

NHSJ Newsletter

第 38 号 2020 年 2 月 15 日
日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会事務局
〒274-0063 千葉県船橋市習志野台 7-24-1
日本大学理工学部 鈴木孝研究室内
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 西谷拓哉

新年を迎え、会員の皆さまにはいかがお過ごしでしょうか。年が改まる度に何かが新しくなるような、かといって大きな変化もないような、断絶と連続のあわいに挟まれた不思議な感覚を覚えます。昨年、広島で開催された第 37 回大会で、高橋利明先生から会長職を受け継ぐこととなりました。この交代が本協会の活動の妨げにならず、継続発展につながるよう微力を尽くす所存であります。どうか皆さまのご協力を賜りますようお願いいたします。

さて、私はメルヴィルを専門としていますが、メルヴィルと比べると、ホーソーンは憎らしいくらい巧みなストーリーテラーであると言うよりほかありません。その小説の特徴は、まずもって独得かつ明確な「シチュエーション」を設定し、その中で登場人物がいかに行動するかを好奇心旺盛に観察することにあります。そのシチュエーションは家庭生活に設定されることが多く、ホーソーンの小説は必然的に家族ドラマとなります。ホーソーンを作るシチュエーションは自伝的背景を持つのみならず、現実の歴史状況、政治状況に影響されており、後者についてイデオロギ的分析を行なうことも当然必要ですが、その一方、ホーソーンを書く濃密な人間ドラマの妙味を、専門的な批評用語に頼らずに説き明かすような視点を改めて模索してもいいように思います。

そのような研究のために必要な言葉は、素朴なものであるが故にかえって探すのがむずかしいのですが、私の場合、ふと目にした書物や雑誌、新聞のコラムからヒントを得ることも多いのです。たとえば、向田邦子が次のようなことを語っています。ある対談で、向田邦子の書くドラマには家族が一体となっている「運命共同体臭がない」と評されて、「地球は公転しながら自転していますね。家族というのは大きな運命のもとでは、たとえば父が落ちぶれば小さな家に住まねばなくなるというところがあります。そうしながら、一人ひとは親の知らない間に失恋したり、いいことがあったり、家族というのはそれぞれが自転しながら公転している」ものだというのです（『向田邦子の本棚』河出書房新社、2019年）。「自転」と「公転」——なるほど、家族とはその二種類の運動からできているのかと、はっとさせられる。ホームドラマの名手ならではの洞察です。ならば、これを『緋文字』や『七破風の屋敷』、「若いグッドマン・ブラウン」や「ウェイクフィールド」などに当てはめて考えれば、どんな家族像が浮かび上がってくるのでしょうか。大変興味をそそられるところです。いや、それは文学研究ではなく評論だと言われるかもしれませんが、こういう素朴ながら力強い言葉を発見することこそが、文学に携わるおもしろさではないかと日々考えている次第です。

そのためにはじっくりテキストに向き合う時間が必要ですが、昨今の慌ただしい状況はなかなかそれを許してくれません。しかし、本年も全国大会、支部研究会、学会誌で、会員の皆さんの鋭い、しかし滋味にあふれた研究の言葉と出会えることを楽しみにしております。この「鋭く、滋味にあふれた」という形容を記すとき、私の脳裡にあるのは、本協会の会長、顧問をお務めになった川窪啓資先生の、紳士的で柔らかな語り口をまといつつも実に厳しい研究姿勢です。昨年ご逝去されました先生のこれまでのご尽力に感謝し、心からご冥福をお祈りいたします。

それでは、5月に沖縄でお目にかかります。

Presentation

The Unpainted Models as Romance in *The Marble Faun*

Shimpei YAMAGUCHI (Kyushu University)

The Marble Faun was published in 1860. Hawthorne attempted some works after this work, but he could not complete them in his life. Some critics have argued that Hawthorne did not unravel the mysteries, such as Antonio's, and that his description was so novelistic while he emphasized this work as a romance. These criticisms might come from his being conflicted as a writer. This presentation aims at unraveling his conflict between romance and novel by focusing on two models' transformation and being unpainted in *The Marble Faun*. The word "model" is very metafictional. These two models, Donatello and Antonio, can project how Hawthorne faces his conflict between models.

There are some analogies between the art theories mentioned in this work and Hawthorne's romance theories written in the other works. It means that a romance resembles painting, while a novel resembles sculpture. Romance and painting have a "story" and the scope of freedom, or "latitude." A novelist and a sculptor have to duplicate his model with reproduction of arrested motion or standstill. This is called "fidelity" according to Hawthorne. In this way, it is possible that the marble Faun of Praxiteles is ambiguous because it has the natures of both painting and sculpture. Hawthorne makes the story of *The Marble Faun* by duplicating the sculpture, so that the work also becomes ambiguous between romance and novel.

Antonio is called Model by characters because he used to be a model of Miriam, a painter. However, he transforms his nature as a model of painting into that of sculpture. After he dies, his dead body is observed by Kenyon, a sculptor. Kenyon says, "In the study of my art, I have gained many a hint from the dead, which the living could never have given me." Antonio's transformation means his story is lost because he belongs no more to painting and gains standstill as a dead body. He becomes an unpainted model, and his mysteries are never to be told.

Donatello also has such an ambiguity. He is a living duplication of the marble Faun. His nature before his transformation copies the nature of a Faun. He never starts his own story until he kills Antonio. He can free himself from nothing more than a sculpture of a Faun by this murder, and his romance starts to be drawn. However, his story is not told enough because he disappears to us with use of a black mask. When Kenyon encounters him at the carnival, Donatello wears a black mask. His identity is disguised and covered by another persona. Kenyon feels to be seen through the eye-holes of his black mask at that time. Though Donatello used to live an existence being observed by artistic characters, he is no more such a boy and becomes a man observing with his eyes. In other words, his story is not drawn anymore because romance stems from the observation of a model.

Hawthorne stresses the importance of superior observing eyes for the art works again and again in *The Marble Faun*. A model is an object to be observed. Considering Hawthorne's suffering from incompleteness of his work after this one, it is natural to think the two models' transformation can be interpreted as a projection of Hawthorne's conflict between romance and novel.

Reading Queer History: Reconsidering the Fortunate Fall in *The Marble Faun* Yu UCHIDA (West Virginia University)

Throughout his oeuvre, Nathaniel Hawthorne gives insights into the myriads of problems the nation faces. Among the writer's astute problematizations of social issues, ones involving gender normativity and US historical revisionism have particularly incited scholarly examinations over the years. However, the interrelation of these two aspects has not been thoroughly explored. This paper aims to evaluate Hawthorne's foresight in terms of the relationship between gender minorities and national history in his fourth romance *The Marble Faun*. In particular, the evaluation focuses on the strategical rhetoric of production/re-production deployed in the narrative, leading to the reinterpretation of Miriam's subversive nature and her use of theological paradox, the fortunate fall.

