

NHSJ Newsletter

第 34 号 2016 年 2 月 15 日

日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会事務局

〒278-8510 千葉県野田市山崎 2641

東京理科大学理工学部教養 川村幸夫研究室内

E-mail: jimukyoku.hawthorne@gmail.com

公式 HP: <http://www.nhs-j.org/>

郵便振替 00190-1-66463

ご 挨拶

会 長 成 田 雅 彦

この原稿を書いている今、2015 年も残すところあとわずかです。今年も我々の協会にはいろいろなことがありました。まずは 5 月、東京の日本大学で全国大会を開催することができ、今回も実り豊かな発表や議論が行われました。大会準備委員、事務局、また日本大学の先生方には多大なご尽力をいただきました。学会誌『フォーラム』も編集の先生方のお蔭でますます充実したものになっています。この場を借りてお礼申し上げます。東京、中部、関西、九州の各支部研究会も変わりなく活発な活動が続いており、これは、会員わずか 200 名ほどの小さな学会であることを思えば驚くべきことと思えます。研究発表や読書会、また作品研究と、没後 150 年を経て、しかも遠い極東の国で、これほど熱烈に論じてもらえるホーソーンという作家はつくづく幸せな作家です。没後 150 年といえば、それに合わせた協会の記念論文集の準備も進んでいます。来年春には刊行される予定です。ご期待下さい。

海外との連携も進んでいます。昨年この欄でも触れましたホーソーン・ポー国際学会が 2018 年 6 月京都ガーデンパレスホテルを会場に開催されることが正式に決定しました。私のもとには、中国の研究者の方から、中国でもホーソーン学会ができたこと、ついては、日本ホーソーン協会と強く連携したいという知らせも届いています。一見、文学研究が力を失っていくように見える昨今、この「活況」は喜ばしいことと言わなければなりません。何かの縁でホーソーンを読み始めた私たち一人一人は、これまでもこの作家を通じて世界の「見えない読者のコミュニティ」の一員でした。しかし、それが急速に visible community となって私たちの前に現れてきています。人見知りの激しい日本のホーソーニアンとしては、多少、緊張し、当惑しつつ握手の手を差し出す格好かもしれませんが、世界の同好の士と直接出会い、つながっていけるというのは、やはり意味深いことにちがいません。

現代は、世界的なディアスポラの時代であると言われます。大勢の人々が戦争などのために住み慣れた土地や親しい人々との絆を失い放浪する。ニュースで伝えられる中東やアフリカの難民の苦境を見るにつけ、それが実感として感じられます。多くの人々の目的地とされるヨーロッパ、そしてそれ以外の世界もまた変化を余儀なくされていくでしょう。さらには、精神的な領域まで話を広げますと、ディアスポラという現象は、今日、様々な局面で慣れ親しんだ世界を離れ、新たな世界に踏み出していかなければならない私たち全体の問題でもあるようです。そうした時代に、ホーソーンが新しい意味を持って読まれています。ローレンス・ビュエルは『緋文字』は何よりもディアスポラの文学だと言いましたし、インド生まれの作家パラティ・ムカジーは、自らをインド人ではなく、移り住んだアメリカに精神の根を張ったアメリカ作家と規定して、『緋文字』に大きなインスピレーションを受けた作品を書いています。「世界文学」などというシャイなホーソーンは赤面するのでしょうか？しかし、この時代、我々は確実に世界の人々をゆさぶる問題意識を共有してこの作家を読んでいくことになるのではないのでしょうか。アメリカン・ルネサンスの文学は、その意味で「彼らの」物語であるだけでなく、「我々の」物語になりつつあるのかもしれません。来年の全国大会は、会場が京都、同志社大学の寒梅館に決まりました。願ってもない会場を手配していただきました先生方に感謝申し上げます。会員の皆さまにとりまして、この 2016 年が良い年でありますよう。それでは、5 月京都にてお目にかかります。

Presentation

“Universal Sympathy with Nature”: Revisiting Visions of Nature in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Works **Naoyuki NOZAKI (University of Texas, Arlington)**

This presentation examines Nathaniel Hawthorne’s representations of nature in terms of environmental theory. Over the last twenty years, environmental criticism has been increasing its presence in the field of literary studies, reflecting a recent scholarly concern shared across disciplines in humanities: the need to work out cultural theories that negotiate the dichotomy between nature and culture. In contrast to other major writers of the American Renaissance, Hawthorne has gathered little attention in the field of environmental criticism; however, his multi-layered representation of nature is not incompatible with diverse concerns of environmental criticism, but has the potential to even cultivate the theoretical field.

Some important reasons for Hawthorne’s invisibility can be traced back to F. O. Matthiessen’s *American Renaissance* (1941), one of the very works that canonized Hawthorne. In the book, Matthiessen defined as a driving characteristic throughout Hawthorne’s entire career his efforts to confront “complexities” of “the world of men,” instead of, as Thoreau did, setting out to “find himself” in the natural world. Later critics have, following Matthiessen’s cue, aptly demonstrated Hawthorne’s grappling with pressing social issues of his day, but not challenged the view of him as privileging culture over nature. Hawthorne’s unpopularity in the field should be explained by critics’ failure to problematize the predominant dualism of nature and culture, not by his alleged indifference to the natural world.

Hawthorne’s semi-autobiographical travel sketches are one of the potential sites for redefining his visions of nature. The narrator, like the young Hawthorne, departs for an American picturesque tour in the hope of discovering resources for his enterprise to develop a national literature of America; but as shown in “My Visit to Niagara,” his eventual disappointment points to the fact that an ideologically determined meaning of a landscape frustrates one’s own perception of it. Hawthorne indeed goes beyond exposing the cultural construction of “American” nature. Hawthorne’s dramatization of the young traveler’s revived sense of awe at the falls’ material forces breaks the clear ontological distinction between the human subject and the object world. Furthermore, in “The Canal-Boat,” where we witness his proto-environmental vision of woods destroyed by land development, Hawthorne’s anthropomorphism brings back to our consciousness histories and subjectivities of nonhuman existents.

In *The Blithedale Romance*, Hawthorne further complicates the nature/culture binary in his depiction of the paradox of the pastoral ideal, which Leo Marx’s *Machine in the Garden* (1964) once read as definitive of the nation’s ideological development. Miles Coverdale, in idealizing – indeed instrumentalizing – the nature of Blithedale as the final arbiter of supposedly debased civilization, not only evades his own responsibility for that civilization but also ends up neglecting the materiality of nature. In spite of his narrator, Hawthorne finds in nature a possibility of rewriting cultural scripts. While in the pastoral tradition women and nature have only functioned as the passive background of masculine activity and fantasy, in Blithedale female characters are invigorated by the natural world, which, for Hawthorne cannot be fully contained by culture, but has its own agency. As suggested in his “re-naturalization” of femininity, for Hawthorne the reconciliation of the division between nature and culture even leads to the possibility of political change.

