

# NHSJ Newsletter

第 35 号 2017 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 換 拶

会 長 成 田 雅 彦

昨年六月はじめ、京都での全国大会が終わってすぐに、バーモント州のストウという山間の小さな町で行われた米国ホーソーン学会に出席してきました。次回大会は来年六月、すなわち京都での国際学会というわけで、会長のサンドラ・ヒューズ先生から相談もあるので是非来てくださいと言われて小さなペーパーを抱えて出かけました。若きホーソーンも旅したニュー・イングランド北部のこの町は、緑豊かな山々に抱かれた可憐な町で、アメリカのホーソーン学者の方々たちはいくつもの充実した発表の中、和気藹々と交流を深めておいででした。最終日、野外でたき火をたいて夕食会があって、たまたま近くにいた日本にもお馴染みのリチャード・コブリー先生が、ポーの新しい伝記を計画される中で未知のポーの手紙を発見したことを興奮気味にお話して下さい、私はアメリカの学者の執念と研究の喜びの一端に触れたような気持でした。しかし、明るい炎があれば暗闇もあるもので、以前の学会と違う影も感じました。中堅、また若手の研究者の方々からは、アメリカの大学も学生の文学離れが進んでいること、英文科は予算を削減され、大学当局から文学教育への締め付けもあるとの話も聞いたのです。日本に限らず、アメリカの文学研究者やホーソーニアンたちも大学で受難の時を迎えているようでした。心なしか、夕食会が終わって消えかかるたき火が寂しげに見えたことを覚えています。

我々日本のホーソーン協会もまた、同じような文学研究受難の時代を生きていて、最近では学会出張にも数々の注文のつく大学も多いと耳にします。実社会で役に立たない文学教育など無意味であるというわけでしょうか。しかし、人は豊かで優れた言葉に支えられて生きていくもののはずです。幸い当協会では全国大会、支部研究会ととても活発な活動が続いています。会員の皆さまの強い熱意の賜物であると言わざるを得ません。例えば支部研究会に集まってこられる方々の真剣なまなざしには、こういう時代だからこそ本当の言葉を求めたいという思いが宿っているようです。結構くたびれてきた昔の文学青年は、グローバリズムとやらが席卷している外の世界を離れ、静かにテキストに向かう方々の内面を去来する様々な言葉を想像し、襟を正されるような気がします。こうした研究の空間を維持していくことが私たちの使命ではないでしょうか。

最近、ジェイムズ・マーシュなどを読んでいて、バーモント州こそが超絶主義発祥の地だったという説を知りました。昨年大統領選挙予備選で風雲を巻き起こした革新的候補バーニー・サンダースもこの州都バーリントンの市長でした。アメリカのホーソーニアンたちが、なぜ学会にこの地を選んだのかは知りません。しかし、私はそれを古き良きニュー・イングランドへの退行ではなくて、新しい時代に向けて刷新を図るシンボルと見なしました。私たちもまた、全国大会、支部研究会、また学会誌を通してさらなる成長をしていければと思います。来年の京都国際大会が頭をかすめますが、まずは今年の静岡での全国大会です。すでに、これまで同様の充実したプログラムが計画されています。皆さま、どうぞ、よい一年をお過ごしください。そして五月静岡にてお目にかかりましょう！

### The Veil and the Wall as the Symbol of Separation: Nathaniel Hawthorne's "The Minister's Black Veil" and Sherwood Anderson's "Surrender"

Hiroki OKADA (Senshu University)

The works of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Sherwood Anderson hardly seem to be similar to one another. However, comparing the image of "separation" in their works shows their common attitude toward the problem of loneliness. Anderson often uses the image of "the wall" that separates a person from the community, especially in his short story "Surrender" in *Winesburg, Ohio* (1919). And in Hawthorne's short story "The Minister's Black Veil" (1835), the image of "the black veil" also signifies the separation.

Although Hawthorne's "The Minister's Black Veil" and Anderson's "Surrender" are set in different times and places, they both seem to focus on the loneliness of an individual in modern society. Each story assumes the idea that the separation from the community is founded on a more basic separation between each individual. Everyone has his or her "inmost heart" that is never completely comprehended by the others or him or herself whether we use languages or any other artificial systems. Our society is constituted of a collection of these systems, therefore people are necessarily still separated in society.

In Hawthorne's "The Minister's Black Veil," covering his face with the black veil and suggesting that everyone also wears the black veil, Reverend Hooper symbolically shows his congregation the separation between each individual. But they choose to separate Reverend Hooper from their community like a scapegoat, rather than admit the loneliness of individual separation. To compare this idea of separation with the religious idea of original sin, this story is set in the era of the secularization of the puritanical society in 18th century New England. Before secularization proceeding, the congregation had recognized this concept of individual separation as the concept of original sin that explains our imperfection and the faulty of our communication. But during the period of the story, the secularized congregation no longer understands the concept of individual separation as the idea of original sin.

In Anderson's "Surrender," Louise Bentley, a girl who has grown up on an isolated farm near the town of Winesburg, and who has suffered from feeling insulated from the community of the town's people, finally begins to live in the town and attempts to overcome the wall between her and the community. However, not recognizing the fact that the other people are also separated from each other, she deepens her loneliness by trying to communicate with those people. This story takes place during the industrialization of the mid-west in the latest 19th century. The people in this time no longer recognize the concept of original sin, nor the conflict between "the inmost heart" and the systems forming society.

These two stories both suggest a discrepancy between the inmost heart and these societal systems by describing the failure of marriages. In "Surrender," the marriage of Louise and John Hardy makes them unhappy because they choose to follow the system of matrimony by ignoring their own heart. In "The Minister's Black Veil," on the contrary, Reverend Hooper and his fiancée Elizabeth choose not to be married. Informed by Hooper, Elizabeth finally recognizes that the systems cannot represent their inmost heart. Hawthorne and Anderson thus express the same attitude towards the problem of loneliness, and describe the basic form of loneliness of separation in their works.

## Rereading “Young Goodman Brown”: Why Didn’t Brown Despair?

Yuko OZAKI (Ritsumeikan University)

Nathaniel Hawthorne’s “Young Goodman Brown” (1835) tells of the eponymous hero’s nightmarish experience at a witches’ Sabbath. Whatever viewpoint they have adopted to interpret the story, few critics have failed to mention the drastic change of Goodman Brown described in the last few paragraphs. Most of them have agreed in thinking that Brown, originally a trusting youth, is shocked at the knowledge of the universality of evil and becomes unable to trust in man’s virtue. Though there is some truth in this explanation, a significant point in Brown’s transformation is that he is not desperate: “A stern, a sad, a darkly meditative, a distrustful, if not a desperate man, did he become, from the night of that fearful dream.” If Brown returns home with the idea that humanity is totally corrupt, he can be “maddened with despair” and follow his immoral instincts just as he does when he discovers Faith’s ribbon in the forest. Yet, believing that his village members are witches or wizards, he still continues a Christian life. Why doesn’t Brown experience the strong feeling of despair that overwhelmed him in the forest?