First, this paper examines the metaphorical acts of production performed by the artists, Kenyon, a sculptor, Hilda, a copyist, and Miriam, a painter. Whereas the Kenyon and Hilda's artistries are respectively associated with the dominant normativity of male/female's roles in sexual reproduction, i.e., men generate seed and women nurture it, Miriam's artistry disrupts the gender binary. Miriam is a female painter who establishes her own artistry, not a copyist. More importantly, she, in spite of her drawing upon traditional motifs in the arts, finally distorts and spoils them by adding "a wayward quirk of her pencil."

The detailed descriptions of their artwork productions are not isolated from the plot; on the contrary, they foreground the significance of the climactic scene of the romance, Miriam and Donatello's murder of the model. Donatello's perplexing complicity in the killing evokes Hilda's intense susceptibility to the Old Masters. On the other hand, Miriam, by her gaze, instigates the crime without her physical involvement in its perpetration just as Kenyon produces his own marble statue without touching the block of marble. As the narrator emphasizes their consolidated relationship after the crime as "closer than a marriage bond," it can be said that the author conceived of a realm where queer sex can be free of the dominant gender norm.

The following argument analyzes the detailed description of the coffined corpse of the model being displayed to the public. Miriam and Donatello's reversed gender role intimated in the crime scene suggests that the demise of the model is not only the death of a man, but also a metaphorical embodiment of a collaborative creation of their artwork. Encountering and acknowledging its completion of it enables Miriam to be released from her mysterious, supposedly abominable, past inasmuch as the model was a sole source of it. Her liberation from the past even intensifies her presentism, which culminates in her use of theological paradox, the fortunate fall.

Lastly, this paper turns to John Milton's epic poem, *Paradise Lost*, and suggests that Hawthorne intentionally lets Miriam represent the Adam's question, which is often referred to as "fortunate fall" to foreground Miriam's queer nature. While Adam and Archangel Michael converse, Eve's absence is clearly mentioned in Milton's original text, and Hawthorne must have been aware of it. Although the queer attribute is associated with problematic historical revisionism in the author's imagination, it is still remarkable to see how astutely he prefigures the rise of socially oppressed queer desire in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Workshop

Re-reading “Wakefield”

The 2019 Workshop dealt with “Wakefield” (1835). It is well known that Jorge Luis Borges once praised this tale as one of the best, not only among Nathaniel Hawthorne’s works, but also among world literature. In more recent years, the tale’s high estimation is exemplified by publications of its adaptations, Japanese translations in the anthologies edited by Fumio Ano and Motoyuki Shibata (both published in 2013), and Shoko Itoh’s 2016 article that identifies Wakefield as one of the immortal American Renaissance protagonists resurrected in the works of Paul Auster. Based on this interest, the panel aimed to reconsider “Wakefield” that had invited many re-readings and re-writings. As the following synopses show, each of the four panelists approached the tale from a different perspective and posed a question to the floor. Responding to the four questions, valuable comments were offered by Kazuya Ikuta, Shoko Itoh, Takuya Nishitani, and Shoko Tsuji. Thus, the panelists and the floor together made an attempt to shed new light on this elusive tale. We appreciate everyone who attended the workshop and joined our discussion.

“The Outcast of the Universe”?: Hawthorne, Berti, and Doctorow’s Wakefield Nozomi FUJIMURA (Asia University)

This paper attempts to illuminate the specificity of “Wakefield” by comparing Hawthorne’s tale with two of its adaptations: Eduardo Berti’s *La Mujer de Wakefield* [*Wakefield’s Wife*] (1999; Japanese translation by Kenshi Aoki published in 2004) and E. L. Doctorow’s “Wakefield” (2008). In so doing, it reconsiders the well-known phrase at the end of Hawthorne’s tale: “the Outcast of the Universe.”

Berti’s novella is set in London in 1811 and narrated by the third-person narrator from the viewpoint of Wakefield’s wife, Elizabeth. Charles Wakefield, an officer of the law, leaves home on the pretext of business trip but does not to return home. Elizabeth soon discovers that her husband is lodging in a nearby boarding house. While she watches him, many individuals arrive on the scene—the Wakefields’ servants and relatives, people at Charles’s office and boarding house. They interconnect one another against a backdrop of Luddism. Thus, Berti foregrounds the network of relations among his characters, making Hawthorne’s original a “twice-told tale” of his own novella that ends with Wakefield’s homecoming and death in 1831.

By contrast, Doctorow’s story is set in present-day America. His protagonist and first-person narrator, Howard Wakefield, lives with his wife Diana and their adolescent daughters in a suburb of New York City, where he works as a lawyer. One spring night, a chain of accidents leads Wakefield to come home late and stay in his garage attic overnight. While his worried wife calls the police, he decides to leave not only his home but also the system. Doctorow satirizes this petty man, who remains dependent on the system: Wakefield stays in the garage attic, peeping at his wife and scavenging neighbors’ garbage, and ultimately returns home in a classy outfit when his past rival in love visits his wife near Christmas time.

Berti and Doctorow thus demonstrate that their Wakefields cannot be “Outcast[s] of the Universe,” illuminating two characteristics of Hawthorne’s tale. First, it is very short with few details: only Wakefield, Mrs. Wakefield, and their male and female servants appear without much interaction among crowds in

18th- or 19th-century London. Second, the first-person narrator, who imaginatively creates the tale based on a story he has read in “some old magazine or newspaper,” frequently criticizes his protagonist as a “fool.” These characteristics seem related to the tale’s supposed inclusion in “The Story Teller,” an unpublished collection of stories, with a sketch, “The Canal-Boat,” as its background. The sketch depicts not only the rapid development around the Erie Canal, in which John Gatta, Jr., observes Hawthorne’s apprehension about an America that is transforming into a London-like city, but also the American narrator’s imagined rivalry with a British writer onboard. Reflecting this rivalry, the tale’s narrator expels Wakefield—a London “fool” who writes his own life as a “joke”—as “the Outcast of the Universe,” making himself an American author who offers a useful moral to his readers. However, the failure of the collection frees “Wakefield” from its American background and nationalistic moral, “open[ing] an intercourse with the world,” as Berti and Doctorow’s adaptations show.

Who Are “We” in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s “Wakefield”?

Yoko SANO (Seikei University)

The question, “Who are ‘we’ in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s ‘Wakefield’?” is not easy to answer. When Americans use the personal pronoun, “we,” the word is often tinged with the solidarity of Americans. The narrator of *The Scarlet Letter* uses the word, “our,” effectively, to make American readers feel that the story has a connection to the origin of their history. The narrator of “Wakefield” also addresses readers in the first person plural, but it seems that, unlike in his other tales and sketches set in New England that he wrote around the same time, the audience Hawthorne tried to reach in “Wakefield” was not only Americans because “Wakefield” is set in London and, as annotated in the Norton edition of Hawthorne’s tales, he uses “English idioms” like “a greatcoat” in the story. Why did Hawthorne, who seems to be an author of localism, set “Wakefield” in London, rather than in an American city.

