully for fear of spoiling her chance of success, and when Katsuragi expresses his agreement but counsels waiting until Yukimura is ready to release her from her obligations, she weeps and upbraids him for his shallow affections. The impression Kōyō creates is that of cunning determination in pursuit of security and this is confirmed by the deception to which she later resorts in order to oust Oen from Katsuragi's affections.

Oen, by contrast, is naive and guileless. Katsuragi discovers her while on a visit back to his home town to commemorate his mother's death and he persuades her to accompany him back to Tokyo, leading her to believe that he will find a suitable husband for her. She has long been a teacher of the koto and has entertained travellers at local inns, but she has never performed any less praiseworthy services for them. She is therefore horrified when Katsuragi tries to force himself upon her once she is in Tokyo, and it is some time before she realises that Katsuragi never meant to find her a husband at all and before she resigns herself to becoming his mistress.

Far less attention is devoted to the character of Asako, Katsuragi's wife. In the first chapter it is reported that she

is said once to have been a famous courtesan, that she helped him to realise the ideal of risshin shusse, and that as his wife her main concern is to protect his reputation. It is also stated that her generosity and kindness have won the hearts of all who come into contact with the household. At the beginning of the second part Katsuragi and Asako discuss the relative merits of his three mistresses and she lavishes praise on Kōbai, but the purpose of this scene is not so much to draw attention to Asako herself as to prepare for Katsuragi's preoccupation with Kōbai at the expense of Saizō and Oen. Asako appears quite often towards the end of the book, but again we learn little about her, for Kōbai is using her as a pawn in her attempt to banish Oen from Katsuragi's favour. Asako's position is secure, and it is her confidence of this that emerges most strongly from Sanninzuma.

Katsuragi's three mistresses, their various personalities, and the jealousy and other emotions that guide their activities are at the centre of Kōyō's attentions throughout Sanninzuma. The result of this is that Sanninzuma has a great deal in common with the ninjōbon tradition. The plots of most ninjōbon revolve around a young man of means sufficient to enable him to devote both time and money to the pleasure quarters, and several women who usually belong either to the pleasure quarters or to their fringes. Tanjirō, the hero of Shunsui's Shunshoku umegoyomi, has three claims on his affections to contend with: Ochō, his betrothed, and Yonehachi and Adakichi, his lovers, who are both Fukagawa geisha. Of the women in Sanninzuma, Saizō is a former courtesan, and this is true of Asako as well; and

Kōbai and Oen were professional entertainers, although they did not derive their livings from the pleasure quarters. The jealousy and intrigue that characterize the second half of Sanninzuma were just as important to ninjōbon and have a prominent part to play, for example, in Shunshoku renri no ume. And at one point Kōyō himself drew attention to the similarity between Katsuragi's treatment of Saizō and the behaviour of characters in chūbon, by which he can only have meant ninjōbon.[22]

It was probably in recognition of these very areas of similarity between Sanninzuma and ninjōbon that Masamune Hakuchō wrote: "Sanninzuma may surpass the old writers in the beauty of its language, but in its contents it is just the same as Umegoyomi, Musume setsuyō and other ninjōbon". It was a masterpiece, he said, but it represented a continuation of Edo fiction and was almost without any reflection of the new age.[23] He went on to refer to it as "Shunshoku Sanninzuma" and to Kōyō as "Kyōkuntei Kōyō": these epithets suggest a connection with Shunsui's ninjōbon, for Shunsui used the pen-name Kyōkuntei and prefaced the titles of many of his ninjōbon with the word shunshoku.

It cannot be claimed that Sanninzuma conformed as closely as Masamune would have us believe to the normal requirements of ninjōbon. This is no more apparent than in the ending, even

22 KZ, III, 71. The term chūbon referred to the size of book that was usual for ninjōbon and kokkeibon and was often used by extension to refer to these two genres, but only the former contain the kind of scene Kōyō mentions.

23 Masamune, 'Ozaki Kōyō', in Sakkaron, I (fifth edition; Sōgensha, 1948), pp. 129-132.

if allowance is made for the haste with which Kōyō seems to have drawn Sanninzuma to a close. It was usual for ninjōbon to conclude with a neat ending that implied a happy and trouble-free future and cut through the complex tangle of relationships which is often only imperfectly understood by the reader. Musume setsuyō ends with a happy future opening up before Kingorō and wife because Kosan has sacrificed herself for everybody else, and at the end of Renri no ume Fusajirō's wife strikes up a friendship with his lover Okiku and invites her to come and live with them in a ménage à trois. Although Asako and Oen plan to live together as sisters, Sanninzuma diverges from ninjōbon practice in that the hero is past his prime from the very beginning, that he is dead by the end, and that two of his mistresses have been dismissed in disgrace.

None the less, the overall similarity between Sanninzuma and ninjōbon is unmistakable and must lead to the conclusion that, as the two Yomiuri editorials implied, Kōyō had not detached himself from the fiction of the Tokugawa period and was not really concerned to depict the world around him. Although the writers of the two editorials clearly considered it to be so, this need not be interpreted as a judgement on the value of Sanninzuma. Sanninzuma remains to this day one of the few of Kōyō's works that has attracted unconditional approval: Masamune's praise was unstinting, and so was that of Tanizaki Junichirō and a number of other writers. And Fukuda Kiyoto considered it to be the best representative of Kōyō's oeuvre.[24]

24 See Fukuda Kiyoto, 'Sanninzuma', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XII, No 10 (October 1935), pp. 18-19. Fukuda discusses the reputation Sanninzuma has enjoyed with writers such as Masamune, Tokuda Shūsei, and Chiba Kameo.

It remains to consider those aspects of Sanninzuma that I have so far ignored, namely Kōyō's language and narrative techniques, which probably account for a good deal of the praise that has been lavished on thework. The following extract is taken from the fifth chapter of the second part of Sanninzuma. The previous day Saizō met her former lover Kikuzumi at the theatre for the first time since their inauspicious parting and arranged to meet him secretly at her mother's house: the passage deals with their reunion.

菊住の服裝劇場にて見しに異ること無く、此外には持ため一張羅と覺し。有るものなれば次更へて來べき今日なるに、然りとは哀にも落ちたる身の果を、己も憚る氣色見えて、我持物にせし折の才藏とは、今姿から壯まで改まりて、おのづから神々しく威を備へたるに呑れ、直ぐ竹骨の扇子を捻くりて、着崩無さの他人がましき挨拶振。おまは心に可笑しく、昔と麁畧無き男は、厚胸も無いやうに想はれて、打解くる樣は酒と、丈度を急がせ、積る話もいゆる〳〵。先一口と盃を差せば。お酌では恐多もとれて、お才は母の浴衣に衣更へ、專三は双肌脱ぎて麻繩絆に涼みながら、相互に別れてからの物語になりけり。

(Kikuzumi's attire was no different from that which she had seen in the theatre and it seemed as if that was the one good bit of clothing he had. This was a day when he should have come wearing different clothes if he had any: sadly enough he must have come down in the world, and he looked ashamed of it himself. She was different body and soul from the Saizō he had once made his own, and he was so overawed by her solemn dignity that his manner of greeting was awkward and distant, and he fiddled with a fan which had a frame of dappled bamboo. Saizō was secretly amused and felt that a man without a flourishing beard had no courage; the medicine to loosen him up is sake, she thought, and she saw that it was prepared quickly - they had a lot to talk about and it was best to be relaxed. She passed him a sake cup, saying, "Well, have a drink"; whereupon he said, "I'm obliged to you for serving me". "My, you're being as cold to me as a stepson", she laughed, and as the exchange of drinks got more and more frequent and the drink began to go to their heads, the barrier of reserve between them went away. Saizō changed into one of her mother's yukata and Senzō [i.e., Kikuzumi] removed the clothes from the upper half of his body and cooled himself in his hempen undershirt. And they fell to talking about what had happened to them since they had parted.)[25]

In the first place, it is clear that some of the features of Saikaku's style are still present. In Sanninzuma Kōyō made no visual distinction between the narrative and the dialogue. He did use the quotative particle to to mark dialogue or thought, but he frequently omitted verbs of speech and thought as well as final verbs. He also occasionally used a rentaikei ending where orthodox bungo syntax would prescribe a shūshikei ending, although there is no example of this in the passage above.

On the other hand, Sanninzuma lacks the rapid pace that was a characteristic of Saikaku's style, for Kōyō was far less ready to resort to the ellipses and rapid changes of subject that abound in Kyara makura. Thus, for example, instead of

25 KZ, III, 249-250.

simply stating that Katsuragi is a very rich man, as he did with the first of Sadayū's customers in Kyara makura, he spent most of the first chapter tracing Katsuragi's rise to wealth. Similarly, in the passage quoted above, Kōyō does not proceed rapidly to the point at which Saizō and Kikuzumi become lovers again. Instead he makes his narrator pause over their first impressions upon meeting again: in Kyara makura he would have eliminated these preliminaries altogether or summarized them briefly before passing on. Their first impressions add nothing to the plot, but they do serve to reinforce the characterization. The reader already knows that her position as Katsuragi's mistress has made Saizō wealthy, and Kikuzumi's reaction shows how this has affected both her manner and her physical presence. Kikuzumi has, by contrast, come down in the world and is a very different man from the Kikuzumi the reader encountered in the early chapters of the first part of Sanninzuma. He feels awkward when confronted by her confident and impressive bearing, and needs to be put at his ease. Saizō's willingness to do this shows how her relationship with Katsuragi has changed.

In order to add these touches to the characterization, and to give the attention he evidently wished to give to the characters that people Sanninzuma, Kōyō seems to have found it necessary to move away from the narrative styles both of Genroku fiction and of ninjōbon. As we have seen, in Kyara makura Kōyō gave his narrator a more important role than he had hitherto allowed him to play, and he took pains to reveal the thoughts of some of his characters. The pressure of events,

however, and the rapid progress from incident to incident prevented him from giving rounded portraits of his characters, many of who vanish from the novel as soon as they have fulfilled their roles. Other priorities were at work in Sanninzuma, where Kōyō's expressed interest was in the contrasting personalities of the three mistresses. For the contrast to stand out, it was important for him not to let events take precedence over character. Many of the events in Kyara makura add little to our understanding of Sadayū's character, but in Sanninzuma he fashioned episodes that would serve to keep the characterization uppermost in the reader's mind. The most obvious of these is the garden party, which Katsuragi's wife and his three mistresses all attend. On the way home with her husband, Asako says what she thinks of his three mistresses, and describes Saizō as a good drinking companion, Kōbai as a good sexual partner, and Oen as most suited to a refined setting.[26]

In the opening chapter of Shunshoku umegoyomi Shunsui depicted a scene similar to the passage quoted above. Tanjirō is ill and in sorry circumstances, but he is pleased to receive a visit from Yonehachi, whom he has evidently not seen for a long time. There is a small preliminary section of narrative, but it is predominantly through the dialogue that Shunsui shows the reader Tanjirō's unhappiness with his present lot and the sympathy and affection that Yonehachi feels for him. Their personalities and their sentiments emerge clearly enough, but this method had its limitations. By relying almost exclusively

26 KZ, III, 222-223.

on dialogue, a writer could not depict the emotions that lie behind speech and he could not conveniently put his work in a wide perspective or discuss the scenes he depicts, for he had more or less dispensed with the services of a narrator. The writers of ninjōbon seem to have felt these restrictions as limitations, for they endeavoured to compensate for them in various ways. By using subsidiary characters to draw out the emotions of the main characters, they acknowledged the importance of unspoken feelings and did their best to bring them to the attention of the reader when the circumstances warranted it. They also inserted sakusha iwaku (the author says) passages into the text to add some remarks of their own and occasionally used the prefaces for this purpose as well.[27] Kōyō managed to escape these limitations by being less concerned with the actual words supposed to have been spoken by his characters and by strengthening the role of the narrator. As is evident from the passage above, he was ready now to omit or summarize dialogue, not, as in Kyara makura, because it held up the plot, but because he wished to show the reader what was going on in the minds of his characters. In Irozange he had tried conveying the thoughts of his characters without relying on a narrator, but in Sanninzuma he gave the narrator a role to play in interpreting those thoughts or commenting on their states of mind. Just before and after the passage above, Saizō's mother warns her about the danger of resuming her relationship with

27 See for example the preface to the second volume of Umebori's Renri no ume (p. 55), in which the author discusses the general theme of his work, and the passage in Shunshoku umegoyomi (p. 173) in which Shunsui refutes the charge of immorality and explains the point of his ninjōbon.

Kikuzumi, but she cannot persuade her daughter to listen to her and, for fear of offending her, keeps her thoughts to herself. The dialogue tells the reader her opinions, but the narrator's explanation is necessary if the reader is to know why she does not speak more forcefully and how anxious she really is. It is also the narrator who tells us that Kikuzumi was "overawed" and that his manner of greeting was "awkward and distant". The narrator is clearly in command here, whereas in ninjōbon he had just a very small role to play and in Saikaku's kōshokumono and the works Kōyō based upon them he had to compete with the demands of the plot.

Kōyō also used his narrator in Sanninzuma to present comments and opinions of a kind that was largely missing from his earlier works. There are passages on the attractions of money, the tendency of men to look to women for their pleasures and satisfaction, and the fact that honesty does not really pay in the nineteenth-century. Elsewhere, the narrator laments that the word shinshi (gentleman) has become synonymous with a man of wealth although it originally referred to a man who was a model of social behaviour, and he deplores the insensitivity and cruelty with which Katsuragi and all men treat their wives..

Nevertheless, the narrator's comments do not add up to an overall view of the connection between money and sexual relationships, or indeed of anything else. He does seem to have a consistently critical attitude towrds Kōbai's scheming, but he does not apply the same standard to Katsuragi. There is a slight suggestion of kanzen-chōaku didacticism in the ending,

for it is the virtuous Oen and loyal Asako who stay on together and, presumably, enjoy the material benefits of Katsuragi's wealth and success. But if this was Kōyō's intention, it remained unspoken; in any case, Saizō and Kōbai do not have much to suffer, for the former rejoins her lover while the latter receives a gratuity of one thousand yen. In a word there is no clear moral to be drawn from Sanninzuma or coherent point of view, and this in spite of the scattered passages and asides from the narrator that seem to imply the existence of such a moral or point of view. The explanation for this is not obvious, but it may be that Kōyō's half-hearted attempt to inject a moral tone into Sanninzuma was a response to Shōyō's stress on the importance of a moral point of view in shinbun-shōsetsu.

The conclusion that the above examination of Sanninzuma points to is that the writers of the Yomiuri editorials were right about some aspects of the novel but wrong to make these the criteria for a value judgement. Sanninzuma owed a great deal to the ninjōbon tradition and was only incidentally concerned with depicting the characteristics of the Meiji period. These features of the novel, however, could only serve as criteria on which to judge its worth if it were accepted that novels ought to deal with the contemporary world and to distance themselves from the fiction of the Tokugawa period as much as possible. And these were in fact the premises on which Shōyō's demands for the shinbun-shōsetsu were at least partially based. On other criteria, however, Sanninzuma could pass muster. Kōyō had chosen a plot that required the characters to be carefully differentiated, and in order to achieve this he used both the techniques he had

used before for revealing thoughts, and a narrator whom he allowed to comment on and describe his characters. Character rather than coincidence had an important part to play in the plot, for the personalities of the three mistresses are to some extent responsible for what happens to them in Sanninzuma.. Saizō is proud as a courtesan and is proud as a mistress: rather than attempt to win Katsuragi back once it becomes clear that she is being slighted, she decides to resume her relationship with Kikuzumi whatever the consequences. Kōbai's desire for security is more important to her than honesty, and her deceitful stratagem for regaining that security leads to her dismissal. And Oen's credulous simplicity allows others to trample on her but in the end it demands Asako's recognition and this leads to a permanent place for her with Asako.

The importance of Sanninzuma lies in the fact, which the writers of the two editorials seem not to have realised, that a novel based on some of the norms of Edo fiction might not be 'new' but it need not necessarily be of poor quality. Perhaps the most conspicuous shortcoming of Sanninzuma was Kōyō's failure to build the narrator's scattered comments into a consistent and coherent point of view, but this had nothing to do with Edo fiction. On the other hand, the attention to character in Sanninzuma derived from Kōyō's awareness of the possibilities afforded by the kind of plot that was commonly to be found in ninjōbon. Kōyō's contemporaries and successive generations of scholars and critics have tended to fault him to the extent that they believed him to be indebted to the fiction of the Tokugawa period, but Sanninzuma is good evidence

of Kōyō's ability to combine this debt with advances in his methods of characterization, and of his readiness to discard aspects of Tokugawa fiction that interfered with his aims.

CHAPTER SIX

Tajō takon and its implications

Tajō takon has proved to be more of a puzzle to the generations of its readers and critics than most of Kōyō's works. On the one hand, it represents the culmination of his hesitant dalliance with the so-called genbun-itchi style, it established de aru as the literary copula of modern Japan, and it has won acclaim as Kōyō's only protracted attempt at psychological fiction. These features have appealed to those ready to applaud signs of modernity in Kōyō's oeuvre. Masamune Hakuchō, for example, saw Tajō takon as the best of Kōyō's works, implicitly contrasting it with the "old morals, old ninjō, old tastes, and old diction" that most of Kōyō's fiction seemed to him to embody.[1] And on the other hand, the claims made for Tajō takon as a work of psychological realism have not always met with approval. Critics of this persuasion seem to prefer to look upon Konjiki yasha as Kōyō's masterpiece and to see Tajō takon as something of an aberration and quite untypical.[2] Tayama Katai (1871-1930) was quite unequivocal in his hostility to the work: he once declared that whatever realism there was in Tajō takon could be traced back to the works of Shikitei Sanba and Santō Kyōden and was not "the real thing".[3]

1 See his 'Kōyō Sanjin', Chūō kōron, XXII, No 8 (1907), pp. 46-47.
2 See for example, Terajima Tomoyuki, 'Tajo takon to Konjiki yasha', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XXIII, No 10 (1946), pp. 41-50.
3 Kindai no shōsetsu (Kindai Bunmei Sha, 1923), p. 74.

The debate about Tajō takon has, as Tosa Tōru has pointed out, not passed far beyond the stage of mottoes representing various points of view and cherished opinions.[4] The difficulty is that insufficient attention has been paid to the circumstances in which Kōyō wrote the work and this has made an hermeneutic approach to Tajō takon more hazardous than it need be. Tosa's study is so far the only one to attempt to explicate some of these factors in the background. Since his arguments are important, this chapter will begin by examining them in some detail and testing their validity.

Tajō takon was serialized in the Yomiuri shinbun from 26 February to 12 June 1896 and from 1 September to 9 December the same year. The day before the first instalment appeared the Yomiuri carried a short piece which announced, in rather puzzling language, that the serialization of Tajo takon would commence the following day. There can be no doubt that Kōyō wrote the piece himself: Hori Shizan, who wrote the preliminary announcements for almost all of Kōyō's novels serialized in the Yomiuri, recorded that he was ill in February 1896 and that Kōyō wrote the announcement for Tajō takon himself.[5] Furthermore, Tosa has drawn attention to the existence of published photographs of the manuscript draft of this announcement and to the fact that the hand is Kōyō's.[6] The announcement itself reads as follows.