To answer this question, this presentation starts by revealing Brown’s self-deception. While too ready to criticize other people’s errors, Brown imagines himself morally pure as long as he does not perform a criminal act. His reluctance to recognize his impulse toward evil shows that he does not grasp the Christian belief that all human beings are flawed by nature. Brown’s falsehood is such that, in Hawthorne’s view, he may be guiltier than the fiend-worshippers he finds in the forest.

Brown’s dishonesty reaches its peak at the devil’s baptism. When he finds a multitude of fiend-worshippers in the forest, he feels “a loathful brotherhood” with them “by the sympathy of all that was wicked in his heart.” Brown’s feeling a “brotherhood” with the sinful people is important because his demand for Faith to “resist the Wicked One” at the climax of the baptism means his refusal to accept the feeling and “all that was wicked in his heart.” Brown completely gives up on achieving proper self-recognition at this moment.

One of the reasons Brown is not overwhelmed by despair in the ending can be this incurable self-deception. Having succeeded in rejecting the devil at the baptism, Brown totally deludes himself into thinking that he is sinless and superior to others. He cannot be desperate while his true nature remains hidden from him.

Another reason is that Brown is unable to reach a settled opinion about Faith’s betrayal. When he orders her to resist the devil, Faith suddenly vanishes and Brown fails to learn whether she obeyed him or not. In consequence, he cannot trust in her virtue nor can he be certain that she is on the devil’s side. Instead of falling victim to despair, Brown forever suffers bitter anguish because of the uncertainty.

Hawthorne’s portrayal of Goodman Brown is closely related to the Salem witch trials of 1692, to which the author is evidently indebted for the story. Brown embodies the psychological state of many Salem villagers, who failed to see their own frailties and accused their neighbors or even their family members during the trials.

## Workshop

### Readings of “Ethan Brand”

The purpose of this workshop is to present the different readings of “Ethan Brand.” Ethan, who had spent a solitary and meditative life, left his lime-kiln to search for the unpardonable sin. After 18 years, he returned to his old lime-kiln again and told the new lime-burner, Bartram, his son Joe, and his community members that he found the unpardonable sin in his own heart. After conversing with the community on his finding of the unpardonable sin, he committed suicide in his old lime-kiln, which is a kind of cremation.

There have been many studies and analyses of “Ethan Brand.” Harry Levin, Michael J. Colacurcio, and Charles Swann discuss Banyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress from This World to That Which Is to Come* or Faust as the background of “Ethan Brand.” Levin, Richard Harter Fogle, Terence Martin, and Robert Milder interpret Brand’s search for the unpardonable sin. Nina Baym and Mark Harris study Brand’s suicide. Especially Harris discusses Brand’s failure to find the unpardonable sin. Considering these studies, three panelists each present readings of “Ethan Brand.” Brand’s return, his community, and cremation are respective key words for each panelist’s reading of “Ethan Brand.”

### Hawthorne and Native American Culture

Erika KATO (Rikkyo University)

The purpose of my presentation is to examine Nathaniel Hawthorne’s racial awareness by looking at how the symbolic image of fire represents the presence of Native Americans in “Ethan Brand.” To achieve that goal, I consider the ways in which Hawthorne portrays those characters who drink alcohol. My approach to understanding Hawthorne’s racial attitudes includes a careful reading of historical documents such as Francis Baylies’ *An Historical Memoir of the Colony of New Plymouth* (1830), one of the books that Hawthorne had borrowed from the Salem Athenaeum Library in 1837, and William Clark’s letter about Indians’ habit of drinking. By juxtaposing the book with the autograph letter of Clark, one could argue that “Ethan Brand” foregrounds Hawthorne’s stance toward racial issues in the nineteenth century.

Hawthorne employs fire imagery on a conscious level and effectively uses alcohol as a motif in “Ethan Brand.” Fire is one of the most predominant symbols of hell in the tale. Yet, at the same time, when Hawthorne uses images associated with fire, they take the form of tobacco or the flame of a lime kiln. Moreover, the story introduces such smokers as the stage-agent and the doctor. The former is considered to be “extinct”—a racially loaded word—as the workforce becomes outdated. Besides, when Ethan enters a tavern, the doctor recommends drinking, but Ethan flatly rejects the recommendation. Furthermore, as Ethan stands in front of the furnace and its flickering flames illuminates his face, the fire “redde[n]” his face. In the end, he throws himself into the fire, and what is left is his own bones. These details seem to constitute some kind of symbolic signs associated with Native American ceremonies.

To prove this hypothesis, we should pay attention to customs among Indians. In *An Historical Memoir*, Baylies explains what the Puritans had encountered during their settlement. The indigenous people had habits of smoking and making a bonfire. Baylies also alludes to the Indian cremation of the deceased. In addition, William Clark, one of the explorers who went into the North America, delivered reports on drinking and alcohol-related harm. He states in his letter that the government must correct Indians’ bad habit of drinking alcohol.

The story's cultural relevance to these texts helps establish the tale not just as portrayal of the ambitious protagonist but also as a part and parcel of anti-Indian prejudice and collective memory stretching back to the seventeenth century. Moreover, later in the nineteenth century, the government had to weigh the consequence of a decision made in 1830. It is worth noting that "Ethan Brand" was published in 1850. Significantly, Hawthorne describes the stage-agent as someone who smokes the pipe which he had lit twenty years ago, the year in which the Indian Removal Act was passed. At the same time, Ethan represents the indigenous people in ways that blur the crucial distinction between whites and Native Americans. Not surprisingly, Ethan's final fate serves as a reenactment of the Indian ritual of cremation. Hence, Hawthorne demonstrates how the indigenous people were faced with extinction due to the contact with whites. Ethan's demise underscores Hawthorne's warning about the danger of whites attempting to differentiate themselves from Native Americans.

### **"Ethan Brand" and Its Community**

**Fumiko TAKENO (Nagoya Gakuin University)**

"Ethan Brand" has attracted readers' attention for its eccentric protagonist, Ethan Brand, who leaves his community and goes wandering around the world to find the unpardonable sin. When we scrutinize the story and analyze the exchanges between characters, however, we notice how important the community is to make the story move on: Brand cannot be Brand in this Faust-like story without the vulgar village people around him.