When we raise the questions above, we should consider both Americans’ cultural identity and the predominance of the British literary marketplace over the American one in the first half of the nineteenth century. “Wakefield” was published in 1835, when America had not yet achieved cultural independence from England, even though they already had proclaimed political independence. Americans at that time had much access to British culture, so they still had what Kariann Akemi Yokota calls “Anglo-American consciousness.” In other words, when Americans declared at the end of the eighteenth century, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal...,” they imagined, using the personal pronoun, a community of Americans which was totally different from that of the British, but in fact, Americans in the first half of the nineteenth century had not yet established their cultural identity. In addition, according to Joseph Rezek, London was “the center of the Anglophone literary field,” so many American writers tried to enter the British literary marketplace, making extensive revisions of their works for the British audience. In “The Devil in Manuscript,” which is said to be based on his own experiences as a writer, Hawthorne mentions the precarious situations of American writers, having one of the characters say, “[N]o American publisher will meddle with an American work, seldom if by a known writer, and never if by a new one, unless at the writer’s risk.”

Taking these circumstances into consideration, it is reasonable to assume that, setting “Wakefield” in London, Hawthorne thought of entering the British literary marketplace to find larger audiences among Anglophone readers. Indeed, in *The Scarlet Letter*, he professes himself to be “a man who has dreamed of

literary fame, and of making for himself a rank among the world's dignitaries by such means." Moreover, by removing the connotation of the solidarity of Americans from the author-reader relationship in "Wakefield," he consequently made the community of "we" open not only to Americans, but also to readers throughout the world.

"Wakefield" and "The Man of the Crowd": Place, Viewing, and Morals **Shoichiro FUKUSHIMA (Doshisha Women's College of Liberal Arts)**

As Dana Brand indicates in *The Spectator and the City in Nineteenth-Century American Literature* (1991), Hawthorne's "Wakefield" (1835) and Poe's "The Man of the Crowd" (1840) are significantly similar in terms of not only the setting (London) but also the narrator's posture of distant observation and the narrative structure. At the end of the story, both narrators suggest a moral, but each moral is inadequate to explain the strange deeds of the person the narrator follows. Why should each tale be closed with an inadequate moral? This presentation elucidates the relationship between the moral and the narrative structure through an analysis based on three points of view: place, viewing, and morals.

In "Wakefield," the "system" is not depicted as a large social one that oppresses, disciplines and alienates individuals; rather, as innumerable ubiquitous one that provides a place an individual relies on, with each system "so nicely adjusted," "to one another, and to a whole." In other words, the systems are closely connected to each other as if they spread horizontally like a web.

This urban image is also represented in the word "place." In "Wakefield," "place" is equivalent to "social being," and losing "place" means "loss of existence." Although Wakefield's whim and vanity might be some of the main reasons why he left his wife, at the root of them lies his anxiousness of losing his own place. His desire to invisibly watching his wife displays not only his need for approval and self-esteem but also anxiety about substitutability.

The problem of "place" similarly appears in "The Man of the Crowd," which was written five years later. In the story representing urban fluidity, both the wandering old man and the narrator lose their place and deviate from the system to which they belong. In the beginning of the story, the narrator says that he is now convalescent from illness, which enables him to scrutinize in a fresh mood. The narrator, who is halfway between being in disease and secularity, views almost all things in a café and after getting bored, begins to watch passengers on the boulevard through a bow window. It can be the "place," or being between a system and another system that cause his acute sense of intuition in his "then peculiar mental state," to penetrate people with a glance.

Both narratives are closed through a circular structure, but there are things that do not fit in, and things that fall from the structure. At the climax, the narrator says that Wakefield "left us much food for thought, and a portion of which shall lend its wisdom to a moral; and be shaped into a figure." Yet paradoxically, it is inadequate morals in "Wakefield" and "The Man of the Crowd" that provoke complex thought. The inadequate morals in "Wakefield" and "The Man of the Crowd" emerge as the readers' "food for thought." In the reality of complex cities, morals are always inadequate, but that insufficiency is necessary for opening up infinite thoughts.

Difficult “Wakefield”

Kohei FURUYA (Kanagawa University)

Last year, I had a chance to read “Wakefield” with my students in a seminar course at my college. The class was not very successful, to say the least. I found the story a little too difficult for students to read and for teachers to teach (and read, too). During the semester, we also read “The Birthmark.” I had given my students an assignment to write a short paper either on “Wakefield” or “The Birthmark,” and predictably, most of them picked the latter. Many students seem to have found “The Birthmark” much more relatable, if not easier to read, than “Wakefield.” “The Birthmark” has a lot of clues for reading, like race, gender, sexuality, class, and genres; students could find at least a focus for understanding the text. “Wakefield,” on the other hand, seems to give the reader little to no clue. Why is “Wakefield” so difficult to read? Why does the story look so clueless?

In this paper, I claim that “Wakefield” is an intentionally difficult work. Like “The Old Manse” and “The Custom House” chapter in *The Scarlet Letter*, “Wakefield” is a deconstructive work, a metafiction that invites the reader to pay close attention to the acts of reading texts. In the same vein, “Wakefield” is a meta-historical narrative, and its narrator a meta-historian. In Hawthorne’s historiographical works, an accidental finding of an artifact from old times inspires the narrator to set out for discovering forgotten histories of the past. The author sets such scenes of finding in order to introduce the story’s main body. As many readers have noticed, the way Hawthorne’s narrators delve into past events by dint of careful archival research and imaginative power almost anticipates the New Historicist literary studies in our time. Based on an old newspaper article he had read, the narrator of “Wakefield” seeks to recreate the scenes behind the extraordinary story. The narrator is, as it were, a proto-New Historicist literary scholar, and the entire story a reading practice for history-oriented literary students. This historian-narrator is the protagonist of “Wakefield.”

But it would be misleading to focus too much on the seeming similarities between the nineteenth-century author and late-twentieth-century historicist literary scholars. The New Historicist tends to see a text as a representation of conflicting political ideologies that the author consciously or unconsciously embraces. Hawthorne’s historian-narrator, on the other hand, bets on his “sympathetic” understanding of the object, whether a text or a person, of his study. Hawthorne’s idea of “sympathy” is unique. It does not mean a subject’s strong emotional investment in an object, which many nineteenth-century sentimental narratives advocate for. In Hawthorne’s works, including “Wakefield,” the term “sympathy” is used as a key term that encourages the reader to read an object closely and patiently. This inclination toward “sympathetic”—that is to say, close and patient—reading is an aspect of Hawthorne as, in Michael Colacurcio’s term, “moral historian.” “Wakefield” should be read as a lesson for such “moral history.”

On Some “Prophetic” Features of Hawthorne’s Tales and Romances

Takaaki NIWA (Professor Emeritus, Kyoto University)

One of Hawthorne’s earliest tales, “The Ambitious Guest,” draws the reader’s attention not with its tragic yet ambiguous story itself but with the narrator’s curious statement: “But this evening a *prophetic* sympathy impelled the refined and educated youth to pour out his heart before the simple mountaineers and constrained them to answer him with the same confidence” (italics mine). The unfamiliar modification of the noun “sympathy” by the adjective “prophetic” reminds us afresh of the author’s love of the “prophetic” vocabulary and topics; it also sets our mind to such “prophetic” features as would really foretell the future adversities of the author’s literary career, and further of his own life.