English and Irish Variations on *The Scarlet Letter* around the Turn of the Century

Akemi YOSHIDA (Kinki University)

By looking at fictional texts produced in and around fin-de-siècle Britain, this paper speculates upon the degree and scope of the influence that Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) exerted upon English and Irish writers such as Thomas Hardy (1840-1928), George Moore (1852-1933), and George Egerton (1859-1945). These writers all dealt with the controversial theme of illegitimacy and fallen women in their fiction, questioning the justifiability of any rigorous application of a puritanical doctrine of purity for women in a post-Darwinian, godless world. I argue that Hawthorne's role as precursor must have been considerable, and that he provided these writers of a younger generation with a conceptual framework for reorganizing their world view, he himself being an agnostic, much ahead of his own time.

This paper looks first at Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* (1891). Similarities between Hardy's novel and *The Scarlet Letter*, including some almost identical scenes and dialogue, have already been pointed out by critics. I argue here, however, that the influence of the latter upon the former might be even greater than has been hitherto recognised. It could be said that Hawthorne provided the basic conceptual framework for the textual formation of Hardy's *Tess*. Tony Tanner has famously analyzed the symbolism of the colour red in *Tess*, but curiously, no connection seems to have been pointed out between this red colour associated with the heroine Tess and the scarlet colour of the letter worn by Hester Prynne. To me, it seems likely that Hardy consciously shared this symbolism with Hawthorne, showing his respect for a great American writer and presenting his own novel as, in effect, an oblique homage to Hawthorne. Another common element to both texts, the opposition between artificial human moral codes and the laws of nature, also seems important, showing how Hardy was reorganizing his world view in a similar way to that of Hawthorne some forty years before.

Moreover, *The Scarlet Letter* casts its shadow upon other works by Hardy. His early work *Two on a Tower* (1882) and his last novel *Jude the Obscure* (1895) both feature heroines bearing illegitimate children and are full of allusions to the biblical commandment against adultery, suggesting that these works also are literary variations upon the central theme presented in *The Scarlet Letter*.

I move on in the paper to discuss two writers of Irish origin, George Moore and George Egerton. Both were agnostic, and both authors also created heroines with illegitimate children. Moore's eponymous heroine in *Esther Waters* (1892) and Rose Leicester in *The Lake* (1905) even have names that sound similar to Hester, and both suggest the heroine of *The Scarlet Letter*. Rose in *The Lake* and Evir in Egerton's short story "At the Heart of the Apple," are heroines associated with the natural and the primitive, and by obstinately refusing to disclose the name of the fathers of their babies, they seem to present themselves as literary daughters of Hester Prynne.

For those with similarly questioning minds, living in a similarly puritanical environment around the turn of the nineteenth century, *The Scarlet Letter*, with its controversial subject matter and its insightful, questioning attitudes toward social conventions must have appeared as an important prototype. It is hardly surprising that there would be various literary variations upon it and that it would stimulate further literary explorations of its themes. The late Victorian literary world, as we see from these examples, seems filled with the echoes and resonance of *The Scarlet Letter*.

Workshop

“The Minister’s Black Veil”: If It Is Kept Secret, There Is the Flower; If It Is Not Kept Secret, There Is No Flower.

“The Minister’s Black Veil” stands as a milestone of Hawthorne’s maturity as a professional writer. Michael J. Colacurcio and Robert Martin both recognize the work as Hawthorne’s highest achievement written during his apprenticeship. If you recall that Colacurcio identifies Reverend Hooper “in his absolutism . . . [with] a Digby figure and situates Hooper somewhere beyond Goodman Brown and on his way to being Dimmesdale,” you will find clues in “The Minister’s Black Veil” to better understand Hawthorne. Despite its importance, this work has only recently been discussed in the conferences of The Nathaniel Hawthorne Society of Japan.

Four panelists commonly intrigued by the dilemma of what the minister reveals by paradoxically and symbolically concealing the very thing to be revealed with his black veil gathered for a Workshop entitled ““The Minister’s Black Veil’: If It Is Kept Secret, There Is the Flower; If It Is Not Kept Secret, There Is No Flower.” The panelists attempted to further clarify this problem from their own perspectives and furnish clues to unanswered questions: the unconscious psyche of the minister in the seventeenth-century community where Puritanism was beginning to weaken (Togashi); the signification of the “two folds of crape” in the historical context of the story (Kodaira); the relationship between the veiled minister and the author, who blurted, “I veil myself” (Sasaki); and the possibility of Hooper being the Quaker minister, a hypothesis evoked by consideration of the Quaker elements in *Moby-Dick* (Ueshiba).

The Symbolism and Multi-Layerism of the Veil: The Black Veil for Whom and What? **Takeo TOGASHI (Reitaku University)**

On the surface, the plot of “The Minister’s Black Veil” is easy to understand. Mr. Hooper appears with a black veil on his face as a symbol of a secret sin he is thought to have committed. There is, however, no concrete proof in the work that he indeed did. Nevertheless, the people of the Milford village are seized at first sight with a fear of his completely changed appearance. Their fear is simply expressed by the word “wonder-struck,” but a clear, gender difference emerges in its depiction. Unlike men, women instinctively sense the nature of Hooper’s veil, which leads to the point by Frederic Crews on “a defense against normal adult love.” Crews points out Mr. Hooper’s inexperience in sexual relationships with women. His inexperience not only comprises the very core of his fear of women, but also provides a clue to a secret sin.

The veil symbolizing a secret sin does not necessarily work independently: there are cases where it has greater influence in harmony with other factors. One remarkable example we can give is a facial expression that often appears and perplexes us in the works of Hawthorne: a smile. There are a lot of smiles in this story, and most of are attached with a modifier such as “melancholy” or “sad.” We can, however, see a smile without any modifier in the scene where Hooper and his fiancée Elizabeth converse about his veil. Elizabeth wants to know why he has a black veil on his face, and makes a desperate entreaty for its unveiling. Despite the genuineness of her request, Hooper refuses it in an obstinate manner and both are filled with a momentary blank. This is the moment when Elizabeth comes to and is suddenly affected with the same terror. We guess, when reading the words “at last,” that Hooper must anticipate a change in her consciousness. It may be true that Hooper cannot accept that their relationship will come to an end, but it would be more unacceptable to grant her request because unveiling would amount to the exposure of a secret sin. Taking these circumstances into consideration, we see that Hooper’s smile in this scene is completely different from his other smiles and can rather be likened to a smile of relief.

Hooper's veil originally symbolizes a secret sin and is an object of fear to the community. Yet Hooper puts all of his energy into helping the community, and does so as devotedly as ever. Through his work for the community, the veil gradually changes from a symbol of fear to that of reverence, much like *The Scarlet Letter* "A." In this way, the veil is flexible and diverse, while also functioning as a mirror that reflects the inner self and shows oneself its own meaning. In this sense, Hooper's veil has multiplicity and is surely polysemous.

Reverend Hooper's Two Folds of Crape: The Theological Ambiguity in Hawthorne **Yuki KODAIRA (Ex-Part-time Lecturer, Kanto Gakuin University)**

Reverend Hooper's black veil consists of "two folds of crape." Why does the veil consist of two folds instead of one? I would like to look into the meaning of the two folds of Hooper's crape.