In this workshop, I examine the role of the community members in the story. Ethan Brand was a naive lime-burner, with "love and sympathy for mankind" and "pity of human guilt and woe," who contemplated the metaphysical thought of the unpardonable sin "which afterwards became the inspiration of this life." "Vast intellectual development," however, "disturbed the counterpoise between his mind and heart," according to Nathaniel Hawthorne, the author. After his search, Brand comes home to show the village people that he has finally found the unpardonable sin. However, the community does not esteem his deed. In this sense, Ethan Brand could be classified as one of Hawthorne's Romantic characters, like those in "The Artist of the Beautiful" and "The Devil in the Manuscript," who pursue their lofty ideals in spite of unsympathetic people. Many critics also point out the similarities with Goethe's romantic character, Faust: in that, a protagonist barter their humanity in their lust for superhuman knowledge (Millicent Bell) and in defiance of God. The difference is that Faust is saved but Brand is not.

When we examine the story with a focus on the role of the community, we find a clue to why Brand, unlike Faust, rejects salvation. Brand seems to think much of the community's esteem, which drives him to a horrifying end. Even though he boasts of his search and despises a devil that he thought he left behind, people from the village tavern do not acknowledge Brand's success in his quest, and insist instead that alcohol is better than that. Brand's rage shows how much he thinks of the community's judgment. In this sense, "Ethan Brand" is a story about a man who is entangled in his relationship with the community and is forced toward suicide. In short, the point of "Ethan Brand" is the reciprocal influence between Brand and the community. We might consider Brand's unpardonable sin to be their joint production. I argue that this makes the story true to 19th-century America in its own right, demonstrating a clear difference from European romantic stories like Faust.

## The Meanings of Circles in “Ethan Brand”

Yoko KURAHASHI (Tokai Gakuen University)

The images of the circle in “Ethan Brand,” which are Brand’s return to his lime-kiln and an old dog chasing his tail, make us associate “Ethan Brand” with Dante’s *Divine Comedy (Inferno)*. In *Inferno*, *Canto VII*, people who squander and skimp clash together, and then at one point “[e]ach one turned backward, rolling retrograde, / Crying, “Why keepest?” and, “Why squanderest thou?”” They repeat this act endlessly. In *Canto XXIV*, thieves are bitten by serpents and burn to ashes which draw together, and they become as they were. And then the serpents entangle them again. In *Canto XXVIII*, “[d]isseminators of scandal and of schism” are running and a devil cruelly puts falchion’s edge on them, but their wounds are closed again and then they repeat the same thing. In Dante’s *Inferno*, torture is repeated again and again, constructing a circle.

Brand’s return to say he found the unpardonable sin proves that he has still been obsessed with the unpardonable sin, and is not emancipated by it like the sinners in Dante’s *Inferno*. However, he is not sure that he found the unpardonable sin, as the old dog, which symbols Band, cannot catch his tail. When he encounters “low and vulgar modes of thought and feeling” of his community, he has the painful doubt that he found the unpardonable sin. Because Brand wants to stop searching for the sin, he has the painful doubt. However, a village doctor perceives Brand’s uncertainty and judges that he did not find the unpardonable sin. Only Brand’s memory of Esther makes him certain, and murmur, “What more have I to seek? What more to achieve?” Now that he cannot stop searching the sin, it is torture for him like the sinners in *Inferno*. The reason why he returned to his village is to say he found the unpardonable sin and stop searching for the sin.

Brand is afraid that he cannot stop searching for the unpardonable sin, observing his subject’s soul. His suicide is to make him stop searching for the sin and his torture, the circle construction. Brand affects Bartram and Joe most. Bartram is worrying that sensitive Joe will never make a man. Brand used to be “a simple and loving man” like Joe. The story suggests that Joe succeeds his father’s job as a lime-burner and may succeed Brand’s searching and the circle. Moreover, Hawthorne is conscious about observing people as a writer. If Brand’s act symbolizes that of a writer, then it is sensitive Joe who succeeds that of a writer.

## Special Lecture

### Whale upon a Hill: The Cultural Origins of Puritan Literature

Takayuki TATSUMI (Keio University)

This special lecture aims to reexamine the literary and cultural transactions between Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) and Herman Melville's *Moby-Dick* (1851), with a special emphasis upon the interactions between whale hunting and witch hunting in 1690s Salem, Massachusetts. I started with Ron Howard's 2015 film *In the Heart of the Sea* based upon Nathaniel Philbrick's non-fiction book, the winner of the 2000 National Book Award. The first sequence of the film features an imaginary but provocative interview between Melville and Thomas Nickerson, one of the survivors of the tragedy of the whaleship Essex in November, 1820, whose log was discovered in the mid-20th century. Meeting with the legendary cabin boy of the Essex in February 1850, Melville as performed by Ben Wishaw boasts of the huge sales of his first novel *Typee* (1846), while Nickerson highly appreciates Nathaniel Hawthorne as "a great writer," dismissing Melville's novels as "seafaring yarns." Of course, no biography has ever verified the encounter between Melville and Nickerson. According to Philbrick, it is another writer called Leon Lewis who in 1876 visited and asked Nickerson about the detail of the shipwreck in question. However, this imaginary conversation sounds so stimulating as to convince us that this mega-novel *Moby-Dick* is primarily designed to respond to and even surpass *The Scarlet Letter*.

In order to address the issue, we should reconsider Salem as an intersection between whales and witches. Let us read a petition composed in the spring of 1691 by John Higginson and Timothy Lindall:

Sir: We have been jointly concerned in several whale voyages at Cape Cod and have sustained great wrong and injury by the unjust dealing of the inhabitants of those parts, especially in two instances: ye first was when Woodbury and Company in our boats in the winter of 1690 killed a large whale in Cape Cod harbor. She sank and after rose, went to sea with a harpoon, warp, etc, of ours, which have been found in the hands of Nicholas Eldridge. The second case is this last winter, 1691. William Edds and Company in one of our boats, struck a whale, which came ashore dead, and by ye evidence of the people of Cape Cod, was the very whale they killed. The whale was taken away by Thomas Smith of Eastham and unjustly detained. John Higginson/ Timothy Lindall (quoted in Frances Diane Robotti, *Whaling and Old Salem: A Chronicle of the Sea* [New York: Bonanza Books, 1962], 16)

Before the rise of Nantucket as the center of whaling in the 1690s, Salem had been one of the major precursors in the very field. Being the champions of Salem's industrial tradition, Higginson and Lindall could not allow for Cape Codder's stealing of the large whale. It is highly plausible that this petition inspired Melville to develop his philosophy of "Fast Fish and Loose Fish," Chapter 89 of *Moby-Dick*. Now please note that the early 1690s saw the coincidence between the whale wars and the witch hunting in Salem. It is the issue of property that had deeply affected both the whale hunters and the witch hunters. At this point, we should not forget a key person Philip English, one of the sources of the fictional Mathew Maule in *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851). Living in the many-gabled Great House, the prosperous

merchant owned 21 vessels besides a wharf and warehouses in 1692, the very year of witch hunting in Salem. Such wealth attracted to himself the envy of some of the Salem townsmen who accused the merchant and his wife of witchcraft (Robotti 24-25). What followed the accusation is narrated by Hawthorne himself: "Philip English, a rich merchant of Salem, found it necessary to take flight, leaving his property and business in confusion. But a short time afterwards, the Salem people were glad to invite him back" ("The Grandfather's Chair," Chapter II "The Salem Witches" [1840]). To put it another way, the dominant discourse of witch hunting forced Philip English to be discharged, that is, beheaded or decapitated socially.