The “prophetic” vocabulary, consisting of the words like “prophetic,” “prophecy,” “prophesy,” “prophets” and “prophetesses,” provides Hawthorne’s stories with a diachronic, classical, and romance-like quality, where they would otherwise remain common and ordinary. It also functions as a device to make us conscious of the narrator’s presence telling his stories from a kind of omniscient point of view.

The voice of emaciated Arthur Dimmesdale, however rich and sweet on the surface, allegedly contains “a certain melancholy *prophecy* of decay” in it (italics mine). Likewise, the stream running through the forest, where fairy-like little Pearl is playing alone innocently, utters a “prophetic” lamentation about what is yet to happen to the unhappy pseudo-family. Roger Malvin’s total fiction of safe return to the camp in the earlier stage of his life, actually sounds, to the ear of oedipal Reuben Bourne, as if it were to be “prophetic” of his own success to follow. Iron-hearted Endicott’s casual gesture of throwing a wreath of roses over the Merry Mount Lord and Lady was reportedly “a deed of prophecy” for the new world they were to cut their way through.

One of the best-known topics of “prophecy” in Hawthorne would be “the prophetic pictures” in the short story so titled. The portraits of a woman and of her lover done by a magician-like artist prove to be really “prophetic,” when, in the couple’s new life, the demented husband tries to stab the melancholic wife. This topic—the “prophetic” quality that the portraits may assume—prevails in the author’s stories. Furthermore, Old Matthew Maule’s weird curse to Colonel Pyncheon on horseback, “God will give thee blood to drink!” turns out to be doubly “prophetic.” The Colonel dies a sudden bloody death on his mansion’s house-opening, and this is still to be followed 160 years later by the death of “Judge” Pyncheon, the very image of his first-generation ancestor.

But what is really noteworthy in Hawthorne is a kind of self-prophecy—the prophecy that the author makes of his literary career and of his own life. “The Ambitious Guest” in which the author annihilates the fame-craving youngster, serves as a kind of “prophetic” tale of the even murderous career that awaited him—a tale, like his *Fanshawe* and “The Devil in Manuscript,” that might have proved nothing but true.

Likewise, “The Great Stone Face,” “Roger Malvin’s Burial,” and *The Blithedale Romance*, for example, can be read as prophecies of his own life. Fatherless Ernest, grown up watching the gigantic Stone image of his valley, never agrees, curiously enough, with the wonder-struck poet who insists on Ernest himself being the likeness of the Image. Like Ernest, however, Hawthorne himself proves to be destined to go on with his own endless search for the idealistic father image for the rest of his life.

“The Twelfth of May! I should remember it well,” says Reuben, before setting out on his weird Roger Malvin’s burial. May 12th is the date when Reuben left behind his adoptive father in the wilderness, eighteen years ago, after their three-day retreat from the cruel battlefield of “Lovewell’s Fight” on May 9th, 1725. What *we should remember* here is the fact that “the Twelfth of May,” which Hawthorne mentions in this very early tale, written in 1832, turns out to be the very date when, in 1864, old and sick Hawthorne actually started out north for a journey for “health recovery”—or rather a journey of death, actually—with his closest friend, Franklin Pierce. Everyone may wonder why the author dared to travel up to Plymouth, New Hampshire in such an unsuitable season for “health recovery.” Besides, Plymouth is farther to the north than Hillsborough, Pierce’s land of connection. It is very likely, therefore, that Hawthorne, now as his own fatherless Ernest, wanted to go and talk face to face with his own idealistic father image, the Great Stone Face, that is, the “Old Man of the Mountain,” located in the Franconia Notch, a little farther north from Plymouth.

Interestingly enough, too, Hawthorne had long before chosen Pierce as his “death-bed companion” in the name of Hollingsworth, when, in 1852, he published *The Blithedale Romance*. Then and there, he made this “prophetic” statement: “Happy the man that has such a friend beside him when he comes to die! and unless a friend like Hollingsworth be at hand,...he had better make up his mind to die alone.” Hawthorne’s own death came on May 19, a week after his leaving Boston with Pierce, when he tottered into the doomed Plymouth hotel, soon to make Pierce practically play the role of “a death-bed companion.”

We might also remember the author’s mouthpiece narrator of “The Custom-House,” who mentions “a prophetic” instinct visiting him “whenever a new change of custom should be essential to [his] good.” It does not seem that Hawthorne, like the James family, was gifted with some special psychic abilities, but, as a writer of the truth of the human heart, he was certainly able to look deep enough into the “interior” of the human heart—deep enough for any of its secrets, including that of his own, thus to enable him to “prophesy” his own future doom to be rendered artistically on the pages of his tales and romances.

“Economy, however, is my mottoe”: The Economic Conditions of Antebellum Writers

“Economy, however, is my mottoe” is written in a letter from Melville to his father-in-law. Money has been an annoying matter for poets and authors throughout the ages. This issue not only forces them to take pains to compose their ideal oeuvres in order not to make them commercial failures, but might compel them to borrow money and get deep into debt. It could also cause some troubles when writers inherit their family members’ property. How were their texts affected by the feelings concerning money matters? This is one topic of our symposium. The word, economy, does not only mean money. Its Greek origin is “household management,” so “domestic economy” or “housekeeping” contributes important viewpoints to us when we examine writers’ compositions. To give one example, Melville, in another letter, expressed his annoyance at needing to follow the schedule of the domestic duties performed by his family members, no matter how absorbed he was in his writing. In our symposium, the focus of each presenter was not so much how the antebellum writers—Hawthorne, Emerson, Fuller, and Melville—suffered hardships from the antebellum national financial economy as how writers’ monetary problems were dealt with in their intimate spheres such as domestic lives, kinship, or friendship, in examinations of the relationships between the writers’ financial troubles and their texts.

Building a Prosperous Republic: Melville’s Critique of Franklin

Mitsuru SANADA (Ryukoku University)

It is well known that Herman Melville harshly criticized Benjamin Franklin, whose practical, shrewd, and sometimes sly character leads some people to regard him as a proto-typical American. In *Israel Potter*, Melville enumerated Franklin’s talents and specialties, and closed the paragraph with his famous conclusion: “Franklin was everything but a poet.” Certainly, being an artist can be inconsistent with pursuing all the professions Franklin engaged in, partly because, unlike creating works of art, those occupations need to follow a clear schedule. One of Melville’s letters reveals his trouble with his domestic economy; he had to adapt his time for composition to his family members’ convenience. He needed to stop writing, “however interested [he] may be,” every time he heard “a preconcerted knock.” It should be noted that Melville includes “professor of housewifery” in the list of Franklin’s specialties, a comment we may consider rather derogatory.

Economy is derived from the Greek word, *oikonomia*, meaning household management. The word, economy, extended its usage to stand for the conduct of state affairs in the early modern period. The economical administration of both a state and a house through money is irreconcilable with an ideal life for artists. So it is natural that Melville’s critique of Franklin, who was both “professor of housewifery” and “political economist,” is severe. In his famous letter to Hawthorne, Melville wrote impressively, “Dollars damn me.” Therefore, Melville, being a writer and patriarch of his house, had to resolve money matters; as a result, his family could live without paying rent, through the generosity of his father-in-law.