Everyone in the village is afraid of the black veil except Elizabeth, Reverend Hooper's fiancé. It is suggested through his sermon that the veil is a symbol of "secret sin." When Elizabeth meets him, she makes sure that the veil is just "two folds of crape" and reassures herself that there is nothing terrible in a piece of crape. Yet when she fixes her eyes on the black veil, she is caught with terror and trembles before him. Hooper mistakes her trembling for what he himself experienced in the "The Great Awakening." It is not the veil, but what is behind the veil, "the Great Awakening," that frightens Elizabeth. Brave and wise, she wants to know the truth by herself, showing a sentiment that we suppose Hawthorne feels himself. Elizabeth's feeling towards the veil evinces Hawthorne's.

"The Great Awakening" reminds us of two persons, Jonathan Edwards (1703-58) and George Whitfield (1714-70). Edwards' *Sinners in the Hands of Angry God* emphasized man's sin and God's wrath towards it. Meanwhile, Whitfield's preaching tour to New England had a great effect on "The Great Awakening." Governor Belcher was an enthusiastic supporter of Whitfield. During Belcher's administration, Hooper preaches the election sermon, which is very honorable. Hooper is a successor to Calvinism, while the villagers are not. Seeing the black veil, they evade him. Their evasion manifests their severe criticism not only of Hooper, but also of "The Great Awakening."

Leonard J. Fick says that "Hawthorne has aligned himself with the Arminians as opposed to the traditional New England Calvinists." Arminianism, which recognizes man's effort to achieve salvation and emphasizes man's free will, was once denied in 1618 in Dordrecht but became popular in New England in the middle of the 18th century. Edwards was deeply concerned with the spread of Arminianism. Calvinists seek for man's salvation before everything, while Hawthorne seeks man's happiness rather than salvation. And furthermore Hawthorne's God was not "the dread Being" but a humane and paternal God interested in the earthly happiness of His children.

Hawthorne was certainly interested in sin. In those days people were generally concerned with business or amusement rather than sin. But Sin was a real matter of concern for Hawthorne. He could agree with Hooper concerning the recognition of sin. He could not, however, agree with those who attempted to discover their "secret sin" and became separated from brotherhood. Contrary to Hooper, Hawthorne really searched for relationships with people.

By "two folds of crape," Hawthorne secretly means both sin and love and the two ideas of an angry God and a benevolent God.

The Minister and the Author, Both Veiled

Eitetsu SASAKI (Momoyama Gakuin University)

In “Mosses from an Old Manse” (1846), Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-64) paradoxically dropped off his mask to blurt, “So far as I am a man of really individual attributes, I veil my face.” In making sure of his hidden undissembled intention regarding the author-reader communion, this presentation treats “The Minister’s Black Veil” (1836), a short fiction written during Hawthorne’s apprenticeship to become a professional writer.

“The Minister’s Black Veil” depicts the unintelligible behavior of the Reverend Hooper, who wears a black veil. Critics are divided over the problem of whether Hooper merits praise or harsh criticism. Existentially aware of the meaning of life, or to use Heidegger’s phraseology, *Dasein*, Hooper warns his parishioners, it seems, of how foolish it is to stay ignorant in plausibly blissful daily activities. If closely inspected, however, Hooper is far from being an Existentialist. He forcefully imposes the same identity as sinners on one and all parishioners, in the name of Puritanism and its dogmatic doctrine, the notion of total depravity. He shows unawares his totalitarian inclination toward essentialism — the sort of attitude that Existentialists denounce. Furthermore, he neglects to hold communion with his parishioners and even with God, and thus incarcerates himself in his own solipsistic realm. When we recall the author’s above-mentioned confession of “I veil my face,” we confront this question: How close is Hawthorne to Hooper the veiled minister?

The Deconstructionist Paul de Man points out that, because of its etiological definition of speaking about something other than itself, the deconstruction of the allegory is part of the allegory itself. From this perspective, we can understand that it is impossible for Hooper to allegorically represent the w/Word(s) (of God), the Origin, and the Cause (of sin) with the use of his black veil, the proxy, symbol, letter, and or language with which he hopes to allegorically convince the congregation of the Puritan notion of total depravity. Aware of how he appears to the eyes of his parishioners, Hooper stops associating with them. He is openly avoided and secretly ridiculed by men and women, young and old. In these adverse circumstances, the degree of their misapprehension over the reason for his veil deepens all the more. In a negative way, Hooper exemplifies the process of what the leading Deconstructionist Jacques Derrida calls “*différance*” and attests to Derrida’s insistence that allegory deconstructs itself.

More than a decade after publishing this story, Hawthorne became a canonical writer by dint of his masterpiece, *The Scarlet Letter* (1850). But around this time he also suffered severe hardships, most of which sprang from misunderstanding on the part of his contemporaries: he was expelled from the sinecure position at the custom house, targeted in a hate campaign by Charles Upham, and incurred the displeasure of locals through his sarcastic depiction of the locally employed officers at the custom house. Moreover, since the 1980s, Hawthorne’s support for Franklin Pierce, the notoriously pro-slavery politician who went on to win the presidency, has induced left-minded critics to undermine the writer’s literary reputation.

In his apprenticeship to become a professional writer, Hawthorne already depicted his future self in the image of Hooper. Portraying both Hooper’s liability to be a victim of misapprehension and his resigned acceptance of this fate, the author predicted the fate that was to befall him later in life and after his death. Hawthorne paradoxically allegorized his own nature of veiled otherness in the form of desacralized allegory/parable and represented it through the Reverend Hooper.

Blasphemies to Be Veiled: The Veiled Theme Conveyed from “The Minister’s Black Veil” to *Moby-Dick*

Maki UESHIBA (Tokyo Seiei College)

In my presentation I try to demonstrate that the Reverend Hooper in “The Minister’s Black Veil” is a Quaker clergyman. For one thing, the chapel where he prays is called “Milford meeting-house” rather than Milford chapel. A Quaker’s chapel is sometimes described as a meeting-house. Moreover, the Congregationalists of the meeting-house in the “Minister’s Black Veil” often “quake” when they listen to Mr. Hooper preach. My presentation therefore presumes that Mr. Hooper could be a Quaker clergyman.

The Quaker Isaac Pennington said in 1651, “As people love themselves too much to discriminate their inside evils from other attributes, and then they cannot bear even being pointed out them by others.” Pennington left many pamphlets and books in order to establish the Quaker’s theology. As Pennington himself might have believed, Hooper’s Congregationalists in the short story always fear being exposed for their “secret sin.” Mr. Hooper’s black veil must symbolize their fear for their own “secret sin.”

Melville’s *Moby-Dick*, the narrative often portrays Quaker attributes because the Nantucket whalers are often Quakers. Captain Bildad and Peleg in Chapter 16 are defined as Quakers. Captain Ahab and Ishmael are not expressly identified as Quakers, but some context of the novel suggests that Ahab is a member of that religion. In the middle of chapter 16, for example, Ishmael offers a general commentary about the Quaker character. He suddenly changes the portrait of the general character of a Quaker coming from Nantucket to one of the tragic hero. He describes, “all men tragically great are made so through a certain morbidness.” If this analysis might apply to Captain Ahab contextually, Ahab could be a Quaker as well as Starbuck. Isaac Pennington also said, “a man is a prisoner because his understanding is fettered, his consciousness is locked and his character and his disposition are bound.” This recognition possesses a specific affinity for Ahab’s perception of self. He says in chapter 36, “if man will strike, strike through the mask! How can the prisoner reach outside except by thrusting through the wall?” The word “prisoner” seems to imply the Quaker’s perception of self.