4 'Tajō takon shiron', Kokugo to kokubungaku, LII, No 4 (1975), p. 12.
5 'Zappōran', p. 32.
6 'Tajō takon shiron'. p. 13.

> Tajō takon: Kōyō. This isn't a haikai; it isn't a zappō; it isn't a hon'an; and it isn't a gassaku. It really is a great creative work: remarkable ability has been applied, the brush has flown, and the ink has danced. If you want to know the outstanding works of 1896, you've got to read this carefully.[7]

Tosa notes that the words haikai, zappō, hon'an and gassaku appearing in the announcement had figured prominently in articles in Kokumin no tomo and other periodicals over the previous few years which had been critical of Kōyō.[8] A number of critics had expressed the view that Kōyō's powers as a novelist were on the wane and referred to his other literary activities in support of their assertions. There was indeed some justification for taking this view. In October 1895 Kōyō had joined with several other poets to form a haiku circle which they called the Shūseikai, and, as we have already seen in the previous chapter, he did write some zappō articles for the Yomiuri, as well as a novel that owed something to some of the Yomiuri's zappō. Also, a substantial proportion of his literary output in the three years preceding the initial appearance of Tajō takon had consisted of hon'an (adaptations) from the Decameron, the Arabian Nights, and the works of Zola and other writers.[9] There were also a number of so-called gassaku, or joint-works: the early novels of such of his followers as Izumi Kyōka (1873-1939), Oguri Fūyō (1875-1928),

7 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Shinshōsetsu yokoku', Yomiuri shinbun, 25 February 1896.
8 Tosa, 'Tajō takon shiron', p. 13. The most trenchant and influential of these articles was probably Miyazaki Koshoshi, 'Ken'yūsha oyobi sono sakka', Kokumin no tomo, No 277 (4 January 1896), pp. 27-28. This expounded the view that the Ken'yūsha's main failing was a lack of any ideology or sō (想).
9 For the details, see chapter eight.

and Tayama Katai were usually examined and 'corrected' by Kōyō before publication, and there was usually a reference to this on the title page.

In these circumstances, it is reasonable to take Kōyō's string of denials as a spirited reply to critics who were too eager to assume that his career as a novelist was at an end, especially since those denials preceded the serialization of a long work of fiction. However, Tosa has suggested that there are additional inferences to be drawn from the announcement, that can add to our understanding of the aims Kōyō had in mind for his new novel.

If taken at face value, the first two denials can only appear fatuous, whether or not they are taken as a reply to criticism. Tajō takon was of course not a short poem, and it is a priori likely that Kōyō had more to say than this. In a short magazine article titled 'Shōsetsu to haiku', which was published in 1894, Kōyō compared a scene from Martin Chuzzlewit with a haiku on a similar subject by Ikenishi Gonsui (1650-1722). He said of the haiku that it said little but implied a great deal, and observed that what was implicit in the haiku was detailed and explicit in the extract from Dickens.[10] Tosa argues that this understanding of the difference between the novel and the haiku underlay the first of Kōyō's denials.[11] Tajō takon was to rely not on what he saw as the haiku techniques of allusion and suggestion but on

10 'Shōsetsu to haiku', Taiyō, I, No 9 (1894), pp. 176-178.
11 'Tajō takon shiron', p. 15.

explicit and detailed narrative.

In a similar way the second denial can be taken to indicate that Kōyō was also rejecting the topical and sensational aspects of zappō and of novels like his own Sanninzuma. Tajō takon, suggests Tosa, was to be of universal rather than topical interest and was to be rooted in everyday life rather than scandal or sensation. The third and fourth denials need no further explanation, although it should be noticed that they represent an avowal of creativity. Tosa concludes from his examination of the four denials and their implications that the characteristics of Tajō takon are the result of a conscious choice on Kōyō's part, rather than the lapse they have sometimes been taken to be.[12] It is important now to see if these conclusions square with the text.

Tajō takon opens fourteen days after the death of Sumi Ryūnosuke's wife, Ruiko, and it is Ryūnosuke's grief that pervades the novel. The only other characters of importance are Hayama Seiya, his only friend, and Otane, Hayama's wife. Ryūnosuke has great difficulty trying to overcome his grief, and this leads him to move in with Hayama at the latter's suggestion. This step involves mastering his instinctive and unreasoned dislike of Hayama's wife. Ryūnosuke's attachment to the memory of his wife remains unabated, but he does come to change his mind about Otane. While Hayama is away on a trip, Ryūnosuke grows increasingly attached to Otane and the climax of the book comes when he disturbs her sleep in the early hours

12 'Tajō takon shiron', p. 16.

of one morning, much to her alarm. His aim is, however, not to seduce her, but to ask her to make him some tea and talk to him because that, he says, will make him feel happier. On his return, Hayama hears about Ryūnosuke's nocturnal visit to his wife from his aged father, who also has a room in the house. He does not suspect Otane of infidelity, but he does yield to pressure from his anxious father and tells Ryūnosuke that he has no choice but to ask him to move out. Ryūnosuke complies, although aggrieved that his honour should be called into question in this way, and moves to a nearby boarding house, where he hangs up pictures of both Ruiko and Otane.

The first paragraphs of the novel reveal the preoccupations of the whole and illustrate some of its characteristics, so the following translation of the first part of the opening chapter will serve as a basis for discussion.

> It was already the fourteenth day since Sumi Ryūnosuke had lost his wife. Out of sight is supposed to be out of mind, but he felt as if these fourteen days were yesterday, and sometimes he felt as if they were this morning, or even just now. And when he dwelt on it too much, he felt as if she were still alive. True, she had been ill and had passed away; she had become as cold as ice, and had blocked her beautiful eyes up tightly; she had been put in a coffin, and buried in the soil of Zōshigaya; she had become a plain wooden memorial tablet, and that is where she was now. So it was not a lie nor a dream. It was certain that she really had died. And there was no doubt that her corpse had been buried and that her figure had gone for ever, but in his heart his dear, dear wife Ruiko was still alive.
>
> Ryūnosuke was the sort of person that does not like very many people and in turn is not liked by many people. There was a man, his friend Hayama, and a woman, his wife Ruiko, and there was no one else in the world that he liked. Instead of liking a lot of people he liked just these two, so his affection for them was very strong. And he was so much in love with his wife that it was a little unsightly.
>
> First it was his wife, second his wife, and third,

> fourth and fifth too. If it was not for her, no day would ever have dawned for him. She was his life, and so much was this so that his colleagues had christened him 'Dr My Wife', but now she had died on him.
>
> The wife that he loved and treasured so much never thought of her husband in the same way. She was casual and conventional, but Ryūnosuke never felt in the slightest way dissatisfied, and believed this to be normal for women.[13]

The reader familiar with Kōyō's works would have noticed the studiously plain and repetitive vocabulary (omou 思ふ, sai 妻 and suku 好く for example), and the uncharacteristic lack of words of Chinese origin. But as an opening it is also noticeably different from those of Kōyō's other works, whether published before or after Tajō takon. Elsewhere, as a rule, Kōyō first gives the reader some idea of the setting. Thus the first lines of Irozange describe the isolated valley in which the nun lives, and those of Konjiki yasha describe the look of the streets in the capital over the New Year period, and then the party at which Kan'ichi and Miya are present. In Tajō takon, by contrast, the preoccupation is with mental processes, that is, with Ryūnosuke's grief, which is to dominate the whole book without undergoing any substantial change. And this preoccupation is all the more apparent from the fact that the novel commences some two weeks after the illness and death of Ruiko and never returns to discuss physical events like these. The lines above tell us very little about Ruiko, apart from the fact that she is dead, or about Ryūnosuke's appearance, dress, home or circumstances. Kōyō has virtually nothing to

13 KZ, V, 1-2.

say about any of these things throughout this long novel, of which the above passage is less than one part in three hundred. It is stated at one point that Ryūnosuke is a highly respected teacher of geology at an institute of the physical sciences in Tokyo, and it becomes apparent in the second half of the book that he has a beard, but there are few other details about him to glean.[14] The concentration on the mental processes of Ryūnosuke and, to a lesser extent, of the other characters thus has the result of leaving in doubt the physical details and, since they do not indulge in reminiscence, the events of their past lives.

Although our view of Ryūnosuke is restricted to his grief and his relationships with a few people involved in his domestic life rather than his career, Kōyō compensated for the narrow range of vision by dealing with the mental processes of his characters in great detail. The preoccupations apparent in the paragraphs above recur throughout the novel, and they characterize both the passages of monologue and and narrative. The dialogue too reflects this tendency, as will become apparent later. On the whole, then, it does seem likely that Kōyō's understanding of the difference between the novel and *haiku*, as expressed in his essay on the subject, lies behind the explicit and detailed narrative in *Tajō takon*.

It will be evident from the preceding that the topical character of *Sanninzuma* is also missing from *Tajō takon*. The only contemporary event with which it is possible to connect

14 *KZ*, V, 24 and 473.

Tajō takon is the death of Iwamoto Zenji's wife on 10 February 1896. Newspaper reports mentioned the widower's anguished grief, but the correspondence with Ryūnosuke's circumstances is far from exact. And while the circumstances of Katsuragi Yogorō in Sanninzuma were in their details common only to him and to the figures upon whom Kōyō based his portrait, there is nothing to make Ryūnosuke's fate unique or to associate it with any particular individual, living or dead. It is possible, for example to suppose that Kōyō's choice of plot was influenced by the Kiritsubo chapter of Genji monogatari. Kōyō read Genji monogatari in the first half of 1895, and Muraoka Tsunetsugu has argued that his reading of it had a part to play in the composition of both Tajō takon and Konjiki yasha.[15] Nevertheless, many other parallels could be cited for Ryūnosuke's grief, and there is nothing to connect that aspect of the book with Genji monogatari in particular.

So Tosa's arguments seem to be borne out by the text. Tajō takon is indeed characterized by a concern not with the adumbrative techniques of haiku and, incidentally, of the style used by Saikaku, but with explicit description, and there is in the novel less that is topical than universal and quotidian. If, then, the characteristics of Tajō takon are the result of a conscious choice on Kōyō's part, it is important to uncover the reasons behind his choice. First, however, there are a few other factors to consider, which help to make the nature of his

15 See 'Kōyō Sanjin to Genji monogatari', in Muraoka Tsunetsugu, (Zōtei) Nihon shisōshi kenkyū (Iwanami shoten, 1940), pp. 474-489. Kōyō's copy of Genji monogatari with his own annotations is apparently in Muraoka's possession.

choice clear. I have already mentioned in passing that the explicit and detailed narrative of Tajō takon relates not to material objects or physical settings so much as to states of mind, and it is the implications of this that I want to consider first. The second factor is the style Kōyō used for Tajō takon.

Behind Ryūnosuke's grief and the personal relationships that lie at the centre of the novel there are a number of explicit pointers to a theme of some importance. This theme is the conflict between what may loosely be described as the traditional or customary approach to love and marriage in Japan, which in the novel is embodied in Hayama, and an essentially more idealistic approach, which is personified by Ryūnosuke. Let us see how this theme is presented.

The strength of Ryūnosuke's attachment to Ruiko is stressed from the outset, as is clear from the passage quoted above. The narrator ensures that the reader does not overlook this or underestimate it by revealing Ryūnosuke's propensity to tears, his frequent visits to Ruiko's grave, his total lack of interest in his job, the world around him, other people and even his own body, and his tendency always to bring conversations around to the subject of Ruiko.[16] It soon becomes apparent from Ryūnosuke's views on the subject of remarriage that his attitude towards marriage and conjugal relationship is quite different from that of Hayama and the other people with whom he is in close contact. The first indication of this comes in a

16 KZ, V, 3-23.

conversation between Ryūnosuke and Hayama. The latter has urging Ryūnosuke to forget Ruiko and not to mention her name any more. Ryūnosuke's response is as follows.

> From your social point of view I'm just a child, I suppose. What you're talking to me about is the way everybody behaves. You're criticizing me by comparing me to everybody else. I don't know anything about 'everybody', but at least I have, to my fortune, got a fragment of sincerity in me that is unclouded by this 'everybody' you talk of.[17]

Ryūnosuke is not ashamed of the grief that Hayama and the reader have witnessed to the full, and feels instead that his very grief bespeaks a sincerity that is lacking in most people. He and Hayama have been talking about Ruiko and his attachment to her memory, so this sincerity evidently relates to his marriage and his feelings towards the wife he has lost. This becomes more apparent later in the work.

Once he reaches home, Hayama mentions briefly the extent of Ryūnosuke's grief, and Otane's immediate reaction is to conclude that this is a sign of "real conjugal affection". When, however, she hears of the tears and everything that Hayama has witnessed she changes her mind and agrees with her husband that Ryūnosuke loves his wife too much and that his reaction to his wife's death is excessive.[18] These two contrasting points of view continue to colour Otane's reaction to Ryūnosuke's behaviour throughout the book: his sincerity and other good qualities excite her admiration, but she feels that they do not

17 KZ, V, 37.
18 Ibid., 55 and 61-66.

accord with her notions of what is manly.

Hayama's understanding of Ryūnosuke's problems is characterized by his assumption that Ryūnosuke will remarry. Shortly after the passage quoted on the previous page Hayama thinks of mentioning the topic, but he refrains for fear of offending him. On a later occasion, however, he does say that Ryūnosuke would be well advised to pack up his home unless he means to remarry in the near future.[19] Ryūnosuke's response is to insist that he has no intention of ever marrying again. Moto, Ryūnosuke's maid, also assumes that he will remarry, but when she mentions the possibility to him he vehemently declares that it is out of the question, adding that Ruiko would have remained a widow had he died first. Moto argues that men and women are not governed by the same criteria and that it is not in the least wrong for a man to remarry after the death of his wife, but Ryūnosuke insists that the same applies to men as to women. He cannot understand, he says, why some men speak slightingly of their wives and care so little for them that they are quick to remarry if their wives happen to die: to forget one's wife quickly like that is not consonant with "real conjugal affection". It would be cruel to Ruiko to find another wife, and so he is determined not to remarry, whatever the inconvenience.[20]

The contrast between the views of Hayama and Ryūnosuke is stressed in the following chapter. Ryūnosuke visits the Hayama home late one night, only to find that his friend is out. Hayama, the reader is told, is out drinking with some company friends.

19 KZ, V, 86 and 224.
20 Ibid., 247-253.

Ryūnosuke is let into the house by Otane, who had already gone to bed. He keeps pressing her to tell him where Hayama has gone and she is hard put to it to reply for she feels that anyone else would have "understood" by this time. Ryūnosuke evidently does not realise that Hayama is probably spending the evening with geisha as well as friends. It does, however, occur to him that he never made Ruiko wait for him alone at night like this. When he asks Otane if Hayama stays away from the house often, she "smiles sadly and looks down".[21] From this chapter it is evident that Hayama, unlike Ryūnosuke, is content to spend evenings or nights away from home in pursuit of his own enjoyment, and that Otane wishes this were not so. And, given the importance that Ryūnosuke places on an equal and close marital relationship, it is not surprising to find that it is in this chapter that he begins to revise his opinion of Otane and first becomes aware that he has begun to see her in a new light. His feelings become clearer still the following evening, when he visits Hayama again and asks about his activities the previous night. The first thing Hayama says is that he was at his lover's, and this provokes Ryūnosuke to a display of shocked indignation, which turns to undisguised relief once Hayama admits that he was drunk and stayed the night with a friend.[22] The reader has no way of knowing if he is telling the truth, but what is clear is that Ryūnosuke is implacable in his disapproval of marital infidelity.

Soon after Ryūnosuke has moved into the Hayamas' house,

21 KZ, V, 255-271.
22 Ibid., 275-278.

Hayama and Otane have a discussion about what they can do to help him get over his grief and regain his health and colour. Otane, it transpires, has been filling Ryūnosuke with milk and good food in the belief that these will work the change they are hoping for. With an amused and mischievous air, Hayama suggests that the medicine Ryūnosuke needs is somewhat different. Otane, who can guess the sort of thing he has in mind, replies by saying that he should not lead Ryūnosuke into bad ways, but Hayama blithely goes on to say that he has met a geisha who is the spitting image of Ruiko and that he is thinking of getting Ryūnosuke to meet her. Otane does not approve of this plan, and says that both she and Ryūnosuke are "yabo", thus siding with Ryūnosuke on the issue of morality. The meeting with the geisha takes place later than night, but it is not a resounding success. Ryūnosuke is concerned only to get his hands on some food, and the geisha, who considers him a "yabo", shows much more interest in Hayama, and this gives Ryūnosuke the excuse he needs to flee the establishment.[23] This episode shows graphically how the attitudes of Hayama and Ryūnosuke differ on the subject of extramarital dalliance. The point is brought home to the reader yet again one evening when Hayama returns late from a party with company confederates. He makes a show of pretending that Ryūnosuke's influence has prompted him to take marriage more seriously and to value it more, and he addresses Otane with unaccustomed politeness. She is quick to realise that he is not sincere and rebukes him for making fun of her.[24]

23 KZ, V, 315-354.
24 Ibid., 408.

There is no need to cite any further instances in which these differing points of view become apparent. Those cited above are sufficient to demonstrate that the attitudes ascribed to Hayama and Ryūnosuke are presented consistently throughout Tajō takon and that the two characters stand for two opposing ways of thought. What may not be so apparent from the account above is the fact that there is a bias running through the book against Ryūnosuke and the way of thought he represents. The first sign that the narrator's sympathies are not wholly with Ryūnosuke and that Ryūnosuke is in some way deluded comes in the opening paragraphs when the narrator tells us that Ruiko's feelings for him were of quite a different order from his for her and adds that he "believed this to be normal for women". This can only be ironic: had Kōyō wished his narrator to present a sympathetic view of Ryūnosuke, if only for the opening section of the book, he could have continued in the same vein as the first paragraph, where epithets betray Ryūnosuke's point of view. Instead, the point of view is shifted quite dramatically away from Ryūnosuke in the second paragraph, as is particularly clear from the last sentence: "and he was so much in love with his wife that it was a little unsightly". The third paragraph maintains the external view of Ryūnosuke, telling us how his colleagues regard his infatuation for his wife.

The bias is reinforced by the opinions the other characters have of Ryūnosuke, and by their virtual unanimity. While the narrator concludes that childishness is at the root of much of Ryūnosuke's behaviour, his mother-in-law regards him as a henjin (變人; strange person, eccentric), and Hayama and Moto agree

with this judgement.[25] His behaviour prompts Otane to be astonished at how "strange" (hen) he is, and Ryūnosuke himself wonders if he is not mentally ill. The unfavourable impression of Ryūnosuke is strengthened by a number of incidents which seem designed to show him in a poor light. There is the embarrassing rendezvous with the geisha; his assumption that Hayama is going to take care of all the arrangements for the removal of his household effects; his enthusiasm for the portrait of Ruiko, which both Hayama and the narrator declare to be bad; and the episode in which he tries on Otane's ring and gets it stuck on his finger.[26] There are many more. Their effect is to undermine Ryūnosuke's credibility and respect in the eye of the reader, and the evident purposefulness behind this whole aspect of the book gives a foolish appearance to suggestions that Kōyō failed to depict a convincing tragedy in Tajō takon.[27] Tragedy was clearly not Kōyō's point.