Melville’s own circumstances in his house are implied in the tale of the narrator of “Jimmy Rose,” published in 1855. The narrator inherited Jimmy’s house; in other words, he did not pay rent to live, just as Melville lived rent-free. It is interesting that the house to which the narrator has “become unexpected heir” lies in “one of the

lower wards” of the town where once there were “great old house[s].” This indicates the relentless changes and upheavals of the antebellum political economy.

According to Drew M. McCoy, the American Revolutionaries including Franklin “embraced the republican spirit of classical antiquity that expressed ‘virtue’ in terms of a primitive economy, but they also realized that this spirit had to be accommodated to their own dynamic world of commercial complexity.” He explains that a virtuous people means “industrious, frugal, independent, and public-spirited” citizens, so it makes sense that Franklin repeatedly preached industry and frugality. Unfortunately, in the new-born republic, commercial demands grew steadily and threatened “the republican spirit of classical antiquity.” This suggests that the so-called image of Franklin that Melville depicted and denounced in *Israel Potter* was fabricated after the nineteenth century.

In conclusion, annoyed with Franklin’s specialties, of domestic and political economies, Melville created tales and poems. His troubles with his domestic economy represent the other writers’ troubles with the antebellum political economy, and vice versa.

Feminist Strategies for the Achievement of Economic Independence: *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845) and *Women and Economics* (1898)

Yoshiko ITO (Taisho University)

This presentation focuses on the economic conditions of the last years of Margaret Fuller in Italy and discusses her unrealized strategies to achieve economic independence. Though Fuller is one of the earliest feminists that emphasized the significance of both physical and psychological independence for women to fulfill their life, she could not achieve her ultimate ideal in her own life. As she wrote to her brother Richard in one of her letters from Italy, “my fate will be the same to the close, —beautiful gifts shown, and then withdrawn, or offered on conditions that make acceptance impossible,” she had searched for immaculate perfection since her early stage, but her pursuit had to be frustrated at the shipwreck. If she had had enough money to buy a safer voyage than the sailing cargo ship, she would have returned to America with her manuscripts on the revolution in Italy, published her new book, and lived a happy life with her own family by the economic benefit from it.

It is clear that Fuller thought her choice and decision of establishing her own family with an Italian nobleman Giovanni Angelo Ossoli would dismay her family and friends in America. She wrote “I know there must be a cloud of false rumors and impressions at first, but you will see when we meet that there was a sufficient reason for all I have done and that if my life be not wholly right, (as it is so difficult to keep a life true in a world full of falsities,) it is not wholly wrong nor fruitless.” She knew the best that she looked as if she betrayed what she had written in her articles and books. At the same time, she was sure that any relationship needs to be built based on each individual qualities and personalities. As she wrote in *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, “Let Ulysses drive the bees home, while Penelope there piles up the fragrant loaves; they are both well employed if these be done in thought and love, willingly,” she thought that there should not be any fixed role. For her, mutual love should have priority.

What matters to Fuller is that they are doing what they are willing to do. She repeated that Giovanni had purity in his heart in her letters from Italy to America. She never represented herself as head in her letters, but the emphasis on Giovanni’s purity proves that she thought she should be the head in their relationship. Thus she thought they would achieve a genuinely harmonious union.

For women to gain economic independence in the antebellum days meant to challenge the norm of gender. Her marriage can be said to be an experiment to make gender roles “fluid” as she said in *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, and she tried to go beyond what she had written. She reversed the gender roles, and she took economic initiative. Half a century after Fuller’s death Charlotte Perkins Gilman advocated the same perspective on gender in *Women and Economic* and insisted that economic questions should be a central issue of feminism. “To be one person and master of our own lives” both men and women need to transcend the “artificial” border of gender.

Emerson’s Concord as an Economic Bloc

Atsuko ODA (Mie University)

It is partly true that the inheritance from his first wife, Ellen Tucker, allowed Emerson to resign his ministry and made him the Emerson we all know, an advocate for freedom and self-reliance. In addition, we can say that he could take an advantage of easier money from lecture fees than from selling books. But either way, it was his constant practical management of income from these sources, as well as from land and stocks, that benefitted him throughout his life.

From his teens, Emerson, in cooperation with his elder brother, had supported his family and his motto was “economy.” He says in the lecture “Home” that “He is not yet a man if he have not learned the Household Laws, if he have not learned how in some way to labor for the maintenance of himself and others.” Unrealistic visionary as he seems in contrast to the realists like Hawthorne and Thoreau, Emerson was fighting against the hardships of real life, poverty and death of his beloved.

To make up for such losses, Emerson bought an estate in Concord, which had been founded by his ancestor, and tried to build a neighborhood consisting of “wise and endeared spirits.” The beautiful landscape of Concord satisfied his “strong propensity for strolling” which Ellen had appreciated. His neighbors included Bronson Alcott, whom he invited, and Henry Thoreau, a native. Emerson thought these two were the only persons who shared with himself “the law of reciprocity or compensation” working in the universe. To develop their ideas, Emerson’s neighborhood necessarily became an economic bloc based on agriculture or outdoor activities.

Emerson, following Carlyle, criticized “the Age of Mechanism” when everything was to be institutionalized against his ideal of self-reliance. Distinguishing his “neighborhood” from oppressive agricultural communities built by reformers, such as Alcott’s Fruitlands and the Brook Farm, Emerson succeeded relatively well in realizing his ideal of “society and solitude,” that is, a spiritual life in awe of nature. Thoreau was his great partner.

Emerson thought of agriculture as involving ways to know the law of nature and to live self-reliantly. This idea recurs in the addresses and essays, such as “The American Scholar,” “Man the Reformer,” and “Prudence.” His attachment to agriculture is also expressed in the word “caduceus” he used to refer to his son’s death in “Experience.” As with Ellen’s death treated in his poems, Emerson again tries to locate his son’s death in the law of nature. He needed good neighbors, like Thoreau and Alcott, and supported them in reciprocity for their reassurance concerning the spirituality of nature.

Hawthorne and Horatio Bridge: From Friendship to Patronage

Yoko KURAHASHI (Tokai Gakuen University)

The purpose of this presentation is to argue how Hawthorne overcame the difficulties of his youth with Horatio Bridge's patronage and returned his favor.

By 1821, when Hawthorne wrote his mother about his dream of establishing fame as a writer, he had realized that authors were "always poor Devils." Hawthorne's determination to achieve renown is expressed in *Fanshawe*, published at his own expense in 1828. In the novel, Fanshawe chooses not "the possibility of earthly happiness" but the "dream of undying fame." Consequently, he engages in his studies, eschewing "the common occupations of the world." However, Hawthorne thought *Fanshawe* was a failed work, and burned it. This action confirms that, to Hawthorne, fame was more important than money.

In "The Devil in Manuscript," a short story published in 1835, Hawthorne writes of his anger at (and disillusion with) the publishing world. Though he tried to publish a collection of his tales, no company would undertake its printing. His friend Bridge, a lawyer who appreciated Hawthorne's talent, was worried about "a kind of desperate coolness" emanating from him. As Hawthorne supporter Elizabeth Peabody noted, he was not good at negotiation. Bridge could not help underwriting the publication of *Twice-Told Tales* by confidentially pledging \$ 250 to publisher Samuel Goodrich. Thus, Bridge became a secret patron, as one of Hawthorne's characteristics was "abhorrence of debt." The book was published in 1837.