What interests me most here is that in 1849 the advent of the new president Zachary Taylor of the Whig party so radically deprived Hawthorne the Democrat of his surveyorship in the Custom-House that the author narrates the moral panic by means of the metaphor of "guillotine," with which the members of the victorious have "chopped off all our heads" (31). The author wanted to consider the whole sketch of "The Custom-House" as the "POSTHUMOUS PAPERS OF A DECAPITATED SURVEYOR." Therefore, it is the political predicament Hawthorne felt as he was writing the novel that helped create the existential predicament the Reverend Arthur Dimmesdale felt as he was giving an Election Sermon in front of Hester and Pearl. Thus, the colonial election of John Endicott as the new governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony prefigures the antebellum election of Zachary Taylor as the new president of the United States of America, closely and logically intertwining "The Custom-House" with the narrative of *The Scarlet Letter*.

This perspective will also enable us to reread Melville's representation of beheading the whales as a sophisticated response to his mentor's masterpiece. He sets up an analogy between the whale's "black and hooded head" hanging "in the midst of so intense a calm" and the "Sphynx's in the desert": "Speak, thou vast and venerable head," muttered Ahab, "which, though ungarnished with a beard, yet here and there lookest hoary with mosses; speak, mighty head, and tell us the secret thing that is in there. Of all divers, thou hast dived the deepest" (*Moby-Dick*, Chapter 70, "The Sphynx," 249). Hawthorne's disciple further expands his deep meditation on the whale's head in the context of western intellectual history: "Can you catch the expression of the Sperm Whale's there? It is the same he died with, only some of the longer wrinkles in the forehead seem now faded away. I think this broad brow to be full of a prairie-like placidity, born of a speculative indifference as to death. But mark the other head's expression. See that amazing lower lip, pressed by accident against the vessel's side, so as firmly to embrace the jaw. Does not this whole head see to speak of an enormous practical resolution in facing death? This Right Whale I take to have been a Stoic; the Sperm Whale, a Platonian, who might have taken up Spinoza in his latter years" (*Moby-Dick*, Chapter 75, "The Right Whale's Head: Contrasted View" 267).

While Hawthorne's figuration of decapitation in "The Custom-House" remains down-to-earth and even nihilistic, Melville's redefinition of beheading sounds metaphysical and even transcendental. As Frances Larson pointed out, "severing someone's head is an act of desecration, but contemplating their skull can be an act of worship" (*Severed: a History of Heads Lost and Heads Found* [London: Granta, 2014], 161). Therefore, the moment Hawthorne lost his head as a surveyor Melville started worshipping the master as another whale.



### The Literary Imagination of Maritime America: Naval Discourse and Antebellum Writers

In response to the Barbary piracy crises after the Revolution, Congress authorized the establishment of the United States Navy in 1794. With a deeply rooted apprehension about a strong national force, the nation nevertheless took a first step toward developing as a maritime power. This period of the navy's expansion until the Civil War coincided with the growth and maturity of American literature. Naval institutions both afloat and ashore often played a certain role in forming reading circles and encouraging seamen as well as officers to write about their voyages. In this way, naval life, maritime affairs and the act of reading and writing were interconnected, reflecting the naval discourse characteristic to this era. Irving, Cooper, Hawthorne and Melville were not a little involved in this growing cultural and social phenomenon. Focusing on these antebellum writers chronologically, our symposium attempted to illustrate dynamic relations between the literary imagination and naval discourse of maritime America.

#### Washington Irving and Navy Implied

Noboru SAITO (Rissho University)

As Washington Irving (1783-1859) became more active in his literary tasks, his economic conditions were gradually exhausted in England. In the fall of 1817, he travelled to Edinburgh, the capital city of Scotland, partly on business and partly for sight-seeing, and there he met Francis Jeffery (1773-1850), Chief Editor of *The Edinburgh Review*, and Archibald Constable (1774-1827) and William Blackwood (1776-1834), publishers of a magazine in Edinburgh, who asked Irving to write articles for their magazines.

But the most significant part of the travel came to him when he visited Walter Scott (1771-1832) at Abbotsford in the Scottish Borders with the letter of introduction by Thomas Campbell (1777-1840). Scott welcomed him so cordially that Irving prolonged his stay from a few hours as he had initially planned to four days according to the persuasion of his host. At any rate, it is quite sure that as a result of his visit to Abbotsford, Irving came to have self-confidence to go on with the literary activities in his own style, and that Scott made him realize he must have an enterprising spirit and endeavor to create something, instead of being merely contented with the routine tasks by others.

Soon Irving started writing articles for a magazine of Blackwood Company in 1818. In autumn of the same year, his eldest brother, William Irving (be in the know about America's Navy), wrote to Washington Irving and asked to come back to America, leaving the business in Liverpool to his elder brother, Peter, and to get a due position in the Naval Department. "My dear Brother: The purport of the letter was to inform you that Commodore Decatur (1779-1820) informed me that he had made such arrangements & such steps would further be made by the Navy Board, as that you will be able to obtain the office of first Clerk in the Navy Department, which is indeed similar to that of under secretary in England.... If you think it will suit, you will return immediately. October 24, 1818" (Johanna Johnston, *The Heart That Would Not Hold*, 1971) But Irving refused his brother's offer, saying in his answering letter that he wanted to stay in England to "produce articles from time to time that will be sufficient for my present support, and form a stock of copyright property, that may be a little capital for me hereafter." He thought it necessary not to leave Europe to proceed with the literary work by collecting materials for his writing.

What he called “a stock of copyright property” in his letter to William was shortly realized by *The Sketch Book* (1819-1820). The book, which made Irving’s fame as an American writer steadfast, was at first published in America in parts, each consisted of three or four chapters. In 1819 when thirty-four chapters had been published thus in separate parts, they were collected in a volume of they were collected in a volume of *The Sketch Book*, which immediately attracted public attention and gained popularity. Irving intended to give life to his major works as American folklores by introducing the antagonism between Yankee and the Dutch colonial community. This is why his works have maintained high literary reputation as Irving’s representative writings for a long time in spite of the circumstances that they were adaptations from tales of other nations. As mentioned above, if Irving accepted the job offer with Navy, he would not be able to work at the literary world again.

## **Midshipmen “Misread”: Naval Reading Communities and the Quarrel among Sailor-Writers Ichiro HAYASHI (Doshisha University)**

My presentation showed how, in the Antebellum discursive space occupied by ex-elite officers of the US Navy who became writers, the purportedly fact-based corpus of their Naval discourse came to incubate within itself ambiguous, elusive and subjectivized modes of representation open to arbitrary interpretation and an endless chain of “misreading.”