The likely explanation for the consistently negative image which accompanies Ryūnosuke throughout the book is that it was intended to express a particular point of view, that is, disagreement with the kind of attitudes represented by Ryūnosuke. Ryūnosuke's belief in an equal and close marital relationship is not traced by Kōyō back to its origins, nor is there much about how it worked out in practice in his relations with Ruiko, but it is probably supposed to reflect the kind of ideas on marriage propounded by a number of people who wrote for the magazine Jogaku zasshi, and particularly Kitamura Tōkoku.

25 KZ, V, 28, 161, 175, and 209.
26 Ibid., 219 and passim; also 308-310, 402, and 476-477.
27 See Shimamura Hōgetsu et al., 'Tajō takon gappyō', Waseda bungaku, October 1897.

Christianity had a part to play in the emergence of these ideas, and so did supposed western practice in general, but whatever their ancestry Ryūnosuke's views were certainly new to Meiji Japan. In rejecting them Kōyō affirmed his belief in the view of marriage that was more usual in Japan.

As we have seen in earlier chapters, Kōyō had long been moving in the direction of a more authoritative narrator. In Sanninzuma he had used his narrator to present points of view but had been unwilling or unable to give his narrator a coherent theme or preoccupation. He managed to do this in Tajō takon, and at the same time he provided something of an answer to those who had been criticizing the supposed intellectual aridity of his works. For once, he had a discernible message.

The second of the two factors I want to consider is the style Kōyō used for Tajō takon, for it was the genbun-itchi style, which is to be found in none of the works I have previously dealt with. I shall first trace the course of Kōyō's interest in and reservations about the style, and then investigate why he should have adopted it for Tajō takon.

Most of what Kōyō had to say about the genbun-itchi style was uncomplimentary, and he was never able to commit himself to it, even when he knew himself to be in a minority. His earliest extant reference to the subject is a brief one to the style as practised by Yamada Bimyō, which appeared in his review of Bimyō's Natsukodachi.[28] His assertion there that the style has inherent weaknesses makes it clear that his subsequent expressions

28 'Shakan Bimyōsai cho Natsukodachi no hyōban', Garakuta bunko, No 7 (8 September 1888), p. 105. For the circumstances surrounding Bimyō's break with the Ken'yūsha and Kōyō's reaction to this, see Kōyō, 'Ken'yūsha no enkaku', pp. 63-64.

of discomfort with genbun-itchi were not prompted by anger at what he saw as Bimyō's betrayal of the Ken'yūsha late in 1888. In the 'sakusha iwaku' passage following the preface to Irozange he made his views more explicit and declared that "genbun-itchi is distasteful to me".[29] However, the clearest expression of his views came later the same year (1889) in one of a series of articles titled 'Dokusha hyōbanki', which appeared in Momochidori, an obscure and short-lived literary magazine published in Osaka. The third of these articles takes the form of a conversation between two girls, one an apologist for genbun-itchi and the other a defender of the gazoku-setchū style, the mixed style which draws mainly on the classical literary language but also admits some colloquialisms. The second girl refers to genbun-itchi as an alien language and one that is akin to the speech of prostitutes, and argues that it owes its popularity to the fact that it is easy to write. She says this in response to taunts from the genbun-itchi girl, who has urged her to keep up with the times and join the majority party: it is as well to remember, as Yamamoto Masahide has pointed out, that Kōyō was at this time the only member of the Ken'yūsha who was mainly interested in fiction but not experimenting with the genbun-itchi style.[30] The genbun-itchi goes on to retort that the gazoku-setchū is the style of those who are susceptible to the current nationalist fervour and are content

29 Irozange, p. All.
30 Yamamoto Masahide, 'Ozaki Kōyō no Dokusha hyōbanki', in Yamamoto, Kindai buntai hassei no shiteki kenkyū (Iwanami Shoten, 1965), p. 733. Yamamoto quotes long extracts from the relevant third instalment of Dokusha hyōbanki, but the complete text is to be found in Momochidori, No 4 (20 October 1889), pp. 2-18. To my knowledge, the Meiji Shinbun Zasshi Bunko in Tokyo University possesses the only extant copies of this rare magazine.

to look to the past for their inspiration. She also states that gazoku-setchū requires of writers an unhealthy preoccupation with style, that is, with the form rather than the content of their work. The gazoku-setchū girl replies at some length, starting out as follows.

> Does art just consist of the depiction of reality and the depiction of life [shashin shasei 寫眞寫生] ? . . . Now, even the mixed style [i.e., gazoku-setchū] depicts life and reality, but its strength is that it grasps the spirit of things. And, if you'll excuse me for saying so, this is what is meant by terms like inchi [韻致 elegance] and yojō [餘情 suggestiveness].[31]

The gazoku-setchū girl has the last word, for her opponent has no more arguments to bring to bear. It is therefore reasonable to concur with Yamamoto's view that Kōyō's sympathies lie with the gazoku-setchū girl. The arguments Kōyō put in the mouth of the genbun-itchi girl show that he was aware of some of the shortcomings of his favoured style, but the speech quoted above shows that he believed that "realistic depiction" was not all there was to a literary work of art and that gazoku-setchū could achieve as much as genbun-itchi and more. This understanding of Kōyō's preferences is reinforced by the opening section of his Genrokugurui, in which he rejects the derisive comments of genbun-itchi fanatics.[32]

Kōyō expressed similar views in later years, but he nevertheless tried his hand at genbun-itchi on a number of occasions. The first of these was Ninin nyōbō, which, as Yamamoto emphasized, Kōyō himself regarded as his first attempt at genbun-

31 Momochidori, No 4, pp. 11-13.
32 Kokumin shinbun, 8 May 1890, supplement, p. 2.

itchi. In the form in which it first appeared in the magazine Miyako no hana, this work comprised three distinct styles.[33] Kōyō used the gazoku-setchū style up to and including the second chapter of the second part, which appeared in November 1891. From the third chapter of January 1892, he adopted one of the prerequisites of the genbun-itchi style, the distinction between narrative and dialogue. This was, of course, not new to Kōyō, for it is to be found in such of his early works as Kyō ningyō and Irozange, both of which preceded his infatuation with the style of Saikaku. From the seventh chapter of the second part (April 1892) he also used the copula de aru. He was not the first to use this, and even after chapter seven he occasionally used nari, beshi and other bungotai forms, but his use of it in Ninin nyōbō and then in Tajō takon gradually spread to other members of the Ken'yūsha, and then to Futabatei and Katai before becoming the standard narrative copula.[34]

After Ninin nyōbō it was some time before Kōyō turned to genbun-itchi again, and in the meantime he wrote a number of works in other styles, amongst them Sanninzuma. He returned to his de aru brand of genbun-itchi with Tonari no onna (1893), Murasaki (1894) and Reinetsu (1894), and his opinions of the style were evidently undergoing a change. In 1895 he wrote a short essay entitled 'Ongyōjitsu', which was not published until after his death. In it he first describes the attitude he had towards genbun-itchi before trying his hand at it in Ninin nyōbō and confesses that he nourished a secret conviction that genbun-itchi was the style of the incompetent. His own

33 See Yamamoto, 'Genbun-itchi to Ozaki Kōyō', in Yamamoto, Genbun-itchi no rekishi ronkō (Ōfūsha, 1971), pp. 178-180.
34 Ibid., pp. 186-189.

experiments with it, he says, have persuaded him that it is not as easy as he thought, and have opened his eyes to some of its strong points, notably its ability to "mirror reality" (shashinkyō 寫眞鏡).[35] His attempt, however, to put his understanding of genbun-itchi to the test in Reinetsu had failed and he had left the work unfinished. It failed, as he himself realised, partly because he still retained lingering traces of Saikaku's style, and partly because his understanding of genbun-itchi was far from satisfactory. Perhaps for this reason, he did not return to genbun-itchi until Aobudō (september 1895) and Tajō takon. But even after he had completed Tajō takon he was still unsure about genbun-itchi and was again questioning its value. At a speech to the Genbun-itchi-kai in 1900 he admitted that genbun-itchi sounded vulgar to him, although he felt that it was ideal for scientific and other writing of a practical nature, and he even went on to suggest that the prospects for genbun-itchi were bleak. He had not, however, abandoned genbun-itchi altogether, for even while working on Konjiki yasha he was reportedly contemplating writing another genbun-itchi novel, which his death prevented him from writing.[36]

This then was the background to Kōyō's choice of the genbun-itchi style for Tajō takon and it remains to inquire into his reasons for the choice. There can be little doubt that one of his motives was related to the contrast in the work between Hayama and Ryūnosuke, which I have examined earlier

35 'Ongyōjitsu', in Shinoyama Ginyō and Hoshino Bakujin, eds, Kōyō ibun (Ryūbunkan, 1910), p. 25; a reference on the following page makes it possible to assign this essay confidently to 1895 - Kōyō refers to "kyonen no Murasaki".

36 Yamamoto, 'Genbun-itchi to Ozaki Kōyō', p. 185.

in this chapter. The dialogue constantly reflects this contrast, as the following will show. The first extract takes place when Ryūnosuke is discussing with Hayama his planned removal from home. Hayama reminds him about the practical steps that will have to be taken, and the extract starts with Ryūnosuke's reply.

> "But that sort of thing's out of the question for me of course."
>
> "But it's not a daimyō who's moving, is it? And whether you're the lord or the retainer there's only one of you, so it's surprising that you're happy to be so vague about it. If your lordship is not going to apply yourself to the task, who, may I ask, is going to come and do it for you?"
>
> Ryūnosuke didn't even grin. "But I naturally planned from the beginning to have you do that sort of thing."
>
> "Uh!" Hayama opened his eyes deliberately wide. "Forgive me for asking this of your lordship, but could it be that the 'you' your lordship mentioned refers to Hayama Seiya?"
>
> "Why?"
>
> "What d'you mean, 'why'? Hayama must decline, I'm afraid."
>
> "Why, why, why!" Ryūnosuke was suddenly confused. "That's not on, it's not on."
>
> "How am I meant to know what's not on?"
>
> "Of course it's not on. It's already been decided, that's why."
>
> "Who's decided!"
>
> Ryūnosuke stared at the other's calm face: "That's a nuisance, a nuisance for me."[37]

Snatches of dialogue like this go a long way towards reinforcing the narrator's assessment of Ryūnosuke as childish and the view of the other characters that he is a _henjin_. Ryūnosuke's reaction to Hayama's reminder about the practical steps to be taken is not to ask for Hayama's assistance but to state that they are beyond him, with no further explanation. In a jocular way, Hayama asks what he means. Ryūnosuke will not be amused and makes it clear that he had been assuming Hayama's help all along.

37 _KZ_, V, 309-310.

Hayama is not angry and it turns out later that he is willing to help Ryūnosuke and had even been expecting something like this. He continues in a jocular vein, but Ryūnosuke's reaction is not to apologize or to make his request. Instead he utters a defensive "why", which he then repeats three times before making a chiding objection, which he also repeats. At the end of the conversation, Ryūnosuke again fails to address himself directly to Hayama's remarks and questions, and instead of admitting that the decision has been his all along, he just says "komaru" and then says it again.

Ryūnosuke's tendency to repeat words or expressions, to resort frequently to personal pronouns, especially boku, and to respond to remarks indirectly or not at all is apparent throughout Tajō takon. His peculiarities of speech sometimes assume comic proportions, as, for example, when he tries a second time to make his way into Otane's room for spiritual consolation.

> The moment the fusuma opened, her father-in-law [who has decided to sleep in the same room as Otane to put a stop to Ryūnosuke's nocturnal rambles] sat up without thinking and said in a deliberately cold manner,
>
> "Who's that!"
>
> Ryūnosuke was as stunned as if he had been cut in two, and all he said was,
>
> "Um", without saying anything more.
>
> "Who's that!"
>
> "It's . . . it's me."
>
> "Who's that!"
>
> "I'm, er, sorry . . . ." And before he had finished he closed the fusuma to.[38]

The speech recorded by Kōyō in each of these scenes, quite apart from his actual behaviour, shows Ryūnosuke in a poor light, and it was to depict this, I suggest, that Kōyō turned to the

38 KZ, V, 511.

genbun-itchi style in Tajō takon. This explanation, however, accounts only for the separation of dialogue and narrative, without which Ryūnosuke's speech mannerisms could not be made apparent. It does not account for the use of genbun-itchi in the narrative, which relies on the copula de aru rather than bungotai equivalents, and on comparatively plain language. In Konjiki yasha, for example, the dialogue is visually distinguished from the narrative, but the latter is anything but genbun-itchi. It is, however, likely that at this stage Kōyō felt that if dialogue and narrative were to be distinguished a literary narrative style could only be out of harmony with colloquial dialogue. This seems to be what happened in Ninin nyōbō, where a few chapters after introducing a visually distinct dialogue Kōyō changed the narrative style as well. An alternative or additional explanation may lie in the fact that a good deal of the narrative in Tajō takon represents the unadorned thoughts of the characters or the narrator's accounts of their thoughts. These passages are sometimes akin to monologue and are much closer to dialogue than the passages of physical description, which are in any case rare in Tajō takon; they are sometimes set apart through the use of a special kind of quotation marks.[39]

The nature of the choices made by Ozaki Kōyō when writing Tajō takon should now be quite clear. They ranged from a rejection of the adumbrative techniques of haiku and Saikaku to a determined attempt at the genbun-itchi style. The final task is to explore possible reasons for these choices. The main reason given by Tosa is that Kōyō was influenced by Maupassant's view

39 For example, KZ, V, 510-511.

of the novel as expressed in 'Le Roman', which first appeared in Le Figaro and then took its place as the preface to his novel Pierre et Jean.[40]

It appears from the reminiscences of Tayama Katai that Kōyō read it in about 1894, probably in English translation, and that he was much impressed by what he called Maupassant's "light touch" (Kōyō's English).[41] The crucial section of 'Le Roman' in Tosa's argument is as follows.

> En somme, si le Romancier d'hier choisissait et racontait les crises de la vie, les états aigus de l'âme et du coeur, le Romancier d'aujourd'hui écrit l'histoire du coeur, de l'âme et de l'intelligence à l'état normal. Pour produire l'effet qu'il poursuit, c'est-à-dire l'émotion de la simple réalité et pour dégager l'enseignement artistique qu'il en veut tirer, c'est-à-dire la révélation de ce qu'est véritablement l'homme contemporain devant ses yeux, il devra n'employer que des faits d'une vérité irrécusable et constante.[42]

Tosa argues that the import of these sentences could reasonably be applied to the literary world of Japan in the mid-1890s. He suggests that in a Japanese context, "le Romancier d'hier" could be understood to apply to the so-called kannen-shōsetsu and hisan-shōsetsu of Kōyō's associates Izumi Kyōka (1873-1939), Kawakami Bizan (1869-1908) and Hirotsu Ryūrō (1861-1928).

Kannen-shōsetsu, as they were christened by Shimamura Hōgetsu, first made their appearance in 1895. The most well-known representatives of the genre are Kyōka's Yakō junsa and Gekashitsu, which were published in literary magazines in April and June

40 Tosa, 'Tajō takon shiron', pp. 19-21.
41 Ibid., pp. 19-20.
42 Guy de Maupassant, Pierre et Jean (Albin Michel, Paris, n.d.), p. 14.

1895 respectively, but a number of other works published at about the same time were also held to share the characteristics of the genre and these included Bizan's Shokikan and Uraomote, of February and August 1895. Common to all of these works was a high degree of concentration on one crucial incident that will affect the lives of several, if not all, characters. Thus in Yakō junsa, a policeman, who is obsessed with his duties to the point that he feels he must fulfil them to the letter, sacrifices his life in an utterly hopeless bid to save the life of the man who is standing in the way of his marriage. And in Shokikan a government official uses his position to offer illegal gain to a man in order to prise the man's daughter away from her lover and make her his own. All in all the kannen-shōsetsu, and the usually crueller hisan-shōsetsu and shinkoku-shosetsu that followed them, do indeed seem to be concerned with "les crises de la vie" along with Maupassant's "Romancier d'hier".

The remainder of Tosa's argument, however, seems to be on shakier ground.[43] In the first place, there is no evidence to suggest that Kōyō was in any way inspired to write Tajō takon by a desire to express disagreement with the kind of fiction represented by kannen-shōsetsu. Had Kōyō had such a desire, it is likely that he would have made this clear, for in the advertisement for Tajō takon he addressed himself directly to his critics, as we have seen. Secondly, although Tajō takon is clearly not preoccupied with "les crises de la

43 Tosa, 'Tajō takon shiron', pp. 17-19.

vie" to the extent that the kannen-shōsetsu were, it is equally clearly not altogether without such elements. The importance in Tajō takon of Ruiko's death and the crisis at the end of the book render the expression "l'état normal" quite inappropriate. Thus Tajō takon does not seem to correspond as closely with Maupassant's description of the novelist of today as Tosa would have us believe.

On the other hand, it does seem likely that Tajō takon owes something to Kōyō's growing interest in western fiction. Tosa has drawn attention to the overall similarity of the plot with that of Pierre et Jean.[44] In both a crisis threatens as a result of a death: in Tajō takon it is Ruiko's death and the crisis involves Ryūnosuke's relationship with Otane, and in Pierre et Jean a woman dies leaving her fortune to the younger of her two sons, which upsets family relationships. In both calamity is averted and things return to what they were before. Again, as Tosa has pointed out, the plots of Tajō takon and Zola's La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret (1875) have a number of points in common. Tayama Katai recalls in his Tokyo no sanjūnen that on his first visit to Kōyō in 1891 he was shown a copy of an English translation of the novel bearing the title Abbé Mouret's Transgression. Kōyō is then alleged to have spoken as follows.

> He [i.e., Zola] is apparently an author with a good reputation. It's very detailed, really what he writes is very detailed. He takes as many as three or four pages to write of the interior of one room. It's something you can't find in Japanese literature at all. . . . As for the plot, it is very simple and just describes

44 'Tajō takon shiron', p. 14.

> the process by which an abbot falls in love with an innocent young girl after an illness. His psychology as he is gradually drawn on by love is described in great detail. Literature in Japan must follow this path too.[45]

And according to Uchida Roan (1868-1929), Kōyō was a particularly avid reader of Zola's works and "read works like La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret over and over again and made a great fuss about how good it was".[46] It was evidently the psychological detail and simplicity of plot that Kōyō was attracted to in this novel, and these were features of Tajō takon that we have already examined in connection with Kōyō's beliefs about the nature of the novel. And just as La Faute traces the process by which the abbot falls in love while recovering from an illness, so does Tajō takon trace the process by which Ryūnosuke falls in love with Otane after his bereavement. Whether the similarities were fortuitous or deliberate is hard to say, but it does on balance seem probable that Kōyō's understanding of the western fiction he had read by this time and admired exerted some influence on Tajō takon.