Despite Bridge's patronage, Hawthorne intended to dedicate the book to Goodrich in recognition of his services. This episode demonstrates that publishing a book was paramount to Hawthorne. Bridge thought Goodrich had exploited Hawthorne for his magazine. Accordingly, Hawthorne omitted the dedication.

The 1845 publication of *Journal of an African Cruiser* was another event showcasing Hawthorne's pride as a professional writer. In 1841, Hawthorne resigned his position at the Boston Custom House, again facing economic difficulties. At that time, Bridge was serving on USS Saratoga off the western coast of Africa. There, he acted as purser for the anti-slavery squadron, yet deemed himself "neither an Abolitionist nor a Colonizationist." Hawthorne advised Bridge to write a book about his experiences. As Patrick Brancaccio suggests, there were other reasons to publish the book: 1) travel literature was in fashion; 2) the world was interested in Liberia as a settlement; 3) Hawthorne wanted to return Bridge's favor. Moreover, Hawthorne expected income from the book. Accordingly, Hawthorne advised Bridge about topics "in order to fit the book for practical men." When the book was published in 1845, Hawthorne's name as the editor was on the cover. However, Bridge's title was on the cover, but his name was not. Bridge was probably omitted because Hawthorne gave the publishing editor (Evert Duyckinck) the impression that he himself was the "ghost writer."

Nonetheless, as sales of the book were poor, Bridge arranged for Hawthorne to get a job at the Salem Custom House. It was there that Bridge introduced him to Franklin Pierce and other statesmen. Later, when Bridge asked Hawthorne for a loan of \$ 3,000, he raised the money with asking William Ticknor (his publisher) to provide it.

Without Bridge's patronage, Hawthorne might not have overcome the difficulties of his youth. Ultimately, Bridge was both Hawthorne's "friend in need, and the friend indeed." Contrariwise, Bridge was supported by Hawthorne in his later years. It is clear that they were friends, as well as patrons, to one another.

東京支部研究会

2019年、東京支部研究会では下記の活動を行いました。今回の研究会も毎回様々な角度からの刺激的な研究発表、作品研究報告がなされ、参加者全員で活発な議論をすることができました。12月開催の読書会では、ホーソーンを歴史や芸術、家族との関連などから論じたテキストを使って包括的な視点でホーソーン文学を概観し、その後の懇親会も含め、参加者と大変有意義な時間を共有することができました。2020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。

△2019年2月23日(土) 午後3時より(於 専修大学 神田キャンパス 1号館 13階 13A会議室)

【研究発表】

発表者: ピーター・バナード氏(ハーバード大学大学院生)

題目: 「ホーソーンの即身仏とハーミットのみやげ——“The Man of Adamant”(1837)と
The Hermit of Erving Castle, Erving, Mass. (1871)における「隠遁」の差異」

司会: 巽 孝之氏(慶応義塾大学)

【作品研究】

発表者: 大野 美砂氏(東京海洋大学)

作品: Nathaniel Hawthorne, “The Gray Champion” (1835)

△2019年7月27日(土) 午後3時より(於 東京理科大学 神楽坂校舎「ボルタ神楽坂」7階第3会議室)

【研究発表】

発表者: 高尾 直知氏(中央大学)

題目: 『『大理石の牧神』第50章と幸運な墮落』

司会: 上原 正博氏(専修大学)

【作品研究】

発表者: 内堀 奈保子氏(日本大学)

作品: Nathaniel Hawthorne, “The Gentle Boy” (1832)

△2019年9月13日(金) 午後3時より(於 日本大学 三軒茶屋キャンパス 1号館会議室1)

【研究発表】

発表者: 古屋 耕平氏(神奈川大学)

題目: 「ホーソーンの戦争ツーリズム——“Chiefly about War Matters” から *Septimius Felton*へ」

司会: 高尾 直知氏(中央大学)

【作品研究】

発表者: 川村 幸夫氏(東京理科大学)

作品: Nathaniel Hawthorne, “Young Goodman Brown” (1835)

△2019年11月9日(土) 午後3時より(於 大正大学 2号館6階人文科学閲覧室)

【研究発表】

発表者: 佐々木 英哲氏(桃山学院大学)

題目: 「Melvilleの *Pierre* ——模倣的欲望の力学と Hawthorne へのルサンチマン」

司会: 高尾 直知氏(中央大学)

【作品研究】

発表者: 大竹 菜穂子氏(町田市立鶴川第二中学校)

作品: Nathaniel Hawthorne, “The Minister’s Black Veil” (1836)

△2019年12月7日(土) 午後3時より(於 大正大学 2号館6階人文科学閲覧室)

【読書会】

テキスト: Elbert, Monika M., editor. *Nathaniel Hawthorne in Context*. (Cambridge UP, 2018)

司会・発表: 大野 美砂氏(東京海洋大学)

発表者: 伊藤 淑子氏(大正大学)

菅野 賢一氏(中央大学大学院生)

(鈴木 孝 記)

中部支部研究会

中部支部では研究会を年3・4回を予定しておりますが、今年度は開催時期がずれましたので以下のようにになりました。

△2019年3月9日(土)午後2時より(於 東海学園大学名古屋キャンパス 425 教室)

【研究発表】

(1) 発表者: 林 姿穂 氏 (三重県立看護大学)

題 目: 「『ブライズデイル・ロマンス』に描かれる病と魔女のイメージについて」

司 会: 森岡 稔 氏 (東海学園大学非常勤講師)

(2) 発表者: 森岡 稔 氏 (東海学園大学非常勤講師)

題 目: 「ナサニエル・ホーソーン『七破風の屋敷』とマーシャル・マクルーハンの「グローバル・ヴィレッジ」

司 会: 林 姿穂 氏 (三重県立看護大学)

△2019年7月20日(土)午後2時より(於 東海学園大学名古屋キャンパス 425 教室)

【研究発表】

発表者: 進藤 鈴子 氏 (名古屋経済大学名誉教授)

題 目: 「リバプールとホーソーン」

司 会: 大場 厚志 氏 (東海学園大学)

(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。今年は、3月の例会で特別講師にご登壇いただき、8月例会ではシンポジウムを開催しました。また10月例会では若手による研究発表、12月例会では、関西支部としては初めての試みとなる批評の読書会を開催しました。

今年より支部世話人が交代しましたが、前述の多彩な企画は前任の西谷拓哉先生がお膳立てして下さったものです。前年度の国際学会を通して関西支部会員同士の絆も強まり、それが支部活動に生きています。文学研究という孤独な知的営みと学会活動という共同作業をバランスよく繋いで支部の発展に尽力下さってきた西谷先生に改めて感謝申し上げます。

会員のみなさまからのご発表希望、新企画アイデア、ご意見などお待ちしておりますので、よろしく願いいたします。

△2019年3月17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: 難波江 仁美 氏 (神戸市外国語大学)