In the first part, “the USS *Somers* Case in Literary Context,” the attempted “mutiny” on the *Somers* in 1842 was read as an episode epitomizing the problematic process of interpretation. Three crewmembers, a midshipman who was the son of the then US Secretary of War and two sailors, were executed by an onboard drumhead court headed by Captain Alexander Mackenzie, but the evidence which determined their fate was of a dubious nature: a scrap of paper purporting to be mutineers’ name list jotted down in schoolboys’ Greek and Mackenzie’s impression that the midshipman was under the influence of “piratical stories.” The piratical romance named by contemporary newspapers as the chief culprit inspiring the “mutiny” was James Fenimore Cooper’s *The Red Rover*, an 1827 sea romance featuring an eponymous pirate king who, in his death-bed confession, turns out to be a patriot dedicated to the revolutionary cause of his nation. The romance was an exercise in ambiguity in which a romanticized pirate ship full of non-national and multi-racial affiliated people paradoxically mirrored as much as it subverted the social institutions it seemed to oppose. As Herman Melville acutely recognized in his review, the ringleader midshipman “misread” this Janus-faced pirate romance. Dubious as they are, both pieces of “evidences” pertained to exegetical activities—decoding a semi-illegible name list and an adolescent fantasy fueled by pirate romances—and thus symbolically reflected the age’s concern with the complexities of language and problem of interpretation.

The succeeding two parts examined the long-standing feud between two Sailor-Writers, Captain Mackenzie and ex-midshipman turned national novelist Fenimore Cooper. The second section, “Praxis in Misreading,” focused on the historical description of the Battle of Lake Erie during the War of 1812 and analyzed how the different evaluations of Captain Jesse D. Elliott’s performance in aiding Captain Oliver Hazard Perry’s heroic act by Cooper and Mackenzie generated voluminous textual responses and name callings. Thus, what was originally a naval controversy came to resemble a literary controversy—literary in the sense that issues of textual ambiguity and indeterminacy originated in the use of one verb in Perry’s field report. In the final part, “Quarrel among Sailor-Writers,” the stage for the Cooper-Mackenzie polemic

was transferred from warships to the Naval Court Martial, at which Captain Mackenzie stood accused of murder and oppression. The Court Martial provided a discursive platform on which elements of political, cultural and literary imagination converged, generating textual exchanges among Richard Henry Dana Jr., Cooper, Mackenzie himself, as well as other influential figures of the late Jacksonian Era. Thus the Naval controversy over the authenticity of historiography turned out to be an assemblage of literary events that would mark the opening of the 1840s, the decade Edmund Wilson labeled the period of “Shock of Recognition.”

## Naval Discourse Shared by Hawthorne and Perry: A Connection between Imagination and Reality Kayoko NAKANISHI (Kyoto Sangyo University)

It was during the period from 1837 to 1850 that Hawthorne’s connection to the navy strongly affected the formation of his literary career. He established a presence as a writer and broke a financial impasse with support from Bridge and Bancroft, naval officers, and Senator Pierce. At that time, Matthew C. Perry was beginning to acquire a high reputation as a navy commander. In this context, Perry and Hawthorne had an indirect connection. In fact, Bridge’s *Journal of an African Cruiser*, which Hawthorne edited, is an account of an African Squadron (1843-45) under the command of Commodore Perry. Meanwhile, Perry commanded the Japan Expedition from 1852 to 1854. On this occasion, Perry used music and theatrical performances as a disciplinary device on board and “his chief cultural weapon” for opening Japan. After fulfilling his mission, Perry visited Hawthorne in Liverpool to ask him to compile the records of the expedition. Taking Hawthorne’s relation to the Navy and Perry’s use of artistic imagination into consideration, my presentation discussed the way Hawthorne and Perry shared a practical mind and an imaginative force in accordance with the naval discourse of maritime America.

Perry commanded the African Squadron and Bridge served as a purser on the Commodore’s flag-ship. The squadron was sent to suppress the slave trade, punish the Africans who had attacked American vessels and protect the colony of Liberia. Especially, the colonization of Liberia was an urgent policy of the Democrats. On the other hand, Hawthorne’s chief purpose in editing the *Journal* was to get a profitable official post, wiping out suspicions from the Democrats who were critical of his participation in Brook Farm. Hawthorne faced difficulties in editing the *Journal* because the squadron was to a great degree unsuccessful: no slave trade vessels were captured, the colony’s conditions were not promising and the violent sanctions were unlikely to please American humanitarian readers. Hawthorne, however, displayed his editing skills, making brutal acts seem valorous, providing few references to failure. He also belittled Sierra Leone, the British colony, to make the American colony seem much better in comparison. Moreover, Hawthorne added a word of praise for Perry and touched on the usefulness of the Navy. Hawthorne was really familiar with naval discourse and knew exactly what was required. As a result, he was appointed to an official position by President Polk, a Democrat.

In 1852, Perry was assigned the task of opening Japan. Two years before this, Congress had passed an Act to prohibit flogging on board ships, in response to a call for naval education reform. Without alternate means, Perry had to devise a way to enforce shipboard discipline. This was extremely critical for his mission because he believed the best way to face Japanese people “of forms and ceremonies” was, with stately and dignified reserve, to exhibit American civilized behavior. He also believed that “the success of his treaty depended upon the success of the entertainment.” For this, Perry used music and theatrical

performances, and succeeded in keeping up morale on board and breaking down the norms of Japanese established system. With the power of imagination, he renewed naval discourse and achieved the great end. On his way back to America, Perry first met Hawthorne and talked about his successful expedition.

Hawthorne and Perry shared the spirit of maritime America and naval discourse characteristic to the period. While believing in the power of imagination, they also took a pragmatic and well-balanced approach toward handling harsh realities. It is no wonder that Hawthorne felt, at the meeting with Perry, that “I seldom meet with a man who puts himself more immediately on conversible [sic] terms than the Commodore.”