According to the biographical information, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Melville met on an the excursion to Monument Mountain in August of 1850. On the excursion, Melville and Oliver Wendell Holmes debated on the superiority of English novelists to American ones. Melville argued that American writers could be compared favorably with English writers. Two weeks later he submitted an essay to the Literary World lauding Hawthorne’s works as achievements equivalent to those of William Shakespeare. Sophia Hawthorne wrote to Evert. A. Duyckinck expressing appreciation for Melville’s understanding of her husband’s works. She admired *Moby-Dick*, too. Nathaniel also admired it, although the letter evidencing his admiration disappeared. Thus, Sophia and Nathaniel Hawthorne had a positive relation with Herman Melville in the early 1850s.

Hawthorne, James and Intertextuality

Shizue EBINE (Emeritus Professor, Ochanomizu University)

No reader of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry James could be unaware of the close relationship between them. Richard Chase keeps returning to them when he explains his concept of the romance-novel division/fusion which to him constitutes the distinctive trait of the American novel. Richard H. Brodhead regards James as the most eminent of the school of Hawthorne. We find the persistence of this interest in the Hawthorne-James relationship in Gordon Fraser's recent essay (2013), criticizing Brodhead and his followers for reading James's *Hawthorne* (1879) through the lens of Harold Bloom's "anxiety of influence," thereby failing to place it in the context of his age. Interestingly Tomoyuki Zettsu, in his review of Akira Hongo's book on eroticism in 19th American writers (including James), observes that one recent trend in literary studies is the exploration of "intertextual relationship," "palimpsest" phenomena among literary texts. In this talk I attempt to analyze the Hawthorne-James relationship in James's *Hawthorne*, not only focusing on Hawthorne's influence on James, but to hint, if possible, what the phenomenon of intertextuality can do for acts of literary creation.

Before examining Hawthorne's influence on James, a few remarks on the term "intertextuality" are in order. It is known that this term was first used by Julia Kristeva. As Kristeva is regarded as a semiotologist critic, some scholars, Leon S. Roudiez for example, says that Kristeva's concept has been misunderstood, and claims that "it has nothing to do with matters of influence by one writer on another." To my mind this view misses the significance of Kristeva's concept for literary studies.

James's *Hawthorne* was published in England as one of the English Men of Letters series, edited by John Morley. Hawthorne was the only American featured in the series. James sketches Hawthorne's biography and discusses his novels and well-known short stories. He refers to Hawthorne's Note-Books, and notes the historical-cultural differences between England and the United States. It makes a well-balanced critical biography intended for English readership, but we notice that James's appreciation of Hawthorne contains perceptions which challenge usual readings. While he admits that *The Scarlet Letter* is Hawthorne's most accomplished novel, he nevertheless emphasizes a lack of warmth in the treatment of its subject. He finds Dimmesdale and Chillingworth interesting, but feels a certain passionless quality in Hester, who is, he says, merely a secondary figure. He deplores "a want of reality and an abuse of the fanciful element — of a certain superficial symbolism." James's attitude to Hawthorne's other works seems more favorable. He appreciates "richness of tone and density of detail" in *The House of the Seven Gables*. He rewrites *The Blithedale Romance* into *The Bostonians*, a brilliant tribute and parody of its predecessor. The most interesting feature of *Hawthorne* is James's predilection for *The Marble Faun*. He is fascinated by Donatello, "the living faun of flesh and blood" and delighted with "the simple combination and opposition of the four actors." We find a long paragraph alluding to *The Marble Faun* in one of James's last unfinished novels, *The Sense of the Past*, and there is obvious intertextuality between *The Golden Bowl* and *The Marble Faun*. I suggest Hawthorne's reservations about *The Scarlet Letter* may be concerned with the distinction between "symbol" and "sign," which, according to Kristeva, marks the transition from the age of allegory to that of the novel. James's complaint about too much symbolism in *The Scarlet Letter* may come from his desire to create a novel which is more realistic and freed from the tradition of New England Protestantism which never completely disappeared from Hawthorne's works.

As Roudiez rightly insists, "intertextuality" is not merely a matter of influence by one author upon another. But this concept is also useful in understanding the processes of literary creation, of how writers form their works not only from directly imitating life, but by borrowing and transforming the texts of writers who have gone before them. This is the lesson to be learned from reading James's *Hawthorne*.

Hawthorne and James: The American Revolutionary War, the Civil War and World War I

The year 2014 marked 100 years since the start of the First World War, and 2015 marked 150 years since the end of Civil War. Various symposia were held and books published relating to the wars. In addition, 2015 lies between 150 years since the death of Hawthorne, and 100 years since that of James. Therefore, we took up the relationship between literature and war in Hawthorne and James, who had difficulty in laboring for appropriate wording concerning war. Hawthorne says that he is “compelled . . . to suspend the contemplation of certain fantasies” in “Chiefly about War-Matters” (1862); and James says, in a wartime interview, that “[T]he war has used up words . . . they have deteriorated like motor car tires.” This symposium attempted to focus on how the two great authors confronted each war and expressed the harsh reality in their novels, essays and newspaper articles, and to detect their common viewpoint concerning war.

Hawthorne and Revolutionary War

Yoko KURAHASHI (Tokai Gakuen University)

The purpose of this study is to search for what Nathaniel Hawthorne thought about the Revolutionary War in America. In the study, social change through revolution, war or riots, and George Washington and Lincoln together with the old Tory are focused on.

First, we can find in “Grandfather’s Chair” and “Old News” that Hawthorne feels nostalgia for the colonial period in the George II era when colonists enjoyed independence and showed loyalty to the king, but the outbreak of revolution, resulting in “oppression” by George III, changed the colonial period.

Hawthorne did not like change but distinguished revolution without war from that with war. Hawthorne tells about “the misery of seeing the whole system of things in old days” in “Old News.” However, Hawthorne suggests in *The Scarlet Letter* that without war “the whole system of society is to be torn down” for women’s rights instead of “ethereal essence.” Moreover in “Old News,” Hawthorne tells that the effects of “a revolution, or anything, that interrupts social order” are “pernicious to general morality” and cynically says that revolution gives opportunities for an individual to display “eminent virtues.”

Hawthorne depicts The Gray Champion as the symbol of repeated war in “The Gray Champion.” The Gray Champion is “the type of New-England’s hereditary spirit” and on the eve of danger he marches. This reminds us of “The Custom House,” which tells of a puritan ancestor coming to America with his Bible and sword and becoming a large figure as “a man of war and peace.” Hawthorne criticized that war had been permitted when there was a reason to protect peace.

Moreover, “My Kinsman, Major Molineux” tells us that cruelty and violence during a riot or war contaminate the multitude, especially a young man like Robin. In this novel, Robin’s shrewdness in following the world leads to his treachery against Major Molineux, which is moral corruption. However, Robin is evaluated as being independent from him. Moreover in *The Old Manse*, a young man kills a dying British soldier with his axe from nervous impulse brought about by war. Hawthorne criticized “it still seemed murderous to slay a brother man.” Hawthorne was worrying about the young having to live with the consciousness of sin.

Hawthorne sympathizes with the old Tory “who clung to the losing side, in the Revolution” in “The Old Tory.” We are told “the Revolution had robbed them of their native country” in *The English Notebooks*, too. The old Tory signified people who had lost their identity as Hawthorne had lost in England.