題 目: 「What James Knew about Anger in American Women——ヘンリー・ジェイムズ初期作品を中心に」

司 会: 増永 俊一 氏 (関西学院大学)

△2019年8月31日(土)午後2時より(於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1401 室)

【シンポジウム】

題 目: 「*Fanshawe* を読む」

司会・講師: 入子 文子 氏 (元関西大学教授)

「存在の根をさがして——*Fanshawe* 試論」

講 師: 植村 真未 氏 (大阪大学非常勤講師)

「“*Fanshawe*”の痕——Paul Auster に埋め込まれた Nathaniel Hawthorne」

講 師: 山本 茂一 氏 (関西学院大学文学研究科聴講生)

「*Fanshawe* とエピグラフ」

△2019年10月19日(土)午後2時より(於 関西学院大学大阪梅田キャンパス 1003 室)

【研究発表】

(1) 発表者: 豊田 真知 氏 (京都ノートルダム女子大学大学院生)

題 目: 「『罪』と絡み合う植物——*The Scarlet Letter* を中心に」

司 会: 妹尾 智美 氏 (立命館大学)

(2) 発表者: 福地 浩子 氏 (奈良女子大学非常勤講師)

題 目: 「*Beachcomber* が観察したタヒチ宣教の実態: Melville の *Omoo*」

司 会: 橋本 安央 氏 (関西学院大学)

△2019年12月21日(土)午後2時より(於 関西外国語大学中宮キャンパス ICC 6304 教室)

【読書会】

テキスト: Abrams, Robert E. *Landscape and Ideology in American Renaissance Literature: Topographies of Skepticism*. (Cambridge UP, 2004)

コーディネーター: 大川 淳氏(京都ノートルダム女子大学)

(1) 発表者: 小南 悠氏(関西学院大学大学院生)

担当章: “Critiquing Colonial American Geography: Hawthorne’s Landscape of Bewilderment”

コメントーター: 大野 美砂氏(東京海洋大学)

(2) 発表者: 森本 光氏(近畿大学非常勤講師)

担当章: “Thoreau and the Interminable Journey of Vision ‘nearer and nearer here’”

コメントーター: 伊藤 詔子氏(広島大学名誉教授)

(3) 発表者: 大川 淳氏

担当章: “Herman Melville’s Home Cosmography: Voyaging into the Inscrutable Interior of the American Republic”

コメントーター: 西谷 拓哉氏(神戸大学)

(中西 佳世子 記)

九州支部研究会

九州支部では、研究会を適宜開催しています。

△2019年9月28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)

【研究発表】

(1) 発表者: 川下 剛氏(広島修道大学)

題目: 「説教壇から晒し台へ——ニューイングランドの祝日におけるディムズデルのパフォーマンス」

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・ルネサンス作家たちとイギリス湖水地方」

司会: 青井 格氏(近畿大学)

【ワークショップ】

司会: 乗口 眞一郎氏(北九州市立大学名誉教授)

作品: 1. “Wakefield” 2. “Young Goodman Brown” 3. “Rappaccini’s Daughter” 4. “Roger Malvin’s Burial” 5. “The Birthmark” について、多角的な解釈、コメント、質問等、自由討議

(青井 格 記)

事務局だより

1. *NHSJ Newsletter* 第38号をお届けします。
2. 第37回全国大会は、2019年5月17日(金)・18日(土)の両日に県立広島大学サテライトキャンパス502大講義室(県立文化センター5階)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御礼申し上げます。
3. 次回第38回全国大会は、2020年5月15日(金)・16日(土)の両日に沖縄県的那覇市ぶんかテンプス館4階テンプスホールで開催されます。詳細は本*Newsletter*18-19ページ「第38回大会のお知らせ」並びに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. 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。
5. 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。
6. 本年度、ホーソーン協会に多大な貢献をされてきた川窪啓資先生の訃報に接しました。ここにご遺徳を偲び、謹んで哀悼の意を表します。

川窪 啓資氏(2019年10月6日 享年84歳)

1935年生まれ。東京大学卒業。デューク大学大学院修士号取得。昭和女子大学博士号取得。麗澤高校英語教諭、麗澤大学講師、助教授を経て、麗澤大学教授。国際比較文明学会副会長、日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会会長(第七代)等歴任。単著書に *Nathaniel Hawthorne: His Approach to Reality and Art* (開文社 2003年)、『トインビーから比較文明へ』(近代文芸社 2000年)、共著書に『比較文明学を学ぶ人のために』(世界思想社 1997年)など。

(鈴木 孝 記)

編集室だより

ことは2本の投稿論文があり、審査中です。書評については2本を掲載予定です。投稿論文数がいまひとつで、編集委員長として責任を感じています。なにかいい打開策はないものかと思いますが、会員のみなさまにおかれては、ぜひとも投稿ならびに投稿の呼びかけをお願いできればと思います。いつもながら、投稿して下さったみなさま、書評執筆をおひき受けいただいたみなさま、さらに、お忙しいなかで詳細なコメントをくださる編集委員のみなさまに、お礼を申し上げます。

投稿にあたっては、事務局 (jimukyoku.hawthorne@gmail.com) 宛の電子メールに、Microsoft Word 書類 (.doc/.docx 形式) として作成した論文を添付してご提出ください。匿名審査のため、投稿者に関する情報 (氏名、ご所属、住所、メールアドレス、電話番号) は、電子メールの本文に書いてください。詳しい投稿規定は、日本ナサニエル・ホーソン協会ホームページに記載されていますので、かならずそちらをご参照ください。スタイルは *MLA Handbook* 第8版に準拠してくださいますように。積極的な投稿をお待ちしております。

- ・編集委員：城戸光世、佐々木英哲、高尾直知 (委員長)、竹野富美子、中西佳世子、古屋耕平
- ・編集室：〒192-0393 東京都八王子市東中野 742-1

中央大学文学部 高尾研究室気付 日本ナサニエル・ホーソン協会編集室

(高尾 直知 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。

井坂義雄 「ヘスター・プリンのボストン帰還——『緋文字』の脈絡一考——」『PHOEBUS』14 法政英語英米文学研究会 (2018)

『ポー研究』11 日本ポー学会 (2019)

ご協力を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

〒981-8557

宮城県仙台市青葉区桜ヶ丘 9-1-1

宮城学院女子大学 学芸学部英文学科 田島優子研究室内

電話：022-277-6111 (研究室直通)

Eメール：y-tashima@mgu.ac.jp

(田島 優子 記)

第 38 回大会のお知らせ

日 時：2020 年 5 月 15 日（金）、16 日（土）

場 所：テンプスホール

（那覇市ぶんかテンプス館内 沖縄県那覇市牧志 3 丁目 2 番 10 号

電話：098-868-7810）

《第 38 回大会概要》

2020 年の全国大会は沖縄での開催となります。去年 11 月の首里城焼失のニュースは、沖縄の人たちはもとより、私たちすべてに計り知れないショックと悲しみをもたらしました。人々の熱意と英知によって立派に再建される日が来ることを祈りたいと思います。大会は例年通り、研究発表、ワークショップ、特別講演、シンポジウムの構成です。特別講演は、下河辺美知子先生（成蹊大学名誉教授）にご登壇をお願いいたしました。シンポジウムは、上原正博先生（専修大学）にまとめ役をお願いして、平石貴樹先生（東京大学名誉教授）、武田悠一先生（元南山大学教授）といった各方面の重鎮の方々に語っていただく予定です。ワークショップでは、「ロジャー・マルヴィンの埋葬」をテキストに選び、生田和也先生（鹿児島女子短期大学）、小宮山真美子先生（長野工業高等専門学校）、高橋愛先生（岩手大学）に再読の可能性を探っていただきます。会員の方々の多数のご参加をお願い申し上げます。