## “Bugs” of the State: *White-Jacket* and Naval Reform

Mitsuru SANADA (Ryukoku University)

Signed on as an ordinary seaman in 1843, Herman Melville served on board the frigate *United States*. He left Hawaii and returned to Boston in 1844. It was not until 1845 that the U.S. Navy founded the Naval Academy as an educational reform. This chronology shows that Melville experienced the naval system when it was notoriously corrupt. *White-Jacket, or The World in a Man-of-War* is his fifth novel based on his experience as a seaman. We have two types of sea narratives: officer’s narratives and seaman’s narratives, because on board there was a sharp distinction between officers and seamen, and that was irreconcilable with the ideal American system—democracy. The seaman’s narratives praise the democratic value, and the narrator clearly lauds democracy in *White-Jacket*. The seaman storyteller describes the life and customs in a man-of-war in detail, one of which involves the scuttle-butt. In Chapter 68, at the end of the passage that explains the scuttle-butt, Melville, for the first time, summons Nathaniel Hawthorne: “And would that my fine country man, Hawthorne of Salem, had but served on board a man-of-war in his time, that he might give us the reading of a ‘rill’ from the scuttle-butt.” The “rill” refers to Hawthorne’s “A Rill from the Town Pump,” so he must have intended to say that Hawthorne could have written an officer’s narrative that would have complemented *White-Jacket*. If Hawthorne “had but served on board a man-of-war,” he surely would have served as an officer, not a seaman. The Navy with which Hawthorne could have served consisted of a small number of cliques with a high degree of specialization, and antebellum naval officers formed aristocratic and anti-democratic society. It is easy to understand that many officers were corrupt and depraved the Navy: in other words, there were “bugs” to be fixed in the Navy and the Navy was also a “bug” in the ideal of the American state. One of the evil naval customs that democratic people would not accept was flogging. From a naval viewpoint, it was necessary to maintain discipline on the sea; however, the point is that only seamen suffered this penalty under the Articles of War, and it was decided arbitrarily by autocratic captains. Melville decries that “the Captain is made a legislator, as well as a judge and an executive.” One man should not acquire such a power under republicanism with the separation of these three powers. Melville points out that the Articles of War originated in Britain, “whose laws we Americans hurled off as tyrannical, and yet retained the most tyrannical of all.” From the position of a seaman, who is subject to aristocratic and autocratic officers, *White-Jacket* admires democracy, an unfinished and ongoing project. In the nineteenth century, Americans keenly accepted Hegel, whose philosophy tries to solve internal conflict or antagonism, that is, bugs, and integrate them. The nineteenth century is one that the U.S. Navy had to reform.

## 東京支部研究会

2016年、東京支部研究会では下記の活動を行いました。研究発表はそれぞれ意欲的な取り組みで、刺激的な内容でした。作品研究は、各回とも活発な議論が展開されました。伊藤詔子氏と丹羽隆昭氏の招待講演は円熟味を感じるとともに、大きなインパクトを受けました。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。2017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。

△2016年3月19日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 1号館8階8B会議室）

【講演】

講師：伊藤 詔子 氏（広島大学名誉教授）

題目：「ファンション・デュパン、ポール・オースター  
——アメリカン・ルネサンス的主人公とポストモダンの文学」

司会：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）

△2016年7月30日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 7号館773教室）

【研究発表】

発表者：上原 正博 氏（専修大学）

題目：「ホーゾーンの歴史認識再考——Main-streetを例にして」

司会：高橋 利明 氏（日本大学）

【研究ノート発表】

発表者：内堀 奈保子 氏（日本大学）

研究テーマ：Mary Moody Emerson について

司会：高橋 利明 氏（日本大学）

△2016年9月17日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 7号館774教室）

【研究発表】

発表者：内田 裕 氏（中央大学大学院生）

題目：「『七破風の家』におけるホルグレーヴの変容とプロットの相関関係」

司会：古屋 耕平 氏（和洋女子大学）

【作品研究】

発表者：大野 美砂 氏（東京海洋大学）

作品：“Roger Malvin's Burial”

△2016年11月26日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 1号館8階8B会議室）

【作品研究】

発表者：高尾 直知 氏（中央大学）

作品：Herman Melville, “The Bell-tower”

【講演】

講師：丹羽 隆昭 氏（関西外国語大学）

題目：「ホーゾンと民主主義——彼のジャクソン賛美を中心に」

司会：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）

△2016年12月17日（土）午後3時より（於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 1号館8階8B会議室）

【読書会】

テキスト：Jana L. Argersinger and Phyllis Cole, eds. *Toward a Female Genealogy of Transcendentalism*  
(Athens: U of Georgia P, 2014)

司会・発表：高尾 直知 氏（中央大学） Introduction, Section 4

発表者：内堀 奈保子 氏（日本大学） Section 1

佐野 陽子 氏（上智大学非常勤講師） Section 2

一瀬 厚一 氏（日本大学大学院生） Section 3

岡田 大樹 氏（専修大学大学院生） Section 3

（川村 幸夫 記）

## 中部支部研究会

中部支部では、研究会／講演会を年4回開催することを予定しております。2016年3月には成田先生をお迎えして講演会を開催することができました。画期的なロマンス論に多々刺激を受けました。2回の研究発表は、いずれも興味深く示唆的でした。2017年1月と3月にも研究会を予定しております。

△2016年3月12日（土）午後2時より（於 東海学園大学 栄サテライト）

### 【講演会】

講演者：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）

題 目：「「不透明な眼球」としてのヘスター——ロマンス・肉体・超絶主義をめぐる」

司 会：倉橋 洋子 氏（東海学園大学）

△2016年6月26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：森岡 稔 氏（愛知学院大学非常勤講師）

題 目：「ホーソーンの『緋文字』をユング心理学で読み解く」

司 会：中村 栄造 氏（名城大学）

△2016年9月18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：竹野 富美子 氏（名古屋学院大学）

題 目：「アメリカのナチュラリストの系譜——エマソンとソローに見る」

司 会：森岡 稔 氏（愛知学院大学非常勤講師）

（倉橋 洋子 記）

## 関西支部研究会

関西支部では例年4回のペースで支部研究会を開催していますが、今年は5回の研究会を持つことができました。これも会員諸氏のご協力の賜とこの場を借りて感謝申し上げます。研究発表は新進からベテランまで、それぞれ意欲的な発表が揃い、作品を深く掘り下げて議論することができたように思います。8月例会ではボーがご専門の西山けい子氏をお招きし、『緋文字』について新たな視点から興味深い講演をしていただきました。今後も新機軸を取り入れながら、支部研究会活動を行なっていきたいと考えております。

なお、2017年3月20日（月）には丹羽隆昭先生にご講演いただく予定です。多数のご参加をお待ちしております。

△2016年3月21日（月）午後2時30分より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1002 室）

### 【研究発表】

（1）発表者：真田 満 氏（龍谷大学非常勤講師）

題 目：「共同体を表現（だいひょう）する——“A Rill from the Town Pump”から  
*Two Years Before the Mast* と *White-Jacket* へ」

司 会：中西 佳世子 氏（京都産業大学）

（2）発表者：竹井 智子 氏（京都工芸繊維大学）

題 目：「「愚者の楽園」と「陰鬱な現実」の間で——Henry James, “A Round of Visits”（「一巡り」）」

司 会：中西 佳世子 氏（京都産業大学）

△2016年8月27日（日）午後3時より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1406 室）

### 【特別講演】

講 師：西山 けい子 氏（関西学院大学）

題 目：「はじまりの愛と三角形的欲望——『緋文字』における愛と憎しみをめぐって」

司 会：丹羽 隆昭 氏（関西外国語大学）

△2016年9月18日（日）午後1時30分より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1408 室）