In conclusion, it must be said that Tajō takon too was a mixture of the old and the new, with the latter dominant. The only expression of the old relates not to the techniques of Kōyō's fiction but to the implications of the characterization. In Tajō takon Kōyō rejected the views on marriage of such writers as Tōkoku, Shimazaki Tōson, and Yosano Akiko and reaffirmed his belief in an unchanged and less idealistic

45 Tayama Katai zenshū, fifteen volumes (Bunsendō Shoten, 1974), XV, 486.

46 Meiji no sakka (Chikuma Shobō, 1941), p. 91. The whole question of Kōyō and western fiction will be dealt with in chapter eight.

conception of marriage. On the other hand, the style he used was new to Meiji Japan and the simplicity of the plot had few parallels in the fiction of the Tokugawa and Meiji periods, with the conspicuous exception of Futabatei's Ukigumo. In both of these two last respects Konjiki yasha seems closer to the old than to the new, but this does not necessarily make Tajō takon a better, or a worse, novel. Each reveals a different facet of Kōyō's interests at the time.

CHAPTER SEVEN

An image of society and a return to sentimentality

Konjiki yasha quite simply caused a sensation. It was serialized intermittently in the Yomiuri shinbun from 1 January 1897 to 11 May 1902 before the final part appeared in the magazine Shinshōsetsu in the first three months of 1903, and the frequent gaps in the serialization prompted letters of protest to the paper.[1] It was not long before its several parts appeared in book form and they were published in impression after impression; and it went on to inspire countless versions for stage and screen, some of which added original touches of their own to the story.[2] Although Kōyō died before he was able to bring the work to a close, the story and especially the celebrated scene on the beach at Atami are familiar even today to Japanese who have never read a single word Kōyō wrote. Whatever we may think of the work itself, its indisputable popularity throws interesting light on the nature and tastes of the contemporary reading public. I shall return to this topic at the end of the chapter and consider first Kōyō's plans for the novel, his themes, possible sources, and the narrative structure of the work.

In a conversation Kōyō had in May 1897 with Gotō Chūgai and Ihara Seiseien, which was later contained in Dagyokushū,

1 Tosa Tōru, 'Konjiki yasha shoshutsu keisai oyobi genkōbon taishōhyō', Bungei to shisō, No 38 (February 1974), pp. 31-32.
2 Yasuda Kōami (pseud.) and sixteen others, 'Konjiki yasha jōchūgehen gappyō' (hereafter 'Gappyō'), Geibun, No 2 (August 1902), pp. 106ff.

Kōyō stated that he habitually drew up only the barest outline of a novel before starting to write. In the case of Konjiki yasha, he said, this outline was simply that "[a character's] personality changes and [he] becomes a cruel usurer".[3] Nevertheless, it seems that he did in fact make quite detailed plans for Konjiki yasha, which is by far the longest of his works, and note down ideas for later development. These jottings have been preserved and some of them have been reprinted several times. They were, however, in the possession of Katsumoto Seiichirō at the time of his death, like so much other material relating to Kōyō, and so it is not possible to verify his arguments for the dating of these plans, since the arguments hinge upon the order of pieces in the notebooks Kōyō used. Katsumoto chose only to reprint selected passages.[4]

The first of the passages outlining Kōyō's plans for the novel bears the title 'Jotei chikushō' and, according to Katsumoto, it dates from some time between July 1896 and January 1897, the month in which the first instalments of Konjiki yasha appeared in the Yomiuri shinbun. 'Jotei chikushō' reads as follows.

> Usury because of love.
> Disappointed in love as has insufficient gold and jumps to conclusion that gold is all there is to the world.
> Choosing to fall into devilish ways, spends ten years.
> Having accumulated a fortune of more than two thousand

3 Dagyokushū, in Kindai bungaku kaisō shū (NKBT 60), p. 52.
4 Katsumoto, ed., 'Konjiki yasha fukuan oboegaki', Ozaki Kōyō zenshū (Chuō koron sha, 1941), VI, 545-619.

> yen, undergoes sudden awakening one morning. (Saves couple from suicide necessitated by money; gets sudden idea and advertises help for couples driven to suicide; saves lives of more than fifty and ends his life without a farthing.)[5]

As with many of the fragments contained in Kōyō's notebooks, 'Jotei chikushō' covers more ground than Kōyō had time to write before his death, but it does prompt a few observations. Firstly, the use of the word ōgon (gold) in the passage to refer to money makes it clear that the title probably signifies a demon that is money or gold incarnate, rather than to twin demons of gold and sex, as has sometimes been suggested.[6] It is possible to take the title as an allusion either to Kan'ichi, the hero, as a personification of monetary greed or to a demon supposed to symbolize that greed in both of the main characters, but in either case Kōyō's concern with money as an evil force is apparent. Secondly, 'Jotei chikushō' reveals the role that lack of money has to play in the broken love affair. This is an important point, because it gives the lie to suggestions that a devious plan is behind Miya's decision to marry her rich suitor and that Kōyō intended to expose this plan in the unwritten sections of Konjiki yasha.[7] Confirmation of this point is to be found in another fragment which is of uncertain date but probably written well after the serialization of the novel had

5 'Konjiki yasha fukuan oboegaki', p. 547.
6 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', p. 122.
7 For a discussion of this issue, see Tosa Tōru, 'Konjiki yasha shōken', Kashiigata (Fukuoka Joshi Daigaku Bungakubu), No 15 (September 1969), pp. 62-70. Tosa inclines to the view that Miya is supposed to have a plan in mind to acquire Tomiyama's money, dispose of Tomiyama and then marry Kan'ichi. If this is the case, it is astonishing to find no mention of such an important aspect of the plot in Kōyō's uncharacteristically detailed plans for the novel.

commenced. This states that "he [i.e., Kan'ichi] was earlier humiliated because he had no money but now he has been able to recover his self-esteem because he has that money".[8]

The portion of Konjiki yasha that Kōyō managed to write before his death conforms quite closely to his outline for the novel. The heroine is Miya, the Shigisawas' only child, and she draws superlative praise from the narrator, unlike the female characters in Tajō takon. Living with her in her parents' home is a student named Kan'ichi, whose parents are dead. The Shigisawas took Kan'ichi in because they were in his parents' debt. It has long been understood that Miya and Kan'ichi will in due course marry, and it later transpires that their intercourse has been sexual as well as social. However, the reader is first introduced not to Kan'ichi but to Tomiyama Tadatsugu, a wealthy young man who has inherited his wealth and who is the owner of a name that attests to his financial pedigree (It is written 富山咱繼: the surname means 'mountain of wealth' and the tsugu in his given name means 'inherit' or 'succeed to'.)..When the Shigisawas receive an offer of marriage from this Tomiyama, they accept it with alacrity and Miya does not object. Miya and her mother go down to Atami, and Mr Shigisawa is left with the unenviable task of explaining to Kan'ichi what has happened. Kan'ichi finds it hard to believe that Miya has given her consent of her own free will, and he travels down to Atami to see her. He learns there that she really has decided to marry Tomiyama and is not opposed to the marriage at all. She insists

8 'Konjiki yasha fukuan oboegaki', p. 548.

that she has something private to tell him, and it is this that has given rise to the speculation that Miya has a plan of some kind. But Kan'ichi does not stop to listen, and after kicking her to the ground, runs off to the sand dunes and a spell of anger and self-pity. The second part of the novel takes the reader several years forward. Kan'ichi has now become a usurer, to the disgust of his friends, and Miya, who did in fact marry Tomiyama as planned, now regrets the decision she made and is overwhelmed at first just by the unhappiness that her predicament has brought upon her and then by the knowledge that her husband is being unfaithful to her. A number of scenes in the middle of the book serve to illustrate the vindictive cruelty with which Kan'ichi pursues his debtors on the one hand, and Miya's distress on the other. In time Kan'ichi comes to hear of Miya's plight, but in spite of friends who intercede for her he refuses to have anything to do with her or to show her any pity, and he tears up the letters she sends him. Towards the end of the book Kan'ichi's attitude begins to soften and the final scenes show his ruthlessness beginning to melt away. For some days he has been troubled by worries and these have culminated in a dream in which he forgives Miya but is too late to prevent her from killing herself. He takes himself off to a hot-spring resort to rest and in his hotel room he overhears a couple in the next room planning to commit suicide together. He interrupts them just at the moment when they are on the point of taking the poison they have prepared, and he asks to hear their story. He learns that the girl's name is Aiko and that she is a Shinbashi geisha. Tomiyama has been visiting her

constantly and is determined to redeem her from her geisha house against her will. Her companion, Sayama, has had to embezzle money from his employer to meet his debts and out of loyalty to Aiko has refused to marry his employer's daughter, although he has been offered a pardon in exchange for doing so. In order to cover the costs of redeeming Aiko and repaying Sayama's debt to his employer, they need a sum of money which it is beyond them to acquire, and so they have resolved to kill themselves. Once he has heard their story Kan'ichi is impressed by their loyalty and devotion to each other and he undertakes to provide them with all the money they need. The novel concludes with a letter from Miya, which Kan'ichi is surprised to find himself opening and reading instead of throwing away. In her letter Miya says that she is no longer afraid of death although she still feels tied to the world, and she makes it clear that she wishes she were married to Kan'ichi. At this point, Kōyō became too ill to continue.

Kōyō expressed his understanding of the themes he had dealt with in Konjiki yasha at the end of the joint review that appeared in the magazine Geibun after the publication of the first three parts of the novel.

> In practice there are two great powers [Kōyō used the English word] in the world of men, and they preserve the unity of society. Should you ask what they are, they are of course love and gold. But in my opinion the strength of gold is only momentary [English word], and however powerful it may be, it cannot preserve that strength indefinitely. But love, by contrast, controls life eternally and without change, I think. In other words, it is love that binds life together. This is what I wanted to write about in this book. That is, Kan'ichi's

> life is a particular representation of the struggle between love and gold. . . . I wanted to depict a Meiji woman. So Miya is a personification of the Meiji type of woman. But if she were an ordinary Meiji woman she would probably break off all past social relationships once married to someone like wealthy Tomiyama, would become his wife, and would discard Kan'ichi. It was with the intention of making her a woman who surpasses the Meiji woman that I gave her such fervent feelings of regret.9

Kōyō's concern to depict not the inner and severely circumscribed world of Tajō takon but a fictional world that is more directly connected with contemporary society is clearly apparent from this passage, and it was made forcefully explicit in the opening lines of the novel. The first two paragraphs describe the quiet streets of the capital on the third night of the New Year and the cold, stormy weather that has set in. The opening sentence of the third paragraph directs the reader's attention elsewhere: "Someone standing in the midst of all this might well wonder how this lonely, dark vista could contain the busy world, society, the capital and the streets".[10]

The remainder of the first chapter goes on to introduce the themes of riches and love in the person of the villain of the piece, Tomiyama. The scene is a card-games party, and the reader encounters the first of the novel's principal characters as he pulls up at the door in a rickshaw: he is described as a shinshi (gentleman), and references to his fur coverings and the smell of his cigars support the implication that he is a wealthy man of some bearing. Before describing his impact on the party, the narrator first introduces Miya. When Tomiyama enters the

9 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', pp. 137-138.
10 Konjiki yasha, in Ozaki Kōyō shū (NKinBT 5), p. 54; this is a critical edition noting textual variations and points of difficulty.

room, the narrator spends several lines describing his appearance and noting such signs of his wealth as his gold watch-chain and gold-rimmed glasses.[11] It is noticed by the party that he is also wearing a gold ring with a large diamond set in it. His wealth is his most outstanding characteristic as far as the narrator is concerned. It also seems to be so for the onlookers, for eleven of their number remark in rapid succession upon the size and value of the diamond.[12] The overall impression the reader has of Tomiyama's wealth is confirmed by a brief account of his pedigree from the narrator, who tells the reader that Tomiyama is the heir of a wealthy self-made man who has founded a bank and is now a city councillor. His name is said to be on the lips of all the girls, and Miya's on the lips of all the boys present, so the stage is set for their future marriage. Two passages at the end of the chapter throw a little more light on Tomiyama. One is a conversation between Tomiyama and his host, in the course of which it becomes clear that Miya has caught his fancy and Tomiyama enquires into her background. And the other is a concluding section of narrative which informs the reader that Tomiyama has been searching for a bride for over a year since his return from England, that he is fastidious enough to have turned down more than twenty possible matches so far, and that his sole reason for coming to the party was his eagerness to find a bride. So by the end of the first chapter the reader knows both Tomiyama and Miya, has a good idea of Tomiyama's means, and has good reason to suspect that

11 Konjiki yasha, p. 58.
12 Ibid., pp. 60-61.

Miya could expect to have satisfied his fastidious tastes since he is showing so much interest in her.

It is only in the following chapter that the reader first encounters Kan'ichi, the hero of the novel. To the surprise of all present, Miya leaves the party in the company of a boy in his mid-twenties wearing college uniform, who has been inconspicuous for most of the evening. At the party, it is stated, they had behaved distantly towards each other and consequently nobody had realised that they were a pair. In the course of their dialogue once they have left the party and are on their way home, Kan'ichi harps on his dislike of Tomiyama and wonders aloud if Miya does not find him and his wealth attractive. Concluding the chapter, the narrator asks what will become of their relationship in the future, and adds that Kan'ichi is waiting to enter university in the summer and is to be married to Miya. So the narrator leaves the reader feeling uncertain about the extent of their commitment to each other, for he has given several indications that all is not well.

The next chapter goes into Kan'ichi's circumstances and explains how he comes to be living in the Shigisawa household. But towards the end of the chapter the narrator turns to consider the question of Miya's feelings for Kan'ichi, and once more what he has to say tickles the reader's curiosity about the subsequent development of the plot.

> Should she marry that professor [i.e., Kan'ichi], or the forty-year-old hospital director [who has recently proposed marriage to her]? The respected position of the latter would be beyond comparison with marrying a

> B.A. and succeeding to the Shigisawa estate. Once she had embraced such a desire, it grew with her years, and she was constantly dreaming of it even in the day-time. She believed and never doubted that it would sooner or later fall to her natural lot for a respected man, or a wealthy man, or a famous man to discover her, place her in a bejewelled palanquin and marry her.13

By this time, of course, the reader, but not Kan'ichi, already knows that such a man of substance is indeed interested in the prospect of marrying her.

Subsequent chapters keep the suspense in tune, with further passages intimating to the reader the course of action Miya will be likely to follow. Money enters the arena again when Mr Shigisawa endeavours to soften the blow of losing Miya by reminding Kan'ichi that he will continue as before to be the heir to the family wealth. He also states that the most important thing for Kan'ichi is to complete his studies, travel abroad and become a man of substance. On hearing the news Kan'ichi restrains the anger and contempt he feels, out of consideration for the fact that Shigisawa is to him "a benefactor greater even than a god",[14] but a passage of something approximating to interior monologue reveals some of his feelings to the reader. From this it is clear that Kan'ichi is particularly indignant at what he feels to be a sullied world and at Shigisawa's expectation that he should "sell a wife to buy a doctorate".[15] Later at Atami, when he realises that Miya has freely given her consent to Tomiyama's proposal, he declares that "however much of a beggar samurai's orphan I may be, I don't intend to go travelling to

13 Konjiki yasha, p. 71.
14 Ibid., p. 89.
15 Ibid., p. 92.

the West with the money I've sold my wife for", and concludes that "it's greed that's in your heart, then, isn't it, it's money".[16] Before leaving he admits that he cannot compare with Tomiyama for wealth but reminds Miya that money cannot buy happiness; marital harmony, he says, depends not on money but on love and he urges Miya to bear this in mind before marrying Tomiyama.

It is evident, then, that this first part of the novel demonstrates Kōyō's thesis that money can be possessed of great power to influence people. And as one of the contributors to the joint review pointed out, the descriptions of Miya's dress in the early chapters bear witness to her extravagant tastes and so show that she is susceptible to the temptations offered by the prospect of wealth.[17] That the power of money, albeit great, is only momentary is illustrated in the remainder of the book as Miya becomes disillusioned with her worldly marriage and regrets the choice she made putting money before love. And so we see that money is ultimately less powerful than love.

The overall scheme may thus correspond quite closely with Kōyō's own views on the relative strengths of love and money to influence lives, but so far we have only looked at the way in which Miya betrays love for money. What are we to make of Kan'ichi's career as a usurer? Amongst his parting words to Miya at Atami is the declaration that he will spend the rest of his life as an akuma (demon) and will eat the flesh of beasts like her.[18] The next part of the book opens four years later when Kan'ichi

16 Konjiki yasha, p. 111.
17 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', pp. 117-118.
18 Konjiki yasha, p. 115.

has long since left the Shigisawa household, his adopted home, has broken off with his friends and become a usurer. As a number of contributors to the joint review observed, there is however no account of the process by which Kan'ichi becomes a usurer nor, and this is a more critical point, of his motives for turning to such a profession.[19] Kan'ichi does give some account of the process to Mitsue, a fellow usurer who makes repeated but unsuccessful attempts to capture Kan'ichi's affections. He states on that occasion that he once had a terrible experience that made him want to kill the person responsible and then die himself: greed (yoku 慾), he says, vanquished giri (in other words, Miya's obligation to remain faithful to Kan'ichi, who was informally betrothed to her), and money brought about the defeat of ninjō and giri. He adds that he has had enough of human fickleness and feels now that money is more trustworthy than people.[20] So although the reader has here been given a thorough understanding of Kan'ichi's feelings after being rejected by Miya, there is no such account of the feelings and motives that lead him to take up usury, and the reader has no choice but to attribute the move to an access of self-pity or to some other more or less irrational impulse.

This very vagueness about Kan'ichi's motivation suggests that Kōyō was less interested in Kan'ichi's character from a psychological point of view than in the nature of his career as a usurer. One of the reviewers drew attention to the fact that a usurer was an appropriate symbol for modern Japan[21], and it does

19 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', pp. 88, 111, 115, and 126.
20 Konjiki yasha, pp. 138-139.
21 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', p. 130.

seem likely that Kōyō made a usurer of Kan'ichi precisely because he wanted to tie his novel more closely to the world in which he lived than he had done in the case of Tajō takon. In the first place, the ways of usurers and the distress they caused were quite familiar to Kōyō. As Shiota Ryōhei and others have pointed out, several members of the Ken'yūsha were at one time or another not only in debt to usurers but also having difficulty with their repayments.[22] And the idea of depicting Japanese usurers in a novel may first have been suggested to him by one of the two literary editorials that appeared in the Yomiuri during the serialization of Sanninzuma. The author of 'Chikagoro no bungakkai' had recommended learning from the description of Fagin in Oliver Twist to depict Japanese usurers.[23]

Secondly, there is the evidence of the announcement for Konjiki yasha that appeared in the Yomiuri on 23 December 1896. This described the novel in the following terms.

> Squalid streets at night; he sucks people's blood and bites their bones; treachery, deception, brutality, villainy; when the world spots a usurer it sees a monstrous devil. Kōyō Sanjin will soon be depicting the truth about them with his developed and supple style, revealing all in a kaleidoscopic plot. The demon will breathe out fire and the wind and rain will smell of blood; beauties will weep with emotion, and flowers and the moon will scowl. If the ink splashes and the brush flies, the arrow will pierce his heart; fresh blood will be in profusion, and an apparition will bewail the night.[24]

This passage refers of course to Kan'ichi's activities as a usurer and so bears no connection whatsoever with the first part of Konjiki yasha, which was serialized from 1 January to

22 Shiota Ryōhei, 'Konjiki yasha no honbun seiritsu ni tsuite', in Shiota, Meiji bungaku ronkō (Ōfūsha, 1970), p. 424.
23 See above, pp. 133-134.
24 Quoted in Honma, Zoku Meiji bungaku shi, tenth edition (Tōkyōdō, 1964), p. 337.