Hawthorne’s aversion to revolution and war made him hate the leaders of the Revolutionary War and Civil War. Hawthorne depicts George Washington as “a fallen angel” in “Old News.” In *The French and Italian Notebooks*, Hawthorne perceives “a certain coldness of demeanor, and especially of eye” in Washington. In “Chiefly about War Matters” Hawthorne makes sport of Lincoln, too. Hawthorne’s thoughts against revolution and war are in a minority in the middle of the 19th century. However, that is his proper function as a writer.

Hawthorne’s Critical Attitude toward War in His Later Works

Misa ONO (Tokyo University of Marine Science and Technology)

When Hawthorne returned to Concord in 1860 after seven years in Europe, he found many people in New England enthusiastically supporting the Civil War. Hawthorne, who condemned slavery but did not favor radical abolitionism or violent settlement, opposed his neighbors. In my presentation, I focused on several of Hawthorne’s works from the 1860s, including “Chiefly about War-Matters” and *Septimius Felton*, and examined his attitude toward the war America had been involved in since the colonial period.

In “Chiefly about War-Matters,” which was written based on his trip to Washington DC during the Civil War, Hawthorne rejects the purported causes for the war and denounces the dichotomy between the North and the South. He refuses to regard John Brown as a hero and emphasizes instead the violence and inappropriateness of his behaviors, though in the North Brown was considered a martyr who had devoted his life to abolition and freedom. He also hesitates to deify President Lincoln. On the other hand, he shows empathy for the Confederate soldiers and attempts to prove that they are not adversaries, which is what they were considered in the North. However, he does not present the North as wrong and the South as right. Rather, Hawthorne seeks an alternative to the dichotomy between allies and foes.

Septimius Felton is set in Concord during the Revolutionary era and describes how the descendants of the Puritans have been embroiled in the war. While most people in Concord fervently support the war, Septimius, who has a lot in common with Hawthorne, does not recognize the significance of the war. Septimius shoots a British soldier on the first day of the war, but soon after that they come to feel sympathy for each other and form an intense bond. The latter half of the story reveals that Septimius and the British soldier are actually blood relatives and at the end Septimius inherits Smithells Hall. Hawthorne in *Septimius Felton* has Septimius deny the causes of the war and mend his relationship with the British soldier.

In *Septimius Felton*, Hawthorne also demonstrates how the Puritans had justified their violence toward Native Americans in the name of freedom and civilization, and he goes on to show the distorted nature of the rhetoric the Puritans had used to justify their exclusion of Native Americans. In describing Native Americans, Hawthorne uses such words as “brutal” and “violent” in the same way that the Puritans themselves had often used such words when representing Native Americans. However, people in Concord, who tolerate violence in the war, are clearly more abusive. Meanwhile, the hill where Septimius builds close ties with the British soldier is associated with Native Americans. The trajectory of the ancestors also suggests the Puritans’ brutality toward Native Americans.

In the essay and the romance Hawthorne wrote during the Civil War, he criticizes the history of America, in which war has been repeatedly used in the name of justice.

Henry James and the Civil War

Tomoko TAKEI (Kyoto Institute of Technology)

My presentation discussed the description of the American Civil War in Henry James's *Notes of a Son and Brother*, the second volume of his autobiography written half a century after the Civil War. While many scholars have pointed out the author's deep resentment at the missed opportunity to see the battlefields, I focused on the strategic aspect of his treatment of the war in which he attempts to reconstruct the image of the American author as a national character.

Unlike his younger brothers, Henry James did not go to the battlefields because of an "obscure hurt" caused during a fire-fighting incident, which occurred almost simultaneously with the onset of the war. Although he lacked direct experience of the war, as an American writer, James was never indifferent to war matters. Rather, he used the war in both the creation and marketing of his works. For instance, he depicted the behavior of his American characters during the war in such early works as *Roderick Hudson* and *The American*. *The Bostonians*, James's first "American" novel, was serialized as part of the popular "Civil War Series" of *The Century Magazine*. The contradiction between the two protagonists, Olive and Basil, is considered a metonymy of the tense relationship between the North and South during the reconciliation period. Unfortunately, this American novel was not at all successful and James moved to England, thereby abandoning his American subjects.

He faced his native country's greatest history once again when writing his autobiographies in his late 60s. In his recollection, he had an indirect but concrete relationship with the war—he says that he felt a huge comprehensive ache and could not discern whether it came from his own wound or "from the enclosing social body." Since it comprised the most important event in US history, his repeated attempts to demonstrate his involvement in the war may indicate his desire, or need, to claim a share in the memory of the war with the nation. Moreover, James sought a liaison with other great national authors in respect to participation in the war. In describing his visit to Portsmouth Grove, a camp for wounded soldiers, James compares himself with Walt Whitman who volunteered as a nurse during the war. Furthermore, he makes a direct link between the death of Lincoln, the iconic figure of both the war and James's own battle with his hurt, and the death of Nathaniel Hawthorne whom James considered the only internationally recognized American writer.

All of these elements of his writings about the Civil War in his autobiography imply his intention to use that war to characterize himself as an American author. On one hand, James seems to have had a long-time desire to write a novel as "good as *The House of the Seven Gables*," which would prove his national quality. On the other hand, in reality, he suffered from psychological depression, partially stemming from the unpopularity of his works—the New York Edition—in his native country. We can assume this situation drove the author to seek his identity as an American in his autobiography.

Henry James and World War I

Yoshio NAKAMURA (Notre Dame Seishin University)

Henry James didn't serve in the Civil War because of his "obscure hurt" and had an inferiority complex about his nonparticipation. It is said that the scar contributed to his perspective as a bystander. He, however, felt "a sort of tragic fellowship" between his hurt and that of America as a national body.

On the contrary, when James confronted the harsh reality of World War I, he took positive actions, extending a helping hand to the evacuees and visiting the wounded soldiers to express sympathy. He was inaugurated as the honorary president of the American Volunteer Motor-Ambulance Corps. Further, he agreed to a newspaper interview for

the American people in 1915 and said in it, “[T]he war has used up words; they have weakened, they have deteriorated like motor-car tires.” Interestingly, James likens the “loss of expression” caused by the war to “ghosts” with “increase of limpness,” which symbolize the damaged condition of personal bodies and national ones. James shared “a sort of tragic fellowship” with wounded Europe through his Civil War “hurt.” In the interview, James also brought America’s participation in the war to the attention of its citizens, in order to re-empower the weakened power of words and to rescue Europe, especially Britain, from its hardship. Even so, James didn’t advocate America’s entry like a propagandist, but positioned his interview as “the simple statement of a neighbor and an observer,” distancing himself from Europe and objectively striving to describe the miserable state in Europe. But his earnest aspiration wasn’t realized in his lifetime, and he became a British citizen in 1915, a year before his death, to declare his loyalty to his beloved country and to protest America’s refusal to enter the war. James, however, kept looking on himself as “the associated outsider” and an “alien” to Britain until he died and felt scruples about the fixedness of his identity.