### 【研究発表】

（1）発表者：小南 悠 氏（関西学院大学大学院生）

題 目：「すりかえられた愛と Georgiana の涙——“The Birth-mark”再読」

司 会：小田 敦子 氏（三重大学）

（2）発表者：佐々木 知彦 氏（関西大学非常勤講師）

題 目：「内戦をめぐる記憶と現在——Paul Auster の *Man in the Dark* における Rose Hawthorne」

司 会：橋本 安史 氏（関西学院大学）

（3）発表者：藤沢 徹也 氏（梅花中学校高等学校）

題 目：「「フェザートップ」における語り手と読者」

司 会：井上 久夫 氏（関西学院大学）

△2016 年 11 月 12 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 1002 室）

【研究発表】

- (1) 発表者：キョウ ゲッチク 氏（京都大学研究生）  
題 目：“Poe’s Nature and Order: Focusing on “The Landscape Garden.”  
司 会：池末 陽子 氏（大谷大学）
- (2) 発表者：中村 善雄 氏（ノートルダム清心女子大学）  
題 目：「ホーゾーンの短編におけるポスト・ヒューマン的想像力」  
司 会：水野 尚之 氏（京都大学）

△2016 年 12 月 24 日（土）午後 1 時 30 分より（於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1406 室）

【研究発表】

- 発表者：入子 文子 氏（元関西大学教授）  
題 目：「ある仮説——ディムズデイルの隠されたモデル」  
司 会：西谷 拓哉 氏（神戸大学）

【読書会】

- 題 目：“The Intelligence Office”を読む  
話題提供：妹尾 智美 氏（立命館大学）“The Intelligence Office”について  
西谷 拓哉 氏（神戸大学）Melville, *The Confidence-Man*, Ch.22 について

（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。

△2016 年 3 月 26 日（土）午後 3 時より（於 福岡大学文系センター棟 14 階 学部共通室）

【シンポジウム】

- 司会・講師：古屋 耕平 氏（和洋女子大学）  
講 師：小林 朋子 氏（広島大学）  
講 師：高村 峰生 氏（神戸女学院大学）  
講 師：竹内 勝徳 氏（鹿児島大学）  
題 目：「アメリカン・ルネサンスにおける情動と身体」

△2016 年 6 月 25 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：逆巻 しとね 氏（独立研究者）  
題 目：「『書写人バートルビー』における距たりと触発  
——ドゥルーズ、アガンベン、ジジェク批判を中心に」  
司 会：川下 剛 氏（九州栄養福祉大学）
- (2) 発表者：大野 瀬津子 氏（九州工業大学）  
題 目：「共感するマシーセン——感傷小説研究における『アメリカン・ルネサンス』批判再考」  
司 会：乗口 眞一郎 氏（北九州市立大学名誉教授）

△2016 年 9 月 24 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：川下 剛 氏（九州栄養福祉大学）  
題 目：「『断念された作品からの抜粋』の語り手の物語と物語の語り」  
司 会：青井 格 氏（近畿大学）
- (2) 発表者：逆巻 しとね 氏（独立研究者）  
題 目：「想像力とモラルの融合——文芸共和国とホーゾーン『ウェイクフィールド』（1835）」  
司 会：大野 瀬津子 氏（九州工業大学）

△2016 年 12 月 10 日（土）午後 3 時より（於 福岡大学文系センター棟 9 階 学部共通室 B）

【特別講演】

- 講 師：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）  
題 目：「緋文字の刺繍をほどこ——ニュー・イングランド思想史管見」  
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35号をお届けします。
2. 第35回全国大会は2016年5月27日(金)・28日(土)の両日に同志社大学で開催されました。大会運営にご尽力いただいた皆さまにこの場をお借りして深くお礼申し上げます。
3. 次回第36回全国大会は2017年5月19日(金)・20日(土)にCSA貸会議室 (JR静岡駅より徒歩3分 レイアアップ御幸町ビル)での開催を予定しております。詳細は来年度にお送りいたします大会案内をご確認ください。会場で多くの会員の皆さまとお会いできることを楽しみにしております。
4. ホーソーン・ポー国際学会の発表募集締め切りが2017年8月1日となっておりますので奮ってご応募ください。詳細は協会ホームページをご覧ください。
5. 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。
6. 住所変更やご所属の変更がございましたら、事務局へご一報ください。

(川村 幸夫 記)

## 編集室だより

現在、『フォーラム』22号刊行に向けた作業が順調に進んでおります。次号には、研究論文1編、書評3編を掲載する予定です。掲載の可否にかかわらず、ご投稿くださいました会員のみならず、ご多忙にもかかわらず厳正に査読していただいた編集委員各位、書評を快くお引き受けいただいた先生方に、この場をお借りして御礼申し上げます。

ご投稿は事務局 ([hawthorne.forum@gmail.com](mailto: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、ぜひ積極的にご投稿ください。

### 『フォーラム』21号会計報告 (2015.9-2016.8)

収 入		支 出	
繰越金	829,387	『フォーラム』21号発行費	334,986
『フォーラム』22号費用	500,000	内訳	
利息	78	印刷費 (400部)	282,960
収入合計	1,329,465	封入手数料 (281件)	12,171
		郵送費	39,855
		笹氣出版への原稿送付費 (1件)	130
		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	990,847	支出合計	338,618

・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。

竹内勝徳・高橋勤(編)『身体と情動——アフェクトで読むアメリカン・ルネサンス』彩流社 (2016)

成田雅彦・西谷拓哉・高尾直知(編著)『ホーソーンの文学的遺産——ロマンスと歴史の変貌』開文社出版 (2016)

藤村希「未完の再生——『大理石の牧神』のホーソン 後期作家経歴における意義」『英文学研究』92 日本英文学会 (2015)

藤村希「流血のテキスト Nathaniel Hawthorne の“Chiefly about War-Matters”と“Northern Volunteers”」『英米文学』76 立教大学文学部英米文学専修 (2016)

Masunaga, Toshikazu. “Beyond the American Landscape: Tourism and the Significance of Hawthorne’s Travel Sketches.” *The Japanese Journal of American Studies*, 27. The Japanese Association for American Studies. (2016)

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 36 回大会のお知らせ

日 時：2017 年 5 月 19 日（金）、20 日（土）  
場 所：CSA 貸会議室レイアップ御幸町ビル  
（静岡市葵区御幸町 11-8 電話：054-269-5070）