23 February 1897. Instead of referring to Kōyō's overall concerns in the novel, as the announcement for Tajō takon did, it draws the attention of potential readers to just one aspect of it. This emphasis on the more sensational aspects of Konjiki yasha, on the scenes of violence and cruelty perpetrated by or upon usurers, undoubtedly owes a good deal to the types of fiction, written mainly by Ken'yūsha associates, that were proving popular in the last five years of the century. The early manifestations of this trend towards stories with a component of violence or cruelty were the so-called kannen-shōsetsu of Izumi Kyōka and Kawakami Bizan, which I discussed in the previous chapter. Their lead was followed by Hirotsu Ryūrō (1861-1928), who had been a Ken'yūsha member since 1889 and who specialized in fiction dealing with sad or tragic topics. One of his most celebrated works was Imado shinjū, a short story that appeared in Bungei kurabu in July 1896, just a few months before the announcement quoted above. It opens with the grief of Yoshizato, a senior Yoshiwara courtesan, who has been abandoned by her long-established lover, Hirata. That night she is visited by a particularly ugly customer of hers called Zenkichi, whom she has long disliked. She learns that he has neglected his business for her sake and she is touched by his sincerity and devotion. She forgets the sadness of having lost Hirata in the joy of being united with Zenkichi. She scrapes together what money she can and gives it to Zenkichi to help him get his business on its feet again, but the effort fails and they kill themselves by jumping off the river bank at Imado and sinking into the Sumida. The tastes that made works like this popular, that is the tastes that made the so-called shinkoku-shōsetsu and hisan-shōsetsu of

writers like Ryūrō popular, are those to which Kōyō is quite clearly appealing in the announcement for Konjiki yasha.[25]

A number of scenes in Konjiki yasha ensure that it lives up to the expectations aroused by the announcement. At one point we are shown Kan'ichi mercilessly pressing a debtor for repayment, and the encounter leads to a fight. Later he is set upon by two ruffians and given a severe beating that necessitates several days in hospital. Then there is the scene in which a supposedly mad woman sets fire to the home of another usurer, Wanibuchi, out of anger at the ruin he brought upon the head of her son. Wanibuchi and his wife perish in the fire. Scenes such as these brought Konjiki yasha closer to the tastes that the works of Kyōka, Bizan and Ryūrō had formed or responded to. This was noticed by one of the contributors to the joint review, who isolated the hisan or shinkoku element as that which distinguished Konjiki yasha from Kōyō's previous works.[26]

The presence of this element shows that Kōyō's concern in Konjiki yasha was something more than a semi-allegorical version of a conflict between love and money. He was also concerned to take his subject matter from contemporary society and deal, as Kyōka and Ryūrō were doing, with situations that had tragic and social dimensions. This too was how some of Kōyō's contemporaries saw Konjiki yasha. One of the reviewers, for example, described the novel as "a living photograph of contemporary society", and in support of his judgement mentioned that Miya was a mixture of

25 Imado shinjū, it should be noted, was reviewed very favourably by Miyazaki Koshoshi, the very man who had been so critical of the Ken'yūsha earlier in the year (see above, p. 156 note 8): 'Ryūrōshi no Imado shinjū', Kokumin no tomo, No 309 (August 1896), pp. 23-25. Kōyō may not have written the announcement himself, but he would certainly have had a say in its composition.

26 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', pp. 90-91.

the old, traditional notions she had been presented with in her childhood and the "new knowledge" of Meiji Japan, and pointed to the appearance in Konjiki yasha of students, bank employees and diplomats.[27]

Before proceeding to examine the details of his treatment of the theme, let us first consider the tricky question of Kōyō's sources. In his Jiko chūshin Meiji bundan shi and Jissetsu Konjiki yasha, Emi Suiin (1869-1934), another member of the Ken'yūsha, stated that Kōyō visited him before the first instalment of Konjiki yasha appeared and told him of his plans for a new novel to be serialized in the Yomiuri. According to Suiin, Kōyō spoke about it as follows.

> I recently read a novel a friend sent me called White Lily [original in katakana] by an American woman writer. The hero is disappointed in love - the woman is tempted by wealth and marries a rich man. On the day of their wedding the hero can't bear to hear the sound of the church bells and he runs far away to a place where he can't hear the bells. That's the plot, and I'm thinking of writing a piece shortly for the Yomiuri based on it.[28]

The work Kōyō refers to in this passage is commonly thought to be a novel called Dora Thorne by Bertha M. Clay, a pseudonym used by Charlotte Braeme. A translation of this work by Suematsu Kenchō (1855-1920) had been published in fascicle form from as early as 1888 to 1890 under the title Tanima no himeyuri, and it is reported by Tokuda Shūsei that Kōyō had in fact read some of Braeme's works.[29] The association of this work with the White

27 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', p. 87. See also Meiyō (pseud.), 'Konjiki yasha zenpen o yomu', Waseda bungaku, VII, No 11 (August 1898), p. 335.
28 From Jissetsu Konjiki yasha, quoted in Shiota, 'Konjiki yasha no honbun seiritsu ni tsuite', pp. 420-421.
29 Oka Yasuo, Ozaki Kōyō no shōgai to bungaku, pp. 117ff.

Lily mentioned by Kōyō has been made on the basis of some similarities with the plot outlined by Kōyō and the references in Dora Thorne to a white lily, but Carl Taeusch has found that Braeme's Lured Away is in fact closer to the plot of Konjiki yasha, but that none of Braeme's works includes anything approximating to the transformation of Kan'ichi into a usurer.[30] And in any case, the basic theme of Konjiki yasha and of White Lily as Kōyō described it corresponds quite closely to that of Natsukosode(1892), an adaptation by Kōyō of Molière's L'Avare.[31]

There is, however, another candidate for the American novel mentioned by Kōyō, and that is a short story called White Lilies. This was written by the American woman writer Alice King Hamilton and it was published in New York in 1895, two years before the serialization of Konjiki yasha commenced, in a collection of short stories concerned with military life.[32] The story is narrated in the first person by one Lilian Thornton. On a boat at West Point she meets the daughter of an old friend; they have not met for some years, because Lilian lost her husband some four years earlier and has since then been travelling around the world. She agrees to tell the story of her life, and this forms most of the rest of the book. She says that when she was young she was once invited to stay with her aunt at West Point: she was able to go once the family had made some financial sacrifices to provide her with the necessary

30 Carl F. Taeusch, 'Ozaki Kōyō and his Approach to the Modern Novel', unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Michigan, 1977), pp. 144-145. For a discussion of the relationship between Konjiki yasha and Dora Thorne, see Fukuda Kiyoto, 'Kaisetsu', Ozaki Kōyō shū (NKinBT 5), p. 40.

31 Ikari Akira, 'Natsukosode no kōsei to Konjiki yasha', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVI, No 7 (1969), pp. 42-43.

32 White Lilies, in Captain Dreams and other stories, edited by Captain Charles King (New York, 1895), pp. 77-111.

clothes for her journey and her stay. She arrived on the day of the "graduation hop" and was intrigued at that event by the one unsociable cadet in the room "who refused to be introduced" to her and who was "handsomer than anyone else in the room, although he had rather a gloomy or preoccupied air".[33] She discovered from an acquaintance that he was a serious student, and later on in the evening had a chance to meet him and learnt that his name was Miles Hancock. They saw each other on several subsequent occasions and their friendship grew, but meanwhile her godfather suddenly died and she found herself to her surprise the heir to a considerable sum of money. The news was soon all over West Point, but Hancock seemed to be eager to avoid her. She taxed him with this, and he admitted that her sudden wealth was the cause. She begged him to change his attitude and asked him to marry her, and he gave his assent. They did not, however, tell her aunt. Another ball was held, and she found to her astonishment that her aunt had already arranged ~~to~~ for her to go in the company of a Mr Thornton from New York "who was known at West Point as being wealthy and a grand parti".[34] She and Hancock then went to her parents' home and became officially engaged. She concludes her story as follows: "There came a quarrel, and then a separation. When by a chance we discovered that it had all arisen through a misunderstanding, a mistake, trifling enough if it could have been remedied before it was too late, I had already engaged myself to another man. Of course a promise of marriage, once having been made, could not be

33 White Lilies,,p. 86.
34 Ibid., p. 98.

cancelled because I had found out that I needn't have broken my engagement with someone else beforehand; and so there was the end of it all".[35] And it is clear from her surname that the other man was Mr Thornton, the desirable parti. In the conversation with Lilian Avery that follows, it transpires that the younger girl is in love with a cadet called Ned Hancock, who is Miles' younger brother. She tells Mrs Thornton that Miles never got over his disappointment, is still unmarried, and is at that moment on sick leave recovering from a wound received in a fight with "the horrid Indians". By chance, he is to be at her mother's house the following day, and she envisages a joyful reunion between the two. Mrs Thornton is more cautious and reminds her young friend that "flowers once withered never more revive"; thereupon the latter looks down at the lilies she has been holding in her hands all this time and exclaims, "Oh, see, Cousin Lilian, my lilies that had faded, how bright and beautiful they are again!" And the narrator concludes, "Have flowers prophetic souls?"[36]

It should first be noted that there are several points in common between this story and Konjiki yasha. In both a young woman who has been in love with a student of quiet disposition marries instead a man of means and later through a series of coincidences comes into contact with her old lover. Konjiki yasha was, as we have seen, moving towards a reunification of Kan'ichi and Miya, and there is a clear hint at the end of White Lilies that the same is in store for Hancock and Mrs Thornton. The use of lilies as a symbol is also common to both

35 White Lilies, p. 107.
36 Ibid., pp. 110-111.

works: the flower is associated with Mrs Thornton's romance with Hancock both at the graduation hop and on the occasion of her meeting with Lilian Avery, and it appears here and there in Konjiki yasha as a symbol of Miya.[37] Finally, there is also some similarity between Kan'ichi's reserved behaviour at the card-games party at the beginning of Konjiki yasha and that of Hancock at the graduation hop.

The situation is therefore complicated. It seems probable that Kōyō had read White Lilies before writing Konjiki yasha and that he was thinking of this work when he mentioned White Lily to Emi Suiin. But the plot of White Lilies only partially corresponds with that of the putative White Lily and it seems likely, therefore, that Kōyō (or possibly Suiin) had confused it with another work.

In spite of all this, however, it is clear that White Lilies exerted no great influence on Konjiki yasha. Taeusch has pointed out that Kōyō merely adapted to a Japanese setting a romantic pattern, that of the scorned lover, which was to be found in Wuthering Heights, the works of Braeme, and other nineteenth century western fiction; to this list now White Lilies has to be added.[38] The touch of originality Kōyō brought to the work was the transformation of Kan'ichi into a usurer, and this, as I have argued above, was prompted by certain types of fiction that were popular in the closing years of the decade.

There remains one important aspect of Konjiki yasha to consider, and that is his treatment of his theme, in which he

37 See White Lilies, pp. 77, 85-88, and 111, and Konjiki yasha, pp. 353 and 395.
38 Taeusch, 'Ozaki Kōyō and His Approach to the Modern Novel', pp. 147-148.

made much use of the techniques of ninjōbon. Yoda Gakkai pointed obliquely to this feature of Konjiki yasha in the joint review when he said of it that "of its kind it is the best in Japan, and people like Tamenaga Shunsui don't really measure up to it".[39] Tosa has drawn attention to the connection between chapter eight of the first part of the novel and a section of Musume setsuyō, a ninjōbon I dealt with in connection with Irozange, but it seems to me that Konjiki yasha owes a good deal more to ninjōbon than that.[40]

The most striking examples of the influence of ninjōbon on this work are the circular nature of the plot and the frequency of coincidences. After the dramatic scene on Atami beach the reader could be forgiven for assuming that no more will be seen of Miya, or, alternatively, of Kan'ichi. Miya, it could be supposed, has served her purpose in betraying Kan'ichi for money and turning him into an embittered man. She could be thought to have served it, perhaps, in much the same way as Ryūnosuke's sister-in-law Oshima serves her role in Tajō takon. Oshima and her mother spend some time living with Ryūnosuke and it is clear that her mother's plan is to marry Oshima off to Ryūnosuke. The latter's abhorrence of this idea is not so much a reflection of his dislike for Oshima as an indication of his firm resolve never to remarry, whatever the advantages that might accrue to him. Having thus highlighted some of Ryūnosuke's views, as well as giving the reader an idea of what a girl of marriageable age might think of Ryūnosuke, Oshima fades out of

39 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', p. 128.
40 Tosa Tōru, 'Konjiki yasha no sōbō - zenpen to ninjōbon Musume setsuyō', Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVI, No 12 (1969), pp. 38-39.

the picture. Much later in the novel Ryūnosuke hears of her engagement, but that is the only other mention of her.

Miya, however, is not so easily discarded. Having been introduced to the reader, she remains, like Kan'ichi's friends and Miya's husband, constantly in the background of the novel, to be brought back into focus from time to time and never to be forgotten altogether. And at its end, the novel is moving towards the close of its full circle, with suggestions of the final reconciliation of Miya and Kan'ichi.

Connected with this aspect of the novel are the coincidences that abound throughout. The first occurs at Atami. Owing to the difficulty of the decision facing her, Miya has become unwell and her mother takes her off to the hotspring resort, leaving father to break the news to Kan'ichi. While they are on the beach two men come up in quick succession: one is Tomiyama and the other is Kan'ichi. The reader has been given no preparation for either of these meetings. The last the reader saw of Kan'ichi was the discussion with Miya's father, while Tomiyama's activities have been hidden in the background for several chapters. It comes as a complete surprise, therefore, to find both of them on the beach at Atami within a few minutes of each other.

A major coincidence occurs in the second part of the novel, and it serves to bring Miya back to the forefront of the reader's attention. The third chapter of this part introduces one Tazumi Yoshiharu, a wealthy man with a passion for photography. Through his henchman Kuroyanagi he is indirectly involved in usury and has also provided the financial backing for another usurer by the name of Wanibuchi. This Wanibuchi took Kan'ichi

in as an assistant and lodger early in Kan'ichi's career as a usurer. Wanibuchi's wife, Omine, is afraid that her husband is keeping the company of an attractive young usurer named Mitsue, and one day she persuades Kan'ichi to go to Tazumi's house to see if her husband really has gone there as he said he had. Kan'ichi discovers that Wanibuchi has not in fact been there, but Kuroyanagi takes advantage of his visit to discuss some business matters with him. The fourth chapter shows an unidentified upper-class woman being conducted around the Tazumi household by Kuroyanagi's daughter, Shizuo, who is much impressed by the visitor's beauty. As the visitor is walking around the house, she suddenly notices a familiar figure in the garden talking to Kuroyanagi. At this point the narrator reveals that the woman is Miya. And he takes the opportunity to add something about Miya's feelings: she has loved and missed Kan'ichi, it appears, since their parting at Atami four years earlier and so she is now overcome with tears. It is only after this that the narrator tells us that Tazumi and Tomiyama became acquainted through their common interest in photography and that Tazumi had invited Tomiyama and Miya over to his house. The preparation, in other words, for the coincidental meeting of Kan'ichi and Miya is left until after the event insofar as Miya's presence at Tazumi's house is concerned. Further on in the chapter the narrator begins to spin the threads of the circular plot by dropping heavy hints about Miya's unhappiness with Tomiyama and her yearning for Kan'ichi. The coincidence has been an important one for it has brought them face to face with each other for the first time in four years and it points to the completion of the plot in the reunion of Kan'ichi and

Miya.

Then in chapter five another coincidence brings Kan'ichi back into contact with some of his old college friends, who later prove instrumental in inducing Kan'ichi to be more conciliatory and forgiving in his attitude towards Miya. The friends are visiting another acquaintance who has contracted a large debt and they find that the usurer is there pressing for repayment, and, what is more, that the usurer is none other than Kan'ichi.

There is another important coincidence at the beginning of the fourth part. An anonymous man is walking along the street one day towards the end of the year, when a rickshaw bumps into him and knocks him sprawling. The passenger turns back to apologize and help him up, and they thereupon recognize each other as Miya and Arao, one of Kan'ichi's former friends who has appeared in earlier parts of the book. This coincidence is important in its turn because it brings Kan'ichi's friends into contact with Miya, and this enables them both to appreciate the extent of her grief and the sincerity of her contrition and to mediate between her and Kan'ichi. There are other coincidences in the book, such as that which takes Kan'ichi and Tomiyama's intended mistress Aiko not only to the same hotel in the same hot-spring resort, but even to adjoining rooms. It should, however, be clear from the above account of some of the major coincidences in the book that they have a commanding part to play in the development of the plot. And we have already seen in earlier chapters that coincidences also had a prominent part to play in ninjōbon.

There are traces too in Konjiki yasha of the objective narrator discussed in the case of Kyō ningyō. In the first place,

there are a number of occasions on which the narrator refuses to identify a character already known to the reader. For example, Miya's encounter with Tomiyama on the beach at Atami is recounted in the following way.

> Miya raised her head casually, and as soon as she did so she noticed the figure of a man strolling among some trees a short distance off. She fastened her eyes on him at once and chased the phantom for a while, sewing together the gaps left by the trees, which blocked him off like a hedge, and the flowers, which blocked him off like curtain. Finally she perceived who it was and hurriedly whispered to her mother. She immediately left her chair and went forward five or six paces, but he had seen her too and quickly called out,
>
> "So you are there, are you?"
>
> The voice disturbed the quiet wood and resounded. The moment she heard it Miya crouched down on the edge of her stool with a look of fear.
>
> "Yes, we've only just got here. How fortunate that you've turned up." Her mother greeted him with those words and stood up to meet him. Miya looked another way and heard the sound of his rapidly approaching footsteps.
>
> It is probably as well to explain who this young gentleman was who appeared before mother and daughter. He had a startlingly large diamond ring a-glitter.[41]

And so the reader knows at last, if he has not guessed already, that the man is Tomiyama. But he is not identified for the reader when he appears, when Miya realises who he is, or even when he speaks. The reader is kept guessing until the end, presumably in the interests of suspense. The same thing happens when Kan'ichi in his turn appears on Atami beach shortly afterwards, and perhaps the most notable incident in the whole book is the visit Miya pays to the Tazumi household. She is described by the narrator as "an upper-class woman", and although the reader might be able to infer her identity from the emphasis

41 Konjiki yasha, p. 96.

on her beauty, she is not positively identified until the narrator has told us that she has seen someone, whom we know to be Kan'ichi, talking to Kuroyanagi in the garden. So this delay too is for the purpose of suspense.