James finds in immobilization a common feature with Hawthorne. According to James, the essay in which Hawthorne satirically described the Civil War, “Chiefly about War-Matters” (1862) is “interesting” in “trying to see the other side as well as his own, to feel what his adversary feels, and present his view of the case.” In fact, though Hawthorne was expected to report favorably on the North in the wartime essay, he evokes sympathy for the South, uttering that “at the tidings of another and another Northern victory . . . [We] woo the South as the lion woos his bride.” In “Nathaniel Hawthorne” (1897), James speaks of Hawthorne’s attitude of seeing things as “aloofness,” and his identity as being “outside of everything, and an alien everywhere.” Therefore, Hawthorne and James share common traits in observing war from both sides and having the positionality of outsiders.

東京支部研究会

2015年、東京支部研究会では、下記の活動を行いました。4つの研究発表はそれぞれ興味深く、刺激的な内容でした。作品研究では、いつもながら新たな発見ができ、今後の参考になりました。読書会では、最新の研究を吸収でき、有意義な時間を共有できました。その後の懇親会では、親睦を深めるとともに、今後の学会活動への決意を新たにしました。2016年も、研究発表・作品研究・招待講演・読書会を開催する計画です。

△2015年3月21日（土）午後2時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 947 教室）

【研究発表】

- （1）発表者：大野 美砂 氏（東京海洋大学）
題 目：「ホーソーンの戦争批判——後期の作品を中心に」
- （2）発表者：辻 祥子 氏（松山大学）
題 目：「ホーソンとジョージ・オーウェルの接点——二つの「痣」の物語を中心に」
司 会：谷岡 朗 氏（日本大学）

△2015年7月18日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 773 教室）

【研究発表】

- 発表者：古屋 耕平 氏（和洋女子大学）
題 目：「アメリカン・ルネッサンスと翻訳——ホーソーンの場合」
司 会：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）

△2015年9月19日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 773 教室）

【研究発表】

- 発表者：加藤 惠梨香 氏（立教大学・院）
題 目：「ホーソンとフロンティア・ライン——“Gray Champion”における白人とアメリカ先住民」
司 会：高尾 直知 氏（中央大学）

【作品研究】

- テキスト：“The Artist of the Beautiful”
コーディネーター：川村 幸夫 氏（東京理科大学）

△2015年11月28日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 773 教室）

【研究発表】

- 発表者：大竹 菜穂子 氏（町田市立鶴川第二中学校）
題 目：「*Tangle Wood Tales* にみるホーソーンの政治観」
司 会：大野 美砂 氏（東京海洋大学）

【作品研究】

- テキスト：“Main Street”
コーディネーター：上原 正博 氏（専修大学）

△2015年12月19日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 13A 会議室）

【読書会】

- テキスト：Magnus Ullén, *The Half-Vanished Structure: Hawthorne's Allegorical Dialectics*
(Bern: Peter Lang, 2014)

- 司会・発表：高尾 直知 氏（中央大学）
- 発表者：岡田 大樹 氏（専修大学・院）
常光 健 氏（中央大学・院）
狭間 亮平 氏（中央大学・院）
内堀 奈保子 氏（日本大学）

（川村 幸夫 記）

中部支部研究会

中部支部では、研究会を3回開催しました。1回目の研究発表は、1970年代初期のアメリカ映画をホーソーン的な観点も視野に入れて解釈を試みようという意欲的なものでした。2回目の研究発表では、マッブル神父（牧師）の説教と「ヨナ書」との関係を検討したもので、メルヴィルの聖書への造詣の深さを再認識しました。また、3回目の研究発表は、エリザベス・ピーボディの出版進出を探究しようとするものでした。今後発表者を増加したいと思っています。

△2015年3月29日（日）午後2時より（於 東海学園大学 栄サテライト）

【研究発表】

発表者：大場 厚志 氏（東海学園大学）

題 目：「1970年代初期のアメリカ映画——ホーソーン的観点も視野に入れて」

司 会：横田 和憲 氏（金城学院大学）

△2015年8月9日（日）午後2時より（於 東海学園大学栄サテライト）

【研究発表】

発表者：横田 和憲 氏（金城学院大学）

題 目：「独創的な二度ものかたり——マッブル神父の説教と「ヨナ書」について」

司 会：倉橋 洋子 氏（東海学園大学）

△2015年12月26日（土）午後2時より（於 東海学園大学栄サテライト）

【研究発表】

発表者：倉橋 洋子 氏（東海学園大学）

題 目：「19世紀の出版界とエリザベス・ピーボディの書店——ホーソーンの初期短編出版」

司 会：竹野 富美子 氏（名古屋学院大学）

（倉橋 洋子 記）

関西支部研究会

関西支部では年4回のペースで支部研究会を開催しています。8月例会では岡真理氏をお招きし、アラブ文学とホーソーンの接点について興味深いお話をうかがうことができました。また、7月には日本アメリカ文学会関西支部で、中西佳世子、丹羽隆昭、澤西祐典氏によるシンポジウム「ホーソーンの群集」も開催され、総じて活発な支部活動となったようです。しかし、昨今の大学事情で日程の調整が難しくなっており、できるときにできることをやるという開き直り精神も必要かもしれません。いずれにせよ、各支部や他の学会との連携も図りながら、さらに多様な活動を行なっていきたいと考えております。

なお、今年より支部世話人が交代しております。長きにわたって支部活動を率いてこられた丹羽隆昭先生にこの場をお借りして感謝申し上げます。

△2015年3月22日（日）午後2時30分より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1401 室）

【研究発表】

(1) 発表者：池末 陽子 氏（近畿大学非常勤講師）

題 目：「エドガー・アラン・ポーとジュリアン・ホーソーン」

司 会：福岡 和子 氏（京都大学名誉教授）

(2) 発表者：妹尾 智美 氏（立命館大学）

題 目：「ラバチーニ博士を〈読む〉——16世紀ルネサンスの宇宙観を背景に」

司 会：岩田 強 氏（京都光華大学名誉教授）

△2015年8月2日（日）午後3時より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1002 室）

【講演】

講 師：岡 真理氏（京都大学）

題 目：「アジーズはヘスター・プリンか？ユースフ・イドリース『アル＝ハラーム』（1959）とホーソーン『緋文字』について」

司 会：水野 尚之 氏（京都大学）

△2015年9月26日（土）午後2時30分より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1403 室）

【研究発表】

(1) 発表者：尾崎 裕子 氏（立命館大学）

題 目：「『若いグッドマン・ブラウン』におけるアレゴリーの問題について」

司 会：増永 俊一 氏（関西学院大学）

(2) 発表者：青山 義孝 氏（甲南大学）

題 目：「『緋文字』の翻訳を通して見えてきたこと」

司 会：丹羽 隆昭 氏（関西外国語大学）

△2015 年 12 月 26 日 (土) 午後 3 時より (於 関西外国語大学 ICC (International Communication Center) 6212 教室)
【読書会】

題 目: 「“Hawthorne and His Mosses”を一緒に読む」
話題提供: 橋本 安央 氏 (関西学院大学)
コメンテーター: 入子 文子 氏 (元関西大学教授)

(西谷 拓哉 記)