### 《第 36 回大会概要》

2017 年度の全国大会は静岡での開催となります。今回は、「文学とコミュニティ」が特別講演とシンポジウムに通底するテーマです。特別講演は小泉凡先生にご登壇をお願いしました。静岡市に隣接する焼津市は、小泉八雲（ラフカディオ・ハーン）がかつて 6 回の夏を過ごしたところとしても知られています。このたびは、ハーンの再話文学を地域活性化、地域教育に活かした、松江と焼津の事例を中心に、文学の社会的活用の可能性について、お話いただけるということです。シンポジウムでは、ホーソーンの周辺の文学者たちを取り巻くさまざまなコミュニティをめぐる、高尾直知先生、白川恵子先生、本岡亜沙子先生、貞廣真紀先生に、フラワー、オルコット、ソーロー、メルヴィル、ホイットマン、および黒人の反乱などを題材にして、論じていただきます。ワークショップでは、上原正博先生、妹尾智美先生、田島優子先生、大川淳先生が「瘧」を精読されますが、実験的な運営を試みますので、会員のみなさまにも是非にご協力いただきますようお願い申し上げます。

### 【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、ふるってご応募ください）
- ・ワークショップ

「瘧」を読む

司会・講師：上原 正博 氏（専修大学）

講師：妹尾 智美 氏（立命館大学）

講師：田島 優子 氏（宮城学院女子大学）

講師：大川 淳 氏（京都ノートルダム女子大学）

<概要>このワークショップはその原点に戻る実験を試みます。当日までに登壇者と会員諸氏とが WEB 上の回覧日誌（SNS）にて交流する（共同作業を進める）ことで、「瘧」の理解を共有していくことになります。読書会を大きくしたものとお考えいただければ幸いです。まず、協会ホームページに登壇者が短い論考を掲載します。それらを会員諸氏にお読みいただき、意見や疑問をお寄せいただきます。それらの意見を参考にしたり、疑問にお答えするように努めつつ、登壇者は論考を改訂してまいります。最終版は、大会前にホームページに再掲しますので、会員諸氏にはそれらを事前にお読みになってお越しいただき、会場にて意見交換を行うことで、短編に対する精緻な理解を練り上げていくことを目指したいと願っています。詳細はホームページにて（および、可能な範囲で各支部の ML などをつうじて）ご案内いたします。みなさまのご協力なくしてワークショップの成功はありません。よろしくお願いいたします。

<全体の流れ>（予定）

1. 登壇者はそれぞれ邦文 3000 字～4000 字程度の草稿を用意する。
2. それを 2 月下旬か 3 月上旬にホーソーン協会の HP 上に掲載する。
3. 会員諸氏から、それらを讀んだ後、コメントや質問を寄せていただく。
4. 登壇者はそれを元にして改訂や議論の精緻化を目指す。
5. 大会前に最終版を 5000 字ないし 6000 字のペーパーにまとめ、HP に掲載する。
6. ワークショップ参加者は（原則として）事前にペーパーを読み、ワークショップに参加する。
7. 登壇者は参加者全員がペーパーを讀んでいるという前提で、15 分程度の報告を行う。
8. 質疑応答や討議にある程度の時間（40～60 分）をとり、内容の充実した、テーマをしっかりと掘り下げた意見交換によるワークショップとする。

・特別講演

講演者：小泉 凡 氏（島根県立大、小泉八雲記念館館長、焼津小泉八雲記念館名誉館長）

演 題：ハーゲン文学とコミュニティ・ツーリズム、地域教育——松江と焼津での取り組みから——

・総会

・懇親会：会場未定

【第2日】

・シンポジウム

陰画としての知のコミュニティ——ホーソーンの周辺事情（仮題）

司会・講師：高尾 直知 氏（中央大学）

講師：白川 恵子 氏（同志社大学）

講師：本岡 亜沙子 氏（広島経済大学）

講師：貞廣 真紀 氏（明治学院大学）

＜概要＞18～19 世紀のアメリカでは、共和国建設ののち、ヨーロッパからの学術的独立が志向された。共和国的な文学・文化、科学、出版のあり方について検討する種々のコミュニティが形成され、国内のみならずトランスナショナルな動きも活発化していく。そのような知のコミュニティとしては、アメリカ哲学協会、サタデークラブ、さまざまな講演会、さらにはより私的な読書会などがあるが、その実態はまさに十人十色のありさまを呈する。若きアメリカは、個人においてではなく、むしろこのようなコミュニティを通じて知的独立を引きよせ、民主国家をさらに確固たるものとし、奴隷制廃止・女権拡張・社会改良などにも関心を示したのだ。ホーソーン自身は、ブルックファームをのぞけば、そのような活動に積極的に関与した形跡は見られないが、アメリカやイタリアでのコミュニティと触れあいながら作品を描いていたことは疑いがない。本シンポでは、ホーソーンと時代的・地域的に近い知的コミュニティ活動を取りあげて、その内実を比較しながら、このような知的人的交流が持つ意味をあぶり出したい。

・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（質疑応答を含まない）とします。（下線部分は前回からの変更点）
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）：橋本安央（関西学院大学）E-mail: yasunaka@kwansei.ac.jp
4. 応募締切：2017 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、中部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》

今回の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、大会準備委員会から発案させていただきました。ですが、**2015**年度の総会で承認されましたように、各支部からの発案も、積極的にお願いしております。次年度は国際学会となりますので、該当しませんが、**2019**年度以降の大会に関して、どうぞよろしくお願いいたします。以下に発案の要綱を再掲しておきます。

- 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ー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。

（橋本 安央 記）

顧問	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				青井格（近畿大学）		
						稲富百合子（岡山大学非常勤講師）		
監		事				内堀奈保子（日本大学）		
						小宮山真美子（国立長野高専）		
理		事				鈴木孝（日本大学）		
						妹尾智美（立命館大学）		
						富樫壮央（麗澤大学非常勤講師）		
						中村文紀（日本大学）		
			会		計	大野美砂		
						中西佳世子		
			編	集	室	中村栄造		
						大場厚志		
						城戸光世		
						倉橋洋子		
						佐々木英哲		
						高尾直知		
			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

# 2015 年度 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会 会計報告

(2015. 4. 1 ~ 2016. 3. 31)

収入		支出			
会費	782,000	編集室費	500,000	前期繰越金	1,216,294
賛助会員	50,000	大会費	6,297	収入計	903,021
雑収入	70,985	大会準備委員会費	0	計	2,119,315
利息	36	印刷費	50,328	支出計	871,050
計	903,021	国際渉外室費	10,000	次期繰越金	1,248,265
		謝礼費	50,000		
		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	71,128		
		事務費	24,297		
		人件費	59,000		
		雑費	0		
		計	871,050		
				キャッシュポジション	
				郵便貯金	608,507
				みずほ銀行普通預金	479,581
				現金	160,177

上記の通り相違ありません

2016 年 3 月 31 日

会計 大野美砂

中西佳世子

監査の結果、上記の通り相違ないことを証明します

2016 年 4 月 1 日

監事 進藤鈴子

井上久夫