Several other factors might be mentioned as well. Kan'ichi's dream towards the end of the novel has a number of interesting features. The reader is not told that it is in fact a dream until the closing line, in which Kan'ichi wakes up, and so there is no reason until that point for the reader to suppose that it is not regular narrative. The same was true of ninjōbon dreams which were similarly concealed from the reader for what they were. We have already looked in chapter two at one example of this in the opening chapter of Shunshoku renri no ume. One factor that aids the deception is the failure of characters in dreams to behave in anything other than a normal way: there is none of the surrealism, distortion, irrationality and discontinuity that are characteristic of dreams. This was true of ninjōbon dreams as well, and Yoda Gakkai criticised this quality of Kōyō's dream, comparing it unfavourably with the dream in Crime and Punishment.[42]

There are in addition several instances in Konjiki yasha of the ninjōbon style of dialogue, which I discussed in connection with Kyō ningyō and which Kōyō had not used since. That is to say, there a few sections of the book in which the dialogue is interrupted by the narrator very rarely and in which a single kanji appears at the head of each utterance to represent the speaker.[43]

42 Yasuda et al., 'Gappyō', p. 127.
43 E.g., pp. 125-126 and 174-177.

Individually, each of these features, with the possible exception of the dream sequence, might be found in nineteenth-century English literature. As we shall see in the next chapter, it is difficult now to establish exactly what western and Japanese fiction Kōyō had read and when, but to illustrate the point examples may be taken from two books that were definitely being read in Meiji Japan. Firstly, the reliance on coincidence for the development of the plot in Konjiki yasha is also a feature of, amongst other works, Scott's The Bride of Lammermoor, which was translated by Tsubouchi Shōyō as Shunpū jōwa and published in 1880. Ravenswood, for example, just happens to be loitering in the right place on her father's estate and at the right time to save Lucy from the attack of a bull. And an equivalent to Kōyō's use of ninjōbon dialogue can be found in the occasional use of a playbook layout, complete with stage directions and names set before lines, for the dialogue in Thackeray's The Newcomes (chapter forty-seven). The Newcomes was listed by several men of letters in 1889 as one of their favourite books.[44]

The combination of all the features mentioned above, however, can only be found in ninjōbon, and it is this tradition that seems on balance to have exerted most influence on the form taken by Kōyō's last novel, although current literary trends dictated some of the content. It comes as no surprise, therefore, to find the novel described as "sentimental".[45] Other factors, particularly money and usury, have parts to play in the novel, but Kōyō planned the work to end with the reunion of Miya and

44 Tokutomi Sohō, ed., 'Shomoku jisshu', pp. 645 and 650.
45 Taeusch, 'Ozaki Kōyō and His Approach to the Modern Novel', pp. 220ff.

Kan'ichi.[46] In other words, he envisaged the sort of romantically satisfying and structurally neat ending that was foreign to the Kōyō of Tajō takon but was de rigueur in ninjōbon.

Both Tajō takon and Konjiki yasha were amalgams of the old and the new, and both had a more substantial admixture of the new than most of Kōyō's previous works. Tajō takon may have been conservative in the attitudes it reflected, but in its style, concern to present a point of view, obsession with psychological description and inconclusive ending it was a radical departure for Kōyō and it pointed forward to aspects of the novel that would later be prominent in the fiction of such writers as Tokuda Shūsei and Tayama Katai. Konjiki yasha was new in its concern with matters of wider importance, such as the ugliness of usury and the power of money, but at the same time it looked back to the well-tried literary techniques of the ninjōbon. And it was this combination that found favour with the common reader of the day, even though more than thirty years had passed since the Meiji Restoration. The readers of ninjōbon and Konjiki yasha alike were lured into labyrinthine plots and their interest and curiosity were maintained by means of manipulated suspense, coincidences, and a narrator who pretends not to know what is going on. Konjiki yasha is a testimony to the lasting appeal of this type of fiction, and to Kōyō's understanding of popular tastes.

46 See 'Konjiki yasha fukuan oboegaki', passim.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Kōyō's times and achievements

In the previous seven chapters we have considered works from most stages of Kōyō's career as a novelist. After a brief period in which he focussed his attention solely on the world of Jippensha Ikku and other writers of comic fiction from the Tokugawa period, he devoted most of his career to fiction that was principally concerned with love in some form or other. In these circumstances it would have been surprising if the ninjōbon tradition, which only came to an end after Kōyō's birth, had left no mark on his techniques as a writer of fiction and the kind of plots he chose to use. But Kōyō was not fettered by the norms adhered to by writers of ninjōbon and was ready to experiment with forms of fiction that were new to him. At one stage he borrowed freely from the techniques and style of Ihara Saikaku, and at another he concentrated on psychological description. It is the principal task of this final chapter to weigh up Kōyō's achievement. To do this it is necessary to identify the legacy that ninjōbon left in his work and to judge its effect, and to estimate the extent and value of his departures from the practices of Tokugawa fiction.

The place that Tokugawa fiction had in Kōyō's works is hard to understand without some grasp of its general popularity in the first half of the Meiji period. I have already examined in chapter four the rapid growth of interest in Saikaku and Genroku fiction in the late 1880s, and it was clear from this

that Kōyō was by no means the only writer to be attracted to the style and atmosphere of Genroku fiction and to imitate some of its features in his works. To be sure, some spoke out against this trend and Kōyō looked back on it later with a measure of distaste, but there is no denying its popularity, however short-lived it may have been. Interest in Edo fiction, as opposed to that of Kansai, was no less strong in the Meiji period, but it was less dramatic and is as a consequence less readily appreciated.

The second decade of the Meiji period has long been regarded as the age of translations and political novels. It is, however, a mistake to forget that translations and political novels represent but a small percentage of all the literary publications of those years. An important facet of publishing activity at the time was the large number of publishers producing reprints of various works of fiction from the Tokugawa period, and the large numbers of such reprints. These reprints began to appear within a few years of the Meiji Restoration, but they reached their peak towards the end of the second decade of the Meiji period, and this peak lasted into the first years of the third decade. As an illustration of their quantity and variety, let us examine the reprints of Kyoku Sanjin's Musume setsuyō issued during the first twenty-five years of the Meiji period.

Date	Publisher
December 1882	Shun'yōdō
1882-1883	Kimura Bunzaburō
April 1885	Eishōdō (a wood-block edition)
January 1886	Shun'yōdō (fourth impression of a different edition)

February 1886	Takebe Takisaburō
July 1886	Jitsugetsudō
" "	Miyoshi Morio
January 1887	Eibunsha
" "	Eisendō
April 1887	Eisendō (with Kyoku Sanjin's Wakamidori)
July 1887	Eisendō (another edition)
August 1887	Shun'undō
October 1887	Kyōsōya, Osaka (with Wakamidori)
December 1887	Eishōdō
November 1889	Inoue Katsugorō[1]

It will be seen from the above that the Shun'yōdō, Eishōdō and Eisendō each published several different editions of Musume setsuyō within the space of a few years. They also published editions of Kyoku Sanjin's less well-known Wakamidori separately in August 1883, October 1885 and April 1887 respectively. The publication of all these reprints of Musume setsuyō in the early years of the Meiji period bears witness to its popularity at the time, but many other works of Tokugawa fiction were also reprinted, some of them more often than Musume setsuyō.

If we can judge by the numbers of these reprints, then it appears that Kyokutei Bakin was the most popular author in the first decades of the Meiji period. By 1892 more than forty of his works had been separately reprinted, mostly several times and within a year or two of 1887, and five single-volume collected editions of his works had appeared. Some way behind was Tamenaga Shunsui. Fourteen of his works were reprinted in the same period including Umegoyomi and its sequels. This is not the place to examine these reprints in any further detail, but it may be stated that the variety of authors and works

1 The details given here and below are derived from the catalogue of Meiji books in the Kokkai Toshokan: Kokuritsu kokkai toshokan zō: Meijiki kankō tosho mokuroku, IV, 456-479. I have come across very few Meiji reprints of Tokugawa fiction that the library does not possess, so the collection is probably fairly complete.

they covered was great and that they were not limited to a few representative works of the most well-known authors. Most of the reprints were of works of fiction dating from the last fifty years of the Tokugawa period, and it must be concluded that this fiction still attracted large numbers of readers in the early Meiji period.

Although the number of reprints is a good indicator of the popularity of this fiction, it is, if anything, liable to lead to an inadequate estimate. This is because it fails to take into account the private lending libraries known as kashihonya, which, even in the Meiji period, dealt largely with Tokugawa fiction. Taisō of Nagoya was the largest and most famous kashihonya and it survived the Meiji Restoration to continue its business until 1898 or 1899.[2] Many other kashihonya were active in the first half of the Meiji period, and there is evidence of the important role they were thought at the time to have. In 1876 one Kawakishi Kan'ichi wrote a letter to the Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun in which he suggested that a ban be placed on some of the activities of kashihonya. He said that kashihonya dealt mainly with ninjōbon and that it was undesirable for works of fiction such as ninjōbon to be circulated in this way, for fiction tended to corrupt.[3] The note of moral indignation was almost as old as Tokugawa fiction itself, but in this case it is indicative of the important role kashihonya played in making fiction available to the reading public that they should have been subjected to this

2 See Asakura Haruhiko, Kashihonya Taisō, Kotsū mamehon 32 (Nihonkosho tsūshin sha, 1977), pp. 4-9.
3 'Haishi shōsetsu no kashihon o kinzu beki no gi', Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun, 4 March 1876, pp. 211-212.

diatribe.

The existence of kashihonya and the publication of so many reprints ensured that works of Tokugawa fiction continued to reach a wide audience, and the literary world of the first half of the Meiji period contained many who had been brought up on such fiction. Tsubouchi Shōyō once recalled that he had spent much of his youth in Nagoya reading works of Edo fiction which he had borrowed from the kashihonya Taisō, and Mori Ōgai in Tsuwano and Aeba Kōson and Takada Sanae in Tokyo seem to have spent their early years in much the same sort of way.[4] And of the sixty-nine prominent writers, journalists and scholars who listed their ten favourite books for Tokutomi Sohō's 'Shomoku jisshu' in April 1889, twenty-two included works of Tokugawa fiction.

There was also a considerable amount of educated interest in Tokugawa fiction in the Meiji period, from about 1885 onwards. In Shōsetsu shinzui Shōyō made much use of his extensive familiarity with the fiction of Edo in particular; his separate study of Tamenaga Shunsui has already been mentioned, but he also wrote essays on the works of Shikitei Sanba and Ryūtei Tanehiko.[5] It was, however, Aeba Kōson who contributed most to the study and interpretation of Tokugawa fiction at this time. Amongst his many articles on the subject was a study of Tamenaga Shunsui's Shunshoku umegoyomi that

4 See Tsubouchi Shōyō, 'Shinkyū kadoki no kaisō', Waseda bungaku, No 229 (March 1925), p. 6; Ogai zenshū, 38 volumes (Iwanami shoten, 1972-1973), XVIII, 67; Takada Sanae, Hanpō mukashibanashi, p. 20; and 'Aeba Kōson shi no den', Kokumin shinbun, 10 August 1890.

5 The essays on Sanba and Tanehiko appeared in the Chūō gakujutsu zasshi in May and August 1886 respectively.

appeared in the first two issues of Shuppan geppyō in 1887. In this he chose to disagree with Shōyō's positive appraisal of Shunsui and reserved the highest praise for Bakin's Hakkenden, Tanehiko's Nise murasaki: Inaka genji and Sanba's Ukiyofuro.[6] Shuppan geppyō went on to carry, along with reviews of newly published works of fiction and non-fiction alike, a series of studies by Yoda Gakkai (1823-1909), who in 'Shomoku jisshu' included Shui hu chuan, Genji monogatari, Bakin's Chinsetsu yumiharizuki, and Tanehiko's Kantan shokoku monogatari amongst his ten favourite books.[7] Uemura Masahisa (1857-1925) also wrote on Bakin, and the Nihon hyōron, a journal he edited for its first eighteen issues, carried an anonymous article on Bakin's Musōbei.[8] In addition, Kokumin no tomo carried a number of articles on Tokugawa fiction, and as the Meiji period advanced into its third and fourth decades the publication of the Teikoku bunko series, which reprinted a large number of works of Tokugawa fiction, and the appearance of such magazines as Aoi, which was devoted solely to the literary culture of the Tokugawa period, testified to the support Tokugawa fiction could still command.

In the first half of the Meiji period the respect accorded to the fiction of the preceding era, and particularly to that of Bakin, was very much at the expense of contemporary fiction. Like all the other contributors to 'Shomoku jisshu', even Shōyō

6 See Aeba Kōson, 'Shunshoku umegoyomi', Shuppan geppyō, No 1 (25 August 1886), p. 29.
7 Gakkai's articles appeared in Shuppan geppyō from No 3 (25 October 1886) to No 29 (25 February 1889).
8 Uemura's 'Bakin shōsetsu no shinzui' appeared in the Kirisutokyō shinbun on 26 January 1886, and the anonymous Bakinō no Musōbei appeared in Nihon hyoron, No 1 (8 March 1890).

neglected to mention a single work of contemporary Japanese fiction amongst his ten favourite books. And as late as 1903 an article in the English language supplement to the magazine Taiyō described Bakin as "the greatest novelist that Japan ever produced" and declared that "before his time there had been no readable novels. Since his time none have been able to imitate even the worst of his works".[9]

Although he did not share the prevailing admiration for Bakin, Kōyō was not out of step with many of his contemporaries. As we have seen, he included works by Saikaku, Santō Kyōden and Kyoku Sanjin in his section of 'Shomoku jisshu' and was responsible for editing the works of these and other authors for publication in book or serial form. However, it is now only possible to gain some idea of the precise books Kōyō read from occasional references in his works and reminiscences, and disparate other sources. Although rumours still circulate to the contrary, there can be no reasonable doubt that Kōyō's entire library perished along with the rest of the contents of the Ōhashi public library in the fires resulting from the great earthquake of 1923.[10]

As far as Tokugawa fiction is concerned, Kōyō's interests seem to have fallen into two distinct spheres. In the first place there was his interest in the fiction of the Genroku and

9 T. Asada, 'Life of Bakin', The Sun Trade Journal, IX, No 13 (1 September 1903), p. 20.

10 See Ono Noriaki, Nihon toshokan shi (Ranshobō, 1952), p. 286. Tsubotani Zenshirō, Ohashi toshokan yonjūnenshi (Hakubunkan, 1942), pp. 153-158, states that all the books were burnt and quotes from contemporary accounts of the burning of the library. The Santō toshokan in Shiba currently displays a sign to the effect that it contains the books formerly belonging to the Ōhashi toshokan, but this refers to the resurrected Ohashi toshokan , which was built after the earthquake. This sign may be the source of the misleading rumours.

succeeding eras, represented principally by Saikaku but extending also to the works of Jishō and Kiseki.[11] It was not a passing interest, for Kōyō edited in his later years a collection of Saikaku's works for the Teikoku bunko series, but its impact on Kōyō's creative work was at its strongest for just a few years, starting at about the time he wrote Irozange. The most obvious effects of Genroku literature on Kōyō's works were on his subject matter and on his style, and it was these that drew most attention from contemporary observers. However, in the case of Kyara makura at least, Kōyō was in his later years unhappy that he should have drawn so much from Genroku fiction (see above, p. 108). Another effect, and one that is probably more important, was that it introduced Kōyō to a new narrative style. Kōyō's early works had revealed a familiarity with the kokkeibon and ninjōbon of the closing years of the Tokugawa period; these genres managed without the services of a narrator, except for descriptive purposes, and relied principally on dialogue. Saikaku, by contrast, made much more use of a narrator, albeit less for descriptive purposes than for summary of action and events. Description was confined to characterizing details, and the narrator served to give opinions of and judgements on characters, which ninjōbon writers refrained from doing. If Kōyō had read any western fiction by 1890 - and it is probable that he had, if only through his attendance at Mita Eigakujuku - then he may well have been aware of the many uses to which nineteenth-century western

11 Tsubotani, Ōhashi toshokan yonjūnen shi, pp. 156-157, states that Kōyō's collection included works by Kiseki and Jishō.

narrators were put, but it remains true that it was in his imitations of Saikaku's works that Kōyō first used a narrator extensively to complement dialogue. And the knowledge of the uses of a narrator that he thus acquired remained with him long after he had turned away from imitations of Saikaku.

As far as ninjōbon are concerned, there are only four specific works Kōyō can safely be assumed to have read. In addition to Umegoyomi, Musume setsuyō and Renri no ume, there is Shunsui's Shunshoku magaki no ume, which apparently escaped the Ōhashi toshokan fire as it was on loan to somebody.[12] However, as we have seen in earlier chapters, the genre exercised considerable influence on Kōyō's conception of the novel, and so it is probable that he had read a good many ninjōbon. It may be mentioned in passing that at least one other member of the Ken'yūsha, Ishibashi Shian, showed interest in the genre: he was even known for a time as "imayō Shunsui" (the Shunsui of the present day) or "Meiji no Shunsui". The influence of ninjōbon on Kōyō's oeuvre may be detected at its most obvious in the relationship between the dialogue and the narrator. It was at its strongest in these respects in Kyō ningyō, but it reappeared much later in Konjiki yasha, albeit in a much diluted form. Common to both ninjōbon and to most of Kōyō's works was a preoccupation with complicated love affairs that absorbed most if not all of the reader's attention, and a related concern to work with tortuous plots that would only resolve themselves towards the end. The impossible amatory dilemmas in which the heroes of Musume setsuyō and Harutsugedori find themselves are resolved in neat and auspicious endings that try the credulity. The ending of Kyō ningyō is of a different kind and so confirms that Kōyō was no slave to the ninjōbon

tradition, but in function it differs little from usual ninjōbon endings, with a surprise to sort out all the complications. Many of Kōyō's works also reflect the almost total lack of concern with the outside world that was a characteristic of ninjōbon and most genres of Edo fiction. Again, though, it seems likely that Kōyō himself saw this as a shortcoming, for he made attempts to counterbalance it. In Kyō ningyō he drew his characters from the educational world of Meiji Japan, even though he had nothing to say about education. Albeit to a small extent, he did try to reflect the times in which he lived. In Sanninzuma too he reminded the reader occasionally that Yogorō's extravagant dalliances were financed by successful business operations, and in Konjiki yasha the romance had to share the stage with money and usury, although he had little to say about the latter other than that it was unpleasant for all concerned. Perhaps the most important contribution of ninjōbon to Kōyō's oeuvre was the tradition of realistic dialogue. There was of course a break in this influence while his attraction to Saikaku's style waxed and waned, but otherwise the dialogue of his works followed the ninjōbon in reproducing the shortcomings of everyday speech so as to approximate actual speech and in playing a part in the characterization. These aspects of Kōyō's use of dialogue are particularly apparent in Tajō takon, which otherwise owes nothing to ninjōbon.

Some of Kōyō's departures from the practices of Tokugawa fiction may have been prompted by his reading of western fiction. Again, the loss of his library poses difficulties, but it is at least possible to identify some of the authors and works he had read from the translations and adaptations he made In all, more than thirty of his works are either translations

or adaptations, mostly from French and Russian literature. French and other literatures he read in English translation, but in the case of Russian he generally relied on literal translations prepared by his pupil Senuma Kayō or her husband Katsusaburō. It is certain that he was familiar at least with the works of the following writers; in brackets are Kōyō's works.