九州支部研究会

九州支部では、研究会を年 4 回開催し、終了後は懇親会で和やかに交流を深めています。

△2015 年 3 月 28 日 (土) 午後 3 時 30 分より (於 福岡大学文系センター14 階 学部共通室)
【シンポジウム】

司会・講師: 竹内 勝徳 氏 (鹿児島大学)
講 師: 城戸 光世 氏 (広島大学)
講 師: 岡本 太助 氏 (九州大学)
題 目: 「応答・再演行為としての文学史——アダプテーションの中のホーソー」

△2015 年 7 月 5 日 (日) 午後 3 時より (於 福岡大学文系センター14 階 学部共通室)
【研究発表】

- (1) 発表者: 川下 剛 氏 (九州栄養福祉大学)
題 目: 「“The Man of Adamant”とレイシストの諧謔」
司 会: 村田 希巳子 氏 (北九州市立大学非常勤講師)
- (2) 発表者: 城戸 光世氏 (広島大学)
題 目: 「アメリカン・ルネサンスの未来形」
司 会: 竹内 勝徳 氏 (鹿児島大学)

△2015 年 10 月 3 日 (土) 午後 3 時より (於 北九州市立大学 E-512 会議室)
【研究発表】

- (1) 発表者: 山村 栄子 氏 (北九州市立大学大学院修士課程修了生)
題 目: 「セイレムの若き文人——“Beneath an Umbrella”より読み解く」
司 会: 青井 格 氏 (近畿大学)
- (2) 発表者: 村田 希巳子 氏 (北九州市立大学非常勤講師)
題 目: 「Chillingworth のホモエロティシズム」
司 会: 稲富 百合子 氏 (福岡大学)

△2015 年 12 月 5 日 (土) 午後 3 時より (於 福岡大学文系センター14 階 学部共通室)
【特別講演】

講 師: 入子 文子 氏 (元関西大学教授)
題 目: 「ホーソーのホシの再考——ホウキボシとナガレボシ」
司 会: 乗口 眞一郎 氏 (北九州市立大学名誉教授)

(青井 格 記)

事務局だより

1. *NHSJ Newsletter* 第34号をお届けします。
2. 学会のホームページアドレスは<http://www.nhs-j.org/>です。
3. 第34回全国大会は2015年5月22日(金)・23日(土)の両日に日本大学文理学部で盛大に開催されました。大会運営にご尽力いただいた方々にこの場をお借りして深くお礼申し上げます。
4. 次回第35回全国大会は2016年5月27日(金)・28日(土)に同志社大学での開催となります。なお、会場は同志社大学寒梅館の地下1階A会議室となっております。詳細は来年度にお送りします大会案内をご確認ください。また、昨今、京都の宿泊は予約がとりにくくなっており、早目の手配をお勧めいたします。会場で多くの会員の方々とお会いできるのを楽しみにしております。
5. ホーソー・ポー国際学会が2018年6月京都ガーデンパレスで行われることになりました。
6. 会員の方々のご著書・論文等は、資料室にお送りくださるようお願いいたします。
7. 住所変更やご所属の変更がありましたら、事務局へご一報ください。

(川村 幸夫 記)

編集室だより

編集委員長として、二期目に入りました。どうか、よろしくお願い申し上げます。現在、『フォーラム』21号発行に向け、作業は順調に進んでおります。投稿者、査読作業に労を厭わぬ編集委員各位、書評をご担当予定の先生方に、感謝の意を心からお伝えいたします。次号には、研究論文1編、書評2編を掲載する予定です。

ご投稿は事務局（hawthorne.forum@gmail.com）宛のメールに、WORD（.doc 形式）で作成したものを添付してご提出願います。投稿者情報（氏名、ご所属、住所、メールアドレス、電話番号）は、メール本文にご記載ください。投稿規定は、日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会ホームページに記載されております。ご参照のうえ、積極的にご投稿ください。

『フォーラム』20号会計報告（2014.9-2015.8）

収 入		支 出	
繰越金	716,868	『フォーラム』20号発行費	383,432
『フォーラム』21号費用	500,000	内訳 印刷費（400部）	329,400
利息	132	封入手数料（290件）	12,582
収入合計	1,217,000	郵送費	41,450
		缶気出版への原稿送付費（2件）	679
		振り込み手数料（1件）	432
		書評用書籍購入費（1件）	2,720
		書評用書籍郵送費（1件）	350
残 高	829,387	支出合計	387,613

・編集委員：大場厚志、城戸光世、倉橋洋子、佐々木英哲、高尾直知、中村栄造（編集長）

・編集室：〒468-8502 名古屋市天白区塩釜口1-501

名城大学理工学部教養教育 中村栄造研究室気付 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会編集室

（中村 栄造 記）

資料室だより

これまでに下記の論文をご寄贈いただきましたので、ご報告いたします。

増永俊一「ハドソン川を上って——19世紀アメリカにおけるツーリズムの展開と文化運動——」『エクス言語文化論集』9
関西学院大学経済学部研究会（2015）

ご協力ありがとうございました。

資料室を充実させてゆきたいと存じますので、今後とも皆様のご協力をお願いいたします。著書上梓の折にはご書名等を、論文ご執筆の折にはタイトル等を、下記の資料室までお知らせ頂けると幸いです。

日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会資料室

〒156-8550 東京都世田谷区桜上水 3-25-40

日本大学文理学部 堀切大史研究室内

電話：03-5317-8948（研究室直通）03-5317-9709（事務室直通）

FAX：03-5317-9336

Eメール：horikiri@chs.nihon-u.ac.jp

（堀切 大史 記）

第 35 回大会のお知らせ

日 時：2016 年 5 月 27 日（金）、28 日（土）
場 所：同志社大学 寒梅館 地下 1 階 A 会議室（室町キャンパス）

《第 35 回大会概要》

2016 年度の全国大会は京都での開催となります。今回は、「海洋国家アメリカと文学」が特別講演とシンポジウムに通底するテーマになっています。特別講演は巽孝之氏にご登壇をお願いいたしました。捕鯨都市セイラムを取り上げて、ホーソーンを中心に、ポーやメルヴィルの作品もからめてお話しいただけるとのことです。シンポジウムでは、アンテベラム期の海軍と文学がどのような関係にあったかについて、中西佳世子氏、林以知郎氏、齊藤昇氏、真田満氏に、それぞれホーソーン、クーパー、アーヴィング、メルヴィルの作品や伝記的事実を題材に論じていただきます。ワークショップは、倉橋洋子氏、竹野富美子氏、加藤恵梨香氏に「イーサン・ブランド」の魅力についてそれぞれ独自の切り口から語っていただきます。

【第 1 日】

- ・開会のことば
- ・研究発表（発表を希望される方は、下記の応募規定に従いまして、奮ってご応募ください）
- ・ワークショップ

「イーサン・ブランド」を読む

司会・講師：倉橋 洋子 氏（東海学園大学）

講師：竹野 富美子 氏（名古屋学院大学）

講師：加藤 恵梨香 氏（立教大学・院）

＜概要＞「イーサン・ブランド」（1850）では「許されざる罪」を捜しに出かけたイーサン・ブランドが、結局自分の中に「許されざる罪」があることに気づき、石灰窯に身を投じる。様々な解釈がある中で「イーサン・ブランド」のテーマを孤独から「知」と「情」の分離と捉えることが根強い。本ワークショップでは、従来の「イーサン・ブランド」の解釈を踏まえつつ三人三様の異なる読みを試みる。例えば、ダンテの「地獄篇」を想起させる「イーサン・ブランド」の円環構造に注目し、ブランドの帰郷や笑い、死の意味等について考える。また「反響」という言葉やバーtramとブランドの心に往来する罪、アルコールのやりとり注目し、イーサン・ブランドとコミュニティについて考える。さらに、「イーサン・ブランド」の火とアルコールのモチーフ、およびイーサン・ブランドの象徴的火葬に着目し、アメリカ先住民表象について考える。