【第 1 日】（14：00 開始予定）

- ・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

「ロジャー・マルヴィンの埋葬」を再読する

司会・講師：生田 和也 氏（鹿児島女子短期大学）

講師：小宮山 真美子 氏（長野工業高等専門学校）

講師：高橋 愛 氏（岩手大学）

<概要>1832 年に『トークン』に発表された「ロジャー・マルヴィンの埋葬」は、ご周知のようにこれまでも父子関係や歴史的背景など様々な角度から論じられてきています。今回のワークショップには、「ロジャー・マルヴィンの埋葬」の新たな読みの可能性を探るべく、これまで主に 19 世紀アメリカ文学における子ども、メイン州、弔いの儀式、ジェンダー、セクシュアリティなどのテーマに関心を寄せてきた講師が集まりました。ワークショップでは、最初に講師 3 名が作品に関する短い発表（発案）をします。その後、フロアのみなさまから多くのご意見をいただき、活発な議論をできればと願っております。みなさまの積極的なご参加をお待ちしております。

- ・特別講演

講演者：下河辺 美知子 氏（成蹊大学名誉教授）

演 題：十九世紀アメリカの陸・海・空——ホーソンとメルヴィルのメンタル・マップ

- ・総会
- ・懇親会：Hotel JAL CITY 那覇

【第2日】(9:20開始予定)

・シンポジウム

ホーゾーンを読むこと——倫理か、理由(わけ)か、理不尽か

司会・講師：上原 正博 氏(専修大学)

講師：平石 貴樹 氏(東京大学名誉教授)

講師：武田 悠一 氏(元南山大学教授)

<概要>小説を読むという営みはどのようなものか。自責の念をこめた問いから、この企画は生まれた。現下の人文科学系領域への強い風当たりを受けて、研究として現れてくる読みの実践を眺めたとき、はたして小説に真摯に向き合うことを忘れてはいないだろうか。脱構築以後、当節みられる読みの多くは、史的読み返し、読みを歴史化せよ、という申し立てに 대응しようとするものであるが、その根幹となる読みの姿勢へのふり返りが見られなくなっているのではないか。こうした戸惑いのなか、作品の声に耳を澄ましながら研究活動を続けてこられた先達は、いまどのようにホーゾーンを読むだろうか、と思わずにいられない。本シンポジウムは、その読みの実践を「生の声」を通して知る機会となるだろう。こうしたふり返りこそ、文学を読むことの意義を問い直すことが要請されている時代に必要な姿勢ではないか。いまや銀髪となられた、かつてのグッドマン・ブラウンの「生の声」に誘われながら、ホーゾーンの作品と向かい合う機会になることを願っている。そして、そこから何かを盗み取ることができたなら、その行為にこそ、読みの醍醐味があることを実感することにもなるだろう。

・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。
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@g.matsuyama-u.ac.jp
4. 応募締切：2020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、九州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が、各支部からの発案も、積極的に行っていただきますよう、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)は大会準備委員会で行う。
- 3) 各支部からの発案と大会準備委員会の発案との調整やコーディネートは、大会準備委員会が行う。
- 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。

(辻 祥子 記)

追悼抄

川窪啓資先生を偲ぶ

丹羽 隆昭（京都大学名誉教授）

当協会第七代会長で、著名なトインビー研究者でもある川窪先生が亡くなられた。先生は六〇年代半ばに渡米、デューク大学でA・ターナー教授の指導の下、M.A.を取得された。事実重視の手堅い研究姿勢はターナー直伝。英語に堪能で、ホーソン論（博論）や、独自の文明論も、達意の英文で書かれている。

先生との交流は長く、出会いは私の院生時代、京都アメリカ研究夏期セミナー文学部門（講師D・アロン氏）のことだが、この時は挨拶程度であった。次は北大でのアメリカ文学会のシンポジウム終了後、久しぶりですね、あなたはさっき「活写」という語を多用されたが、「滑車」と紛らわしいから使わん方がいいですよ、と注意しに来て下さった折のことで、ゆっくり論するような独特の口調には敢えて反論する気も失せ、むしろわざわざ指摘して下さった御厚意への感謝の方が勝った。これ以後先生の声の呪文にかかったまま、協会発足後には、いろいろな折に、様々な知恵やノウハウを伝授して頂いた。ただ、印旛沼に近い先生のお宅に「滑車」の付いた井戸でもあるのかどうか、それは確かめるに至っていない。

先生は会長職のほか、記念論集『ホーソンの軌跡』や機関誌『フォーラム』などの編集にも情熱を傾けられた。先生の尋常ならざる熱意と独特の指摘に触れて、投稿原稿の修正に当たった会員も少なくないであろう。ご冥福を祈る次第である。

恩師を偲んで

富樫 壮央（麗澤大学非常勤講師）

十月七日午前、川窪先生の奥様から訃報のご連絡がありました。あまりに突然の出来事に、茫然自失となり、この時に奥様と交わした会話の詳細はほとんど記憶にありません。川窪先生と最後にお会いしたのは、私が全国大会のシンポジウムで発表をさせていただいた四年前でした。それ以降、川窪先生とは年に数回お電話でお話をさせていただく機会はありませんでしたが、いま思えば、もっとお会いする機会がなかったかと後悔することしきりです。

「あなたは Centenary 版を知っていますか。」これが大学院入試の口頭試問の場での川窪先生の最初の質問でした。当時、Norton 版の存在しか知らなかった私に、ホーソンのことからホーソン協会に至るまで、川窪先生が質問というよりはむしろ講義のようにお話されていた光景を、私は今でもつい昨日のこのように思い出します。

大学院入学後、特別研究の授業ではホーソンではなく、アーノルド・J・トインビーの『歴史の研究』を講読しました。川窪先生は比較文明の研究もされておりましたが、私は比較文明どころかトインビーの存在すら知らず、先生のお話についていくこともままなりません。この時の私は、トインビーの言葉を借りていうならば、まさしく「暗中模索」（“Groping in the dark”）といった状態であったように思います。そんな私に、川窪先生は修士課程の授業参加を勧めてくださいました。この授業では、川窪先生のご著書 *Nathaniel Hawthorne: His Approach to Reality and Art* を輪読しました。川窪先生は常々、精読・再読の重要性をお説きになり、お話の最後には決まって、「富樫くん、ホーソンを深く読み込んでいけば、ホーソンもトインビーも同じなんですよ」というお言葉を掛けていただいたことを思い出します。

川窪先生のエピソードは尽きませんが、最後に一つ挙げるとすれば、