Hans Anderson (Ninin mukusuke of 1891; also Ukigimaru of 1896, earlier serialized in the Yomiuri as Misuji no kami in 1893)

The Arabian Nights (Yamato shōkun of 1889)

The Decameron (Reinetsu of 1894, Taka ryōri and Sankajō of 1895, Jū no namari of 1897 and Tebiki no ito of 1898)

Molière (Koi no yamai of 1892 and Natsukosode of the same year, and Yaedasuki of 1898)

Zola (Mukitamago of 1891 and Tonari no onna of 1893; for Kōyō and La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret, see above, pp. 180-181)

Maupassant (Onna of 1902; for Kōyō and Pierre et Jean, see above, p. 178)

Tolstoy (Meikyoku Kurētserofu of 1895, and Anna Karēnina of 1902-1903)

Turgenev (Tsurugenēfu shōhin and Tōshoka of 1902)

Dickens (it is evident from Kōyō's 'Shōsetsu to haiku' that he had read Martin Chuzzlewit)

In addition, Munezanyō (1902), Osanagokoro (1902), both Shashinchō and Tsuki to hito (1903), and Kusawakeginu (1903) are apparently based on works by Dostoevsky, Daudet, Chekhov and Lessing respectively.[13]

13 See Yoshida Seiichi, 'Hon'an jidai no Kōyō', Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō, III, No 6 (1938), pp. 55-59, and Oka Yasuo, 'Kōyō to gaikoku bungaku', in Ozaki Koyo no shōgai to bungaku, pp. 44-55.

Kōyō had clearly read widely in European fiction, and there are several aspects of his works that wholly or in part can be attributed to his familiarity with western fiction. This is particularly so since he was evidently reading Zola and Molière in the very early 1890s. Even before his infatuation with Saikaku, Kōyō was making his first attempts at putting his narrator to greater use and at revealing the thoughts of his characters, and we have seen that his imitations of Saikaku gave him a chance to experiment with types of narrative fiction that were new to him. Long after the direct influence of Saikaku had fallen away, these features remained a part of Kōyō's work, and his realization of their worth is probably partly due to his familiarity with their uses in western fiction. Furthermore, he was aware from his reading of Martin Chuzzlewit of the descriptive detail in which he could indulge a narrator.[14]

In addition, his plots moved away from the coincidences and surprises of his early works. These probably derived from ninjōbon, but they could have been reinforced by familiarity with the works of Scott, for example, had Kōyō read any.[15] The other western fiction he knew may have inspired him to rely less on coincidence, but it should be remembered that he returned to this in his last work. He did this largely because he was aware of current literary tastes and recognized the lasting appeal with the reading public of Tokugawa fiction and ornate literary styles. In Tajō takon he had appealed to the thinking reader with an interest in current issues and had

14 Ozaki Kōyō, 'Shōsetsu to haiku', pp. 176-178.
15 Works by Scott had by this time already been translated by Shōyō and others. A biography of Scott, translated by Kamuro Midori appeared in Garakuta bunko and Bunko from No 11 (10 October 1888) to No 17 (11 March 1889).

used much of what he had learnt from western fiction. Tajō takon was applauded by some, but not all, of the critics, but Konjiki yasha was literally a sensational success and put its predecessor in the shade. This was because, rather than although, it was essentially a less alien work.

Both Tokugawa fiction and that of the west were at work in shaping Kōyō's literary output. This, it is fair to say, was not fully appreciated by his contemporaries. Shōyō's familiarity with Tokugawa fiction was, if anything, more extensive than that of Kōyō and it was certainly more scholarly, but that did not lead his contemporaries to suppose that he was hostile to the Meiji period or to its literature, nor has it led students of Shōyō to suppose so. Kōyō's interest in Tokugawa fiction did not keep him from reading western fiction or from writing about the Meiji period, but it is frequently inferred from his works that he had no sympathy with the age in which he lived and that he was not really a 'modern' writer. Some years after the event, Tayama Katai recollected that "at least Kōyō's death was useful in that it enabled us to throw away the chaff of the Genroku era and of Edo".[16] And Kitamura Tōkoku described Kōyō as "a writer who has risen up against the Europeanization of today".[17] We have already examined that statement in the context in which it was uttered, that of Kyara makura, but it is important to consider its bearing on the whole of Kōyō's oeuvre, if only because it has often been used in that way. For this purpose it is helpful to compare Kōyō with Mantei Ōga, a writer

16 Kindai no shōsetsu, p. 108.
17 Tōkoku zenshū, I, 267.

who was admittedly minor but who was without doubt an opponent of what Tōkoku described as europeanized Japan.

Mantei Ōga's early works, which date from around the beginning of the Kōka era (1844-1848), were in the kokkeibon tradition of comic fiction which inspired Kōyō's Kokkei kai byōbu. Well before the advent of the Meiji period he turned away from humour towards didacticism, which in some form or other coloured most of the works he wrote in the remainder of his life. The most well-known of the works he wrote in this vein is Shaka hassō: Yamato bunko, a life of the Buddha which he compiled from kanazōshi and various other sources. It was one of a number of works by various authors of which the first parts appeared before the Meiji Restoration and of which successive volumes continued to appear into the 1870s: the first part of Yamato bunko was published in 1845 and the fifty-eighth and last part in 1871.

After the Restoration Ōga declined to adopt the sycophantic attitude most other writers took towards the new government, and instead of subscribing to the precepts contained in 'Sanjō no kyōken' with complete submission, as did Kanagaki Robun and Sansantei Arindo, he continued to make it quite clear in his works that he preferred life under the bakufu.

At first his resistance to the times was expressed in the form of satire, but from 1873 he started writing works which had very few of the qualities associated with fiction and presented arguments against various aspects of the Meiji period and the changes it had seen. One of the first of these works was Tōsei rikō musume, which was published in March 1873. In this work he sought to refute the arguments with which Fukuzawa Yukichi had attacked the customs of eyebrow-shaving and teeth-blacking in his Katawa musume of September 1872.

Tōsei rikō musume is narrated in the first person by a woman who argues that the "katawamono" (maimed) are not those who shave their eyebrows and blacken their teeth but those who are such "prisoners of the West" that they reject the customs of their own country for those of foreign countries. She suggests that the customs of Japan are no more wrong than the western practice of having ears pierced for ear-rings, and points out, with a degree of logic on her side, that at least the Japanese practices are reversible.[18] Again, in Nihon jo kyōshi of 1874, Ōga argues that what is good for one country is not necessarily good for another, and describes the imported idea of equal rights for women as an infection which is already beginning to have such disastrous effects as making women more preoccupied with their own affairs than those of their children.[19]

Mantei Ōga was almost alone in expressing opposition to the consequences of the Meiji Restoration in his published works, and he cannot be said to have made a major impact, although he seems to have enjoyed sufficient favour to have had a number of books published.[20] But there is no disputing that he was "a writer who had risen up against the Europeanization of Meiji Japan", to use Tōkoku's words. He was not content, as Robun was, to poke fun at the faddists who could not stop themselves singing the praises of beef, science, or English, and he counselled caution before customs and ideas from the West were

18 See Tōsei rikō musume, in Meiji kaikaki bungaku shū I (MBZ I), pp. 181-183.
19 See Nihon jo kyōshi (Tsuruya Kiemon and seven others, 1874).
20 At the end of most of Oga's works there are long lists of all his most recent publications, which were numerous in the 1870s.

imported to Japan.

It must be said first of all that there is little trace in Kōyō's oeuvre of beliefs of this sort, and that Kōyō never abandoned fiction for polemics. From what little remains of his early work, Musume hakase, it seems that his primary purpose was to satirize contemporary schoolgirls rather than to launch an attack against the very idea of education for women, although it can be inferred that he was not in the vanguard of educational reform. The closest Kōyō came to Ōga's opposition to alien influence was Tajō takon, which put new attitudes towards marriage in an unfavourable light, but even Tajō takon is first and foremost a work of fiction and it bears no resemblance to Ōga's diatribes. In short, Kōyō made no public advocacy of any particular view, be it that of an Ōga or that of a Fukuzawa.

Kōyō's very reluctance to express his opinions in public on issues unconnected with his literary calling may possibly be seen as a point he shared with late Edo writers of fiction. But it is equally possible that he was quite simply not as interested in such matters as in questions of literary technique. We have seen already how the problems of style and narrative preoccupied him for much of his career: his concern was first with the craft of fiction, which had lost its bearings since the end of the Tokugawa period, and only secondly with any philosophy he might attempt to convey with it. His works and their popularity demonstrate the lasting attraction Tokugawa fiction had for writer and reader alike as late as thirty-five years after the Meiji Restoration, but in pursuit of his craft he was as ready to reject as to retain its influence. He endeavoured to make good what he considered to be its shortcomings, and he recognized such of its strengths as the tradition of realistic dialogue.

Textual variations in Kyō ningyō

The changes Kōyō made to the serialized text of Kyō ningyō in readiness for its publication as a book fall into two broad categories. The first of these comprises particle changes and alterations of sentence order. For example, lines 13-14 of the translated extract on page 40 read in the serialized version as follows: "Nasu kozara ni iro no utsurau o nageku". For the book version Kōyō added a particle so that the text now read, "Nasu wa kozara ni iro no utsurau o nageku".[1] In a very few cases Kōyō reversed the process and removed particles that had appeared in the serialized version, but the greater part by far of changes of this sort involved the addition of particles. Most chapters gained several particles in the course of revision, and chapter nine will provide the second example. The text in Garakuta bunko is as follows.

> mado no to oshihiraki. mono-omoi no kao o dasu otoko . . . tare Niyake Kyōnosuke ga Ibumura no shissaku. sore ni igai no fūsetsu . . .

After revision this read:

> mado no to o oshihiraki. mono-omoi no kao o dasu otoko wa Niyake Kyōnosuke. Ibumura no shissaku ni igai no fūsetsu . . .[2]

1 Respectively, Garakuta bunko, No 7, p. 109, and Kyō ningyō (Shinshindō, Osaka, September, 1889), p. 51.
2 Respectively, Bunko, No 17 (6 March 1889), p. 347, and Kyō ningyō, p. 145.

After adding the objective particle o, the particle he added most frequently, Kōyō replaced the rhetorical tare with wa and removed the ga. This had the effect of creating a simple statement of equivalence, "the man is Niyake", where there had previously been a question and answer. He then removed the full-stop and the sore after shissaku, to connect shissaku syntactically with what follows. This example shows that Kōyō was concerned not only to add particles where he had previously omitted them, but also to pare away disruptive rhetorical flourishes and noun-stopped sentences. Similar concerns were at work in the changes he made in word order. Let us take three examples: "sutto deru kubi" became "sutto kubi o dashi"; "mabuchi ni someru usukōbai" became "mabuchi ni usukōbai o somete"; and "hidari ni kinu no hankechi o tsukande kuchibiru o nugui - mikkame naredo kaoru uaioretto" became "hidari ni uaioretto no niou kinu hankechi o tsukande kuchiniru o nugui".[3] In each case Kōyō rearranged what he had written so that it ended not with a substantive but with a verb, albeit not in a final form.

The second category consists of deletions from the serialized text. Kōyō deleted phrases and senetences from each chapter of Kyō ningyō, but he deleted the longest passages from the earliest chapters. In the first chapter there is a scene in which Takeda is reading from a collection of translated poems by Byron. As he reads out one of the poems he intersperses his own comments, but Kōyō removed all of these when he revised the text. And most of the argument later on in the same chapter about whether or not Sode is to retrieve the lost ball does not

3 Respectively, Garakuta bunko, Nos 7, p. 109, 14, p. 265, and 14, p. 266, and Kyō ningyō, pp. 52, 114, and 117.

appear in the book edition.

We have seen in chapter four that omission of grammatical particles and noun-stopped sentences were features of Saikaku's prose style. Kōyō's addition of particles to the text of Kyō ningyō and his alterations of word order therefore had the effect of reducing the similarity between his style and that of Saikaku. Neither the long deletions from the text nor the abundant shorter ones make any substantial difference to the plot, and the conclusion to be drawn from them is that Kōyō's ideas were at this stage so fluid as to change considerably within the space of a few months and to demand extensive revision of work he had published just a few months earlier.

APPENDIX TWO

Awashima Kangetsu and Saikaku

Awashima left two fairly detailed accounts of his encounter with Saikaku. The first of these,'Tankidan', first appeared in the magazine Shumi in August 1906. The second, 'Meiji jūnen zengo', appeared in Waseda bungaku in 1925 and is prefaced by a caveat to the effect that Awashima had lost all his books and papers in the great earthquake of 1923 and that the dates might be wrong.

According to the first of these, his enthusiasm for things western waned when he moved to Kanda in about 1877 and started going to the Teikoku toshokan in Ueno, where he started reading Tokugawa literature.[1] Even this date is in some doubt, however, for the 'Kangetsu nenpyō' compiled by Saitō Shōzō and contained in Bon'un'an zatsuwa (Bon'un'an was a pen-name Awashima used) gives the date of that move as 1879.[2] It was there that he met Kōda Rohan and Ishibashi Shian, and Kōyō was later introduced to him by Shian. He made his first trip to Kansai in about 1884 (1885 according to 'Kangetsu nenpyō') and on his return wrote a short piece in imitation of Saikaku's style, so he was clearly an admirer of Saikaku by this time.[3]

According to 'Meiji jūnen zengo', Kangetsu already had a collection of Saikaku's works in his possession by the years

1 Awashima Kangetsu, Bon'un'an zatsuwa, edited by Saitō Shōzō (Shomotsu tenbō sha, 1933), p. 138.
2 Ibid., p. 254. The nenpyo is on pp. 253-257.
3 Ibid., pp. 139-140.

1880-1881, and he showed them to Kōyō and Kōda Rohan at about the time when the magazine Miyako no hana was coming out.[4] Miyako no hana first appeared in October 1888, but since there are traces of Saikaku's style in Fūryū: Kyō ningyō (25 May 1888 to 25 March 1889), Kangetsu's memory seems to be at fault here.

The evidence is too imprecise to draw conclusions with any certainty. However, it seems likely that Kangetsu started reading Saikaku in or around 1880 and that he showed works by Saikaku to Kōyō sometime in 1887 or 1888.

4 'Meiji jūnen zengo', Waseda bungaku (March 1925), p. 135.

APPENDIX THREE

A postscript

On page five of this thesis I stated that the man'yōgana used for the word garakuta in Garakuta bunko were suggested by Kōyō. None of the primary or secondary material I have used gives any indication that Kōyō's suggestion was anything but an original one. Since writing this thesis, however, I have learnt that it was not original. In a pile of old magazines I acquired I found a single copy of a magazine titled Garakuta chinpō 我樂多珍報 . It is the eighty-seventh issue and is dated 11 November 1881; it was evidently published by the Fusake-esha 淳西京繪社 in Kyoto. I have come across no other copies of the magazine and have seen none listed in library catalogues.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Works of Kōyō

This bibliography contains only those works of Kōyō mentioned in this thesis. A full, albeit not complete, bibliography of Kōyō's works is to be found in Kindai bungaku kenkyū sōsho 近代文學研究叢書, volume 7 (Shōwa Joshi Daigaku Kōyōkai 昭和女子大學光葉會 1957), pp. 27-46. Where applicable, I have given the number of the Kōyō zenshū volume in which a work is to be found in brackets after the entry.

Anna Karēnina アンナカレーニナ, Bunsō 文藪, Nos 1 (September 1902) to 6 (February 1903). (With Senuma Kayō 瀬沼夏葉)

Aobudō 青葡萄, Yomiuri shinbun 讀賣新聞, 16 September 1895 to 1 November 1895 (KZ 4)

Benikaishi 紅儀紙, Yomiuri shinbun, 23-26 December 1889.

Dokusha hyōbanki 讀者評判記, Momochidori 百千鳥, Nos 2 (September 1889) to 7 (December 1889).

Edo no mizu 江戸水, Bunko 文庫 Nos 24-25 (July and August 1889).

Enoshima miyage: Kokkei kai byōbu 江島土産滑稽貝屏風, Garakuta bunko (first series) 我樂多文庫, Nos 1 (2 May 1885) to 8 (25 May 1886); partially reprinted in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', pp. 15-16, and Honma, Meiji bungaku shi I, 370-373.

Fūgamusume 風雅娘, Shincho hyakushu 新著百種, No 3 (June 1889)(KZ 1).

Fūryū: Kyō ningyō 風流京人形 , Garakuta bunko No 1 (25 May 1888) to Bunko No 18 (25 March 1889); revised edition published by the Shinshindō 駸々堂 of Osaka in September 1889.

Garakuta bunko hirō 我樂多文庫披露 , Garakuta bunko (first series), No 1 (2 May 1885); quoted in full in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 15.

Genrokugurui 元禄狂 , Kokumin shinbun 國民新聞 , 8 May 1890 (Supplement), p. 2.

Jū no namari 銃ノ鉛 , Taiyō 太陽 , III, No 25 (December 1897).

Kantō Gorō 關東五郎 , Shōbungaku 少文學 , Nos 1 (21 September 1889) to 5 (19 December 1889) (KZ 1).

Kazariebi 飾海老 , Yomiuri shinbur, 1-9 January 1890.

Ken'yūsha no enkaku 硯友社ノ沿革, Shinshōsetsu 新小説 , VI, No 1 (1901), pp. 54-67.

Ken'yūsha shasoku 硯友社社則 , Garakuta bunko, No 1 (25 May 1888), pp. 14-15. For authorship, see p. 30 note 4.

Koi no yamai 戀ノ病 , Yomiuri shinbun, 13 November to 5 December 1892 (KZ 2).

Konjiki yasha 金色夜叉 , Yomiuri shinbun, 1 January 1897 to 11 May 1902, and then Shinshōsetsu, VIII, Nos 1 to 3 (January to March 1903); (KZ 6, and NKinBT 5).

Konjiki yasha fukuan oboegaki 金色夜叉腹案覺書 , in Ozaki Kōyō zenshū 尾崎紅葉全集 (Chūō kōronsha 中央公論社 1941), VI, 545-619.

Kōyō zenshū 紅葉全集, 6 volumes (Hakubunkan 博文館 1904).

Kusawakeginu 草分衣 , Niroku shinpō 二六新報 , 15 January to 24 February 1903.

Kyara makura 伽羅枕, Yomiuri shinbun, 5 July 1890 to 23 September 1890 (KZ 2).

Meikyoku Kuretserofu 名曲クレーツエロフ, Kokumin no tomo 國民之友, Nos 239-273 (August to December 1895) (with Konishi Zōtarō 小西增太郎).

Misuji no kami 三筋の髪, Yomiuri shinbun, 1-31 January 1893 (later reprinted as Ukigimaru, q.v.).

Mukitamago むき玉子, Yomiuri shinbun, 11 January to 21 March 1891.

Munezanyō 胸算用, Bungeikai 文藝會, I, No 1 (March 1902); (with Senuma Kakusaburō 瀬沼恪三郎).

Musume hakase 娘博士, Garakuta bunko (first series), No 14 (October 1887).

Musume setsuyō 娘節用 (edited by Kōyō), Shūchin meicho bunko 珍名著文庫, volume 4 (Fuzanbō 富山房 1903).

Namu Amida Butsu 南無阿彌陀佛, Hyakkaen 百花園, Nos 1 to 4 (May to June 1889) (KZ 1).

Natsukosode 夏小袖, (Shunyōdō 春葉堂 September 1892) (KZ 2).

Natsuyase 夏瘦, Yomiuri shinbun, 1-21 May 1890 (KZ 1).

Nenge misho 拈華微笑, Kokumin no tomo, No 69 (New Year Supplement; 3 January 1890) (KZ 1).

Ninin bikuni: Irozange 二人比丘尼色懺悔, Shincho hyakushu, volume 1 (April 1889); facsimile edition issued by Nihon kindai bungaku kan 日本近代文学館 (1973) in Meicho fukkoku zenshū 名著複刻全集 series; (KZ 1).