・特別講演

講演者：巽 孝之 氏（慶應義塾大学）

演 題：捕鯨都市セイラム——ピューリタン文学の起源

- ・総会
- ・懇親会：同志社大学 寒梅館 7 階フレンチレストラン・ウィル

【第2日】

・シンポジウム

海洋国家アメリカの文学的想像力——海軍のディスクールとアンテベラムの作家達

司会・講師：中西 佳世子 氏（京都産業大学）

講師：齊藤 昇 氏（立正大学）

講師：林 以知郎 氏（同志社大学）

講師：真田 満 氏（龍谷大学・非常勤講師）

＜概要＞アメリカは1794年に海軍を創設した。ジェファソンの時代に5つの海軍工廠を建設したアメリカは海洋国家としての道を本格的に歩み始める。そして蒸気船を導入し、日本開国に成功したアメリカであるが、この時期の作家達には海軍体験を持つものや身近に海軍との接点を持つものが少なくない。クーパーやメルヴィルは実際に海軍に従事したし、海軍エリートや政治家や文人が交流する場でもあった海軍工廠にはクーパー、アーヴィングやホーソーンも出入りした。これらの体験が作家達の創作活動に影響を与える一方、海洋フィクションに感化される海兵や自ら遠征記を書く海軍士官を生み出すなど、いわば洋上の読者共同体を形成していくこととなった。海軍には、エキゾチックな体験やロマンティックな冒険への憧れとナショナリズムが織りなす海軍のディスクールがあったのだ。シンポジウムでは、海洋国家として発展する19世紀アメリカにおける海軍のディスクールと作家達の文学的想像力の接点を考察し、アンテベラムの文学を新たな視点から読み解く試みを行いたい。

・閉会のことば

《発表応募規定》

1. 発表者は会員であること。
2. 発表内容は未発表のものに限り、発表時間は1人25分以内（質疑応答を含む）とします。
3. 応募書類

①発表要旨：横書きで日本語800字程度、もしくは英語400words程度にまとめたもの。

②略歴：氏名（ふりがな）、勤務先、職名（学生の場合は所属先、身分）、連絡先（住所、電話番号）を明記したもの。

上記2点を大会準備委員会までEメールに添付してお送りください。

応募先（問い合わせも）：辻祥子（松山大学）E-mail: tsuji@cc.matsuyama-u.ac.jp

4. 応募締切：2016年2月末日（必着） 選考結果は3月中に応募者にお知らせします。
5. 応募書類は返却いたしません、個人情報の扱いには十分留意いたします。
6. 大会の開催地区以外に居住している大学院生会員が研究発表（ワークショップ、シンポジウムを含む）をする場合、交通費の一部を協会が助成いたします。今大会では、関西以外の地域に居住している大学院生が対象となります。助成希望の方は事務局までご連絡ください。

《大会準備委員会より》

シンポジウムとワークショップのテーマや人選につきましては、2015年の総会で各支部から発案していただくことが決まりました。今回、シンポジウムは関西支部から、ワークショップは中部支部から案を出していただき、発表者はなるべく同じ支部に偏らないように選んでいただきました。限られた時間の中でご尽力いただいた関係者の先生方にあたためてお礼を申し上げます。発案の要綱を以下に記します。

- 1) 各支部からの発案（テーマ、人選など）は複数でもよいし、発案しなくてもよい。
- 2) 各支部からの発案の選考や具体化（実施年度の決定など）は準備委員会で行う。
- 3) 各支部からの発案と準備委員会の発案との調整やコーディネイトは準備委員会が行う。
- 4) 機械的、強制的な支部間のローテーション制とはしない。

今後ともこのような形で臨機応変にテーマの決定や人選を行いたいと思いますので、ぜひご協力のほどお願い申し上げます。

（辻 祥子 記）

顧問	阿野文朗（東北大学名誉教授）	鴨川卓博	川窪啓資（麗澤大学名誉教授）
	島田太郎（東京大学名誉教授）	當麻一太郎（元日本大学教授）	丹羽隆昭（関西外国語大学）
	萩原 力（専修大学名誉教授）	牧田徳元（金沢大学名誉教授）	師岡愛子（日本女子大学名誉教授）

役員

会長	成田雅彦（専修大学）	事務局	川村幸夫
副会長	高橋利明（日本大学）		青井格（近畿大学）
	西谷拓哉（神戸大学）		稲富百合子（福岡大学）
監事	井上久夫（関西学院大学）		内堀奈保子（日本大学）
	進藤鈴子（名古屋経済大学）		小宮山真美子（国立長野高専）
理事	大野美砂（東京海洋大学）		鈴木孝（日本大学）
	大場厚志（東海学園大学）		妹尾智美（立命館大学）
	川村幸夫（東京理科大学）		富樫壮央（麗澤大学非常勤講師）
	城戸光世（広島大学）		中村文紀（日本大学）
	倉橋洋子（東海学園大学）	会計	大野美砂
	佐々木英哲（桃山学院大学）		中西佳世子
	高尾直知（中央大学）	編集室	中村栄造
	谷岡 朗（日本大学）		大場厚志
	中西佳世子（京都産業大学）		城戸光世
	中村栄造（名城大学）		倉橋洋子
	橋本安央（関西学院大学）		佐々木英哲
	堀切大史（日本大学）		高尾直知
	増永俊一（関西学院大学）	資料室	奈良裕美子（諏訪東京理科大学）
			堀切大史
		国際渉外室	上原正博（専修大学）
			藤村希（亜細亜大学）
		大会準備委員	谷岡 朗
			辻祥子（松山大学）
			中村善雄（ノートルダム清心女子大学）
			橋本安央

2014 年度 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会 会計報告

(2014. 4. 1 ~ 2015. 3. 31)

収入		支出			
会費	757,000	編集室費	500,000	前期繰越金	1,202,168
賛助会員	60,000	大会費	3,066	収入計	945,040
雑収入	128,000	大会準備委員会費	0	計	2,147,208
利息	40	印刷費	97,416	支出計	930,914
計	945,040	国際渉外室費	10,000	次期繰越金	1,216,294
		謝礼費	70,000		
		支部研究会費	100,000		
		(東京)	40,000		
		(中部)	20,000		
		(関西)	20,000		
		(九州)	20,000		
		通信費	45,770		
		事務費	23,662		
		人件費	81,000		
		雑費 (預り金返金 6,000 円を含む)	0		
		計	930,914		
				キャッシュポジション	
				郵便貯金	806,371
				みずほ銀行普通預金	204,618
				現金	205,305

上記の通り相違ありません

2015 年 3 月 31 日

会計 大野美砂

監査の結果、上記の通り相違ないことを証明します

2015 年 4 月 1 日

監事 進藤鈴子

井上久夫