Ninin mukusuke 二人椋助, Shōnen bungaku 少年文學, volume 2 (Hakubunkan 1891) (KZ 1).

Ninin nyōbō 二人女房, Miyako no hana 都の花, Nos 64-97 (August to December 1891) (KZ 1).

Nise murasaki: Ikari no hachimaki 偽紫怒鉢巻 , Garakuta bunko (first series), Nos 8 and 9 (May and November 1886); most of the first instalment is reprinted in Honma, Meiji bungaku shi, I, 365-368.

Ongyōjutsu 隠形術 , in Shinoyama Ginyō 篠山吟葉 and Hoshino Bakujin 星野麥人 , editors, Kōyō ibun 紅葉遺文 (Ryūbunkan, 1910), pp. 24-29.

Onna 女 , Shinshōsetsu, September 1902.

Osanagokoro をさな心 , Shinshōsetsu, VII, No 3 (March 1902).

Rabijin 裸美人 , Yomiuri shinbun, 22-23 November 1889.

Reinetsu 冷熱 , Yomiuri shinbun, 27 May to 6 July 1894 (KZ 4).

Saikaku zenshū 西鶴全集 , edited by Kōyō and Watanabe Otowa 渡部乙羽 , Teikoku bunko 23 and 24 (Hakubunkan, May and June 1894).

Sankajō 三箇條 , in Yotsu no o 四つの緒 (Shunyōdō, July 1895) (KZ 4).

Sanninzuma 三人妻 , Yomiuri shinbun, 6 March 1892 to 11 May and 5 July to 4 November 1892 (KZ 3).

Sarumakura 猿枕 , Yomiuri shinbun, 1-5 February 1890 (KZ 1).

Shakan Bimyōsai cho Natsukodachi no hyōban 社幹美妙齋著夏木だちの評判 , Garakuta bunko, Nos 7 (10 September 1888) to 9 (10 October 1888).

Shashinchō 寫眞帖 , Shinshōsetsu, VIII, No 11 (1903); with Senuma Kayō.

Shinirozange 新色懺悔 , Yomiuri shinbun, 9-19 February 1890 (KZ 1).

Shinshōsetsu yokoku 新小説予告 , Yomiuri shinbun, 25 February 1896.

Shōsetsu to haiku 小説と俳句 , Taiyō, I, No 9 (1894).

Tajō takon 多情多恨, Yomiuri shinbun, 26 February to 12 June and 1 September to 9 December 1896 (KZ 5).

Taka ryōri 鷹料理, in Yotsu no o (Shunyōdō, July 1895) (KZ 4).

Tategoto sōshi jo 堅琴草紙序 , Garakuta bunko (first series), No 1 (2 May 1885); quoted in full in Katsumoto, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku', p. 17.

Tebiki no ito 手引の糸 , Shinshōsetsu, III, No 1 (January 1898).

Tonari no onna 隣の女 , Yomiuri shinbun, 20 August to 7 October 1893 (KZ 4).

Tōshoka 投書家 , Shinshōsetsu, VII, No 3 (March 1902); with Senuma Kayō.

Tsuki to hito 月と人 , Shinshōsetsu, VIII, No 9 (1903); with Senuma Kayō.

Tsurugēnefu shōhin ツルゲエネフ小品 , Shinshōsetsu, VII, Nos 3-4 (March to April 1902); with Senuma Kayō.

Ukigimaru 浮木丸 , (Shunyōdō, 1896); see Misuji no kami above; (KZ 4).

Uzumagawa 巴波川 , Shincho hyakushu, unnumbered volume (December 1890) (KZ 1).

Yaedasuki 八重襷 , Yomiuri shinbun, 5 June to 3 September 1898 (KZ 4).

Yamato shōkun 大和と昭君 , Bunko, Nos 19-23 (1889).

B Other primary and secondary material in Japanese

Anonymous, 'Bungaku yoron' 文學餘論 , Yomiuri shinbun, 11 September 1892.

Anonymous, 'Chikagoro no bungakkai' 近頃の文學界 , Yomiuri shinbun, 7-8 September 1892.

Asakura Haruhiko 朝倉治彦 , Kashihonya Taisō 貸本屋大惣 ,
Kotsū mamehon 古通豆本 No 32 (Nihon Kosho Tsūshinsha 日本
古書通信社 , 1977).

Fukuda Kiyoto 福田清人 , 'Sanninzuma', Kokugo to kokubungaku
国語と国文學 , XII, No 10 (October 1935), pp. 18-27.

Hiraoka Toshio 平岡敏夫 , 'Kōyō no shoki shōsetsu' 紅葉の初期
小説 , Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLV, No 4 (April 1968), pp.25-42.

- , Nihon kindai bungaku no shuppatsu 日本近代文学
の出発 , (Kinokuniya shoten 紀伊國屋書店 , 1973).

Honma Hisao 本間久雄 , Meiji bungaku shi 明治文學史 ,
fifteenth edition, two volumes (Tōkyōdō 東京堂 , 1965).

- , 'Tōsenroku' 冬扇錄 , Meiji Taishō bungaku kenkyū
明治大正文學研究 , No 17 (September 1955), pp. 94-105.

Hori Shizan 堀紫山 , 'Zappōran' 雜報欄 , Bunshō sekai 文章世界
II, No 2 (February 1907), p. 30-35.

Ihara Saikaku 井原西鶴 , Saikaku shū 西鶴集 , I (NKBT 47).

Ihara Seiseien 井原勢々園 and Gotō Chūgai 後藤宙外 , Dagyokushū
唾玉集 (Shunyōdō, 1906).

Ikari Akira 伊狩章 , Ken'yūsha no bungaku 硯友社の文學 ,
(Hanawa shobō 塙書房 , 1961).

Ishibashi Ningetsu 石橋忍月 , 'Bunko no Kyō ningyō' 文庫の京
人形 , Kokumin no tomo, No 47 (12 April 1889), pp. 39-40.

- , 'Shincho hyakushu no Irozange' 新著百種の
色懺悔 , Kokumin no tomo, Nos 48 (22 April 1889), pp. 35-36,
and 49 (2 May 1889), pp. 38-39.

- , 'Yabu no uguisu no saihyō' 藪鶯の細評 ,
Kokumin no tomo, No 25 (6 July 1888), supplement, pp. 23-27.

Ishibashi Shian 石橋思案 , Joseito katagi: Bonnō no yami 女生徒
かたぎ煩悩の闇 , Garakuta bunko (first series), No 13
(July 1887), pp. 11-16, and 14 (October 1887), pp. 14-19.

– , "'Yabu no uguisu no saihyō' o yomu"「藪鶯」ヘ細評を請む, Kokumin no tomo, No 27 (3 July 1888), pp. 36-37.

Iwaya Daishi巌谷大四, Ozaki Kōyō 尾崎紅葉(Jinbutsu ōraisha, 1967).

Iwaya Sazanami巌谷小波, 'Aete Harunoya no goshujin ni tataku' 敢て春の舎ヘ御主人に叩く , Yomiuri shinbun, 25 December 1886, p. 3.

– , Satsuki no koi五月鯉 , Garakuta bunko, No 1 (25 May 1888) to No 12 (25 November 1888).

Jippensha Ikku十返舎一九 , Kokkei: Enoshima miyage滑稽江嶋土産 (Okajima Shinshichi岡嶋新七, Osaka, 1809-1810).

– , Tokaidō hizakurige 東海道膝栗毛 (NKBT 62).

Kanagaki Robun仮名垣露文, Ushiya zōdan: Aguranabe牛店雑談安愚楽鍋, in Meiji kaikaki bungaku shū (NKinBT 1).

Katsumoto Seiichirō勝本清一郎, 'Ken'yūsha no hossoku'硯友社の発足, Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō国文學解釋と鑑賞 XXVII, No 5 (1962), pp. 9-17.

– , 'Ken'yūsha no seiritsu'硯友社の成立 , Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō, XXVII, No 6 (1962), pp. 9-21.

Kawazoe Kunimoto川副国基, 'Bimyō Kōyō no gunkiteki rekishi shōsetsu'美妙紅葉の軍記的歴史小説, in Gunkimono to sono shūhen軍記物とその周辺, essays in honour of Sasaki Hachirō佐々木八郎 (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu早稲田大学出版部, 1969) pp. 767-780.

Kitamura Tōkoku北村透谷, Tōkoku zenshū, three volumes (Iwanami shoten岩波書店, 1971).

Kōjibashi Ichinin麹橋一人, 'Ninin bikuni: Irozange', Shuppan geppyō出版月評, No 19 (25 April 1889), pp. 80-82.

Kokuritsu kokkai toshokan zō: Meiji ki kankō tosho mokuroku国立国会図書館蔵明治期刊行図書目録, seven volumes

(Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan, 1971-1976).

Kyoku Sanjin 曲山人, Kosan kingorō: kanamajiri musume setsuyō 小さん金五郎假名文章娘節用, in Sasagawa Taneo 笹川種郎, editor, Sharebon kusazōshi shū 洒落本草雙紙集, Hyōshaku Edo bungaku sōsho 評釋江戸文學叢書, volume 8 (Kōdansha 講談社, 1970).

Kyokutei Bakin 曲亭馬琴, Chosakudō zakki 著作堂雜記, in Kyokutei ikō 曲亭遺稿 (Kokusho kankōkai 國書刊行會, 1911).

Maruoka Kyūka 丸岡九華, 'Ken'yūsha bungaku undō no tsuioku' 硯友社文學運動の追憶, Waseda bungaku 早稲田文學, No 232 (June 1925), pp. 24-49.

–, 'Ken'yūsha no bungaku undō', Waseda bungaku, Nos 233 (July 1925), pp. 108-126, and 243 (April 1926), pp. 78-91.

Masamune Hakuchō 正宗白鳥, 'Kōyō Sanjin' 紅葉山人, Chūō Kōron 中央公論, XXII, No 8 (1907), pp. 46-47.

–, Sakkaron 作家論, fifth edition (Sōgensha 創元社, 1948).

Matsushita Munehiko 松下宗彦, 'Kōyō no "namida"' 紅葉の涙, Seishin joshi daigaku ronsō 聖心女子大学論叢, No 4 (March 1954), pp. 76-90.

Miyake Kaho 三宅花圃, Yabu no uguisu 藪鶯 (Kinkōdō, 1888).

Miyazaki Koshoshi 宮崎湖処子, 'Ken'yūsha oyobi sono sakka' 硯友社及び其の作家, Kokumin no tomo, No 277 (4 January 1896), pp. 27-28.

–, 'Ryūrōshi no Imado shinjū' 柳浪子の今戸心中, Kokumin no tomo, No 309 (August 1896), pp. 23-25.

Mizuno Minoru 水野稔, Kibyōshi-sharebon no sekai 黄表紙洒落本の世界 (Iwanami shoten, 1976).

Mori Senzō 森銑三, Meiji jinbutsu yowa 明治人物夜話 (Kōdansha, 1973).

Mutō Motoaki 武藤元昭, 'Shunsui igo' 春水以後, Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVIII, No 10 (1971), pp. 146-155.

Nakanishi Baika 中西梅花, 'Shincho hyakushu daigogō Fūryūbutsu hihyō' 新著百種第五号風流仏批評, Yomiuri shinbun, 17 October 1889, supplement, p. 1.

(Nisei) Umebori Kokuga 梅墓里谷峨, Shunshoku renri no ume 春色連理の梅, edited by Murakami Shizuo 村上静人, volume twenty-five of the unnamed series published by the Ninjōbon kankōkai 人情本刊行會 (1923).

Oka Yasuo 岡保生, Ozaki Kōyō - sono kisoteki kenkyū 尾崎紅葉その基礎的研究 (Tōkyōdō, 1953).

--, Ozaki Kōyō no shōgai to bungaku 尾崎紅葉の生涯と文学 (Meiji shoin 明治書院, 1968).

Okitsu Kaname 興津要, Tenkanki no bungaku 転換期の文学 (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1960).

Ryūtei Rijō 滝亭鯉丈, Hanagoyomi: Hasshōjin 花暦八笑人, edited by Koike Tōgorō 小池藤五郎 (Iwanami shoten, 1942).

Seki Naohiko 関直彦, 'Nippon shōsetsu kairyō ron' 日本小説改良論, Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun 東京日日新聞, 12-13 January 1887.

Shikitei Sanba 式亭三馬, Ukiyofuro 浮世風呂 (NKBT 63).

Shiota Ryōhei 塩田良平, 'Konjiki yasha no honbun seiritsu ni tsuite' 金色夜叉の本文成立について, in Meiji bungaku ronkō 明治文学論考 (Ōfūsha, 1970).

Takada Sanae 高田早苗, Hanpō mukashibanashi 半峯昔ばなし, (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1927).

Tamenaga Shunsui 爲永春水, Fugetsu kaijō: Harutsugedori 風月花情春告鳥, Nihon koten bungaku zenshū 47 日本古典文学全集 (Shōgakkan 小学館 1971).

–, Shunshoku umegoyomi 春色梅兒譽美 (NKBT 64).

Tanaka Ichirō 田中一郎, Kokkei shinwa: Shosei kimotsubushi 滑稽新話書生肝粒誌 (Kokindō 古今堂, 1883).

Tanimura Hisako 谷村久子, 'Garakuta bunko hisshabon mokuroku' 我楽多文庫筆写本目録, Gakuen 学苑, No 242 (May 1960), pp. 64-71.

–, 'Garakuta bunko katsuji hibaibon mokuroku' 我楽多文庫活字非売本目録, Gakuen, No 243 (June 1960), pp. 72-76.

Tayama Katai 田山花袋, Kindai no shōsetsu 近代の小説 (Kindai bunmei sha 近代文明社 1923).

Teruoka Yasutaka 暉峻康隆, Saikaku - hyōron to kenkyū 西鶴評論と研究, two volumes (Chūō Kōron sha, 1948-1950).

Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰, editor, 'Shomoku jisshu' 書目十種, Kokumin no tomo, Nos 48 (22 April 1889), supplement, pp. 1-18, 49 (2 May 1889), pp. 30-32, and 54 (July 1889), pp. 282-29.

Tosa Tōru 土佐亨, 'Kinsei bungaku ni genwa o motsu Kōyō sakuhin nishu' 近世文学に原話をもつ紅葉作品二種, Kashiigata 香椎潟, No 17 (March 1972), pp. 141-152.

–, 'Konjiki yasha shoshutsu keisai oyobi genkōbon taishō hyō' 金色夜叉初出掲載および現行本対照表, Bungei to shisō, No 38 (February 1974), pp. 31-46.

–, 'Konjiki yasha no sōbō - zenpen to ninjōbon Musume setsuyō' 金色夜叉の相貌 前編と人情本娘節用, Kokugo to kokubungaku, XLVI, No 12 (1969), pp. 35-48.

–, 'Konjiki yasha shōken' 金色夜叉小見, Kashiigata, No 15 (September 1969), pp. 62-70.

– , 'Kōyō shoki shōsetsu no hōhō' 紅葉初期小説の方法 , Nihon bungaku 日本文学 , XXII, No 5 (1973), pp. 1-12.

– , 'Kōyō to Yomiuri shinbun sha to no iwa o meguru Meiji nijū gonen kugatsu no jiken ni tsuite' 紅葉と読売新聞社との違和をめぐる明治二十五年九月の事件について , Kashiigata, No 20 (March 1975), pp. 21-29.

– , 'Sanninzuma no shūhen' 三人妻の周辺 , Bungei to shisō, No 35 (December 1971), pp. 16-30.

– , 'Tajō takon shiron' 多情多恨試論 , Kokugo to kokubungaku, LII, No 4 (1975), pp. 12-25.

Tsubouchi Shōyō 坪内逍遙 , 'Meiji nijūninen bungaku-jō no dekigoto geppyō' 明治二十二年文學上の出來事月評 , Yomiuri shinbun, 13 January 1890, p. 5.

– , 'Shinbunshi no shōsetsu' 新聞紙の小説 , Yomiuri shinbun, 17 and 18 January 1890.

– , Shin migaki: Imotosekagami 新磨妹と背鏡 , twelve fascicles (Kaishin shoya 會心書屋 , December 1885 to September 1886).

– , Tsubouchi Shōyō shū (NKinBT 3).

Uchida Roan 内田魯庵 , 'Kōyō Sanjin no Fūryū: Kyō ningyō' 紅葉山人の風流京人形 , Jogaku zasshi, No 157 (13 April 1889), pp. 405-406.

– , Meiji no sakka 明治の作家 (Chikuma shobō 1941).

Yamada Bimyō 山田美妙 , Bimyō senshū 美妙選集 , two volumes (Ritsumeikan shuppanbu 立命館出版部 , 1935).

– , 'Chōkai shōsetsu tengu' 嘲戒小説天狗 , Gorakuta bunko (first series), Nos 9 to 13 (November 1886 to July 1887).

– , 'Musashino' 武蔵野 , Yomiuri shinbun, 20 and 23 November and 6 December 1887.

Yamaguchi Takeshi 山口剛, editor, Ninjōbonshū 人情本集, Nihon meicho zenshū Edo bungei no bu 15 (1926).

Yamamoto Masahide 山本正秀, Genbun-itchi no rekishi ronkō 言文一致の歴史論考 (Ōfūsha, 1971).

———, Kindai buntai hassei no shiteki kenkyū 近代文体発生の史的研究 (Iwanami shoten, 1965).

Yamazaki Fumoto 山崎麓, 'Kōyō no Kantō Gorō sono ta' 紅葉の関東五郎其他, Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō, III, No 8 (1938), pp. 53-56.

Yoshida Seiichi 吉田精一, Gendai bungaku to koten 現代文学と古典 (Shibundō 至文堂 1961).

Yasuda Kōami 安田衡阿鼈 and sixteen others, 'Konjiki yasha jōchūgehen gappyō' 金色夜叉上中下篇合評, Geibun 藝文, No 2 (August 1902), pp. 86-138.

C Other secondary sources in English

Hamilton, Alice King: 'White Lilies', in Captain Charles King, ed., Captain Dreams and Other Stories (Grosset and Dunlap, New York, 1895), pp. 77-111.

Kornicki, Peter F.: 'Nishiki no ura: An Instance of Censorship and the Structure of a Sharebon', Monumenta Nipponica, XXXII, No 2 (1977), pp. 153-188.

Lane, Richard: 'Saikaku's Prose Works: A Bibliographical Study', Monumenta Nipponica, XIV, Nos 1-2 (1959), pp. 1-26.

———: 'The Beginnings of the Modern Japanese Novel: Kanazōshi, 1600-1682', Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, No 20 (1957), pp. 644-701.

Morita, James R.: 'Garakuta bunko', Monumenta Nipponica, XXIV, No 3 (1969), pp. 219-233.

– : 'Yamada Bimyō as Novelist' (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1968).

Pyle, Kenneth B.: The New Generation in Meiji Japan (Stanford University Press, California, 1969).

Ryan, Marleigh Grayer: Japan's First Modern Novel (Columbia University Press, New York, 1967).

– : The Development of Realism in the Fiction of Tsubouchi Shōyō (University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1975).

Taeusch, Carl F.:'Ozaki Kōyō and His Approach to the Modern Novel', (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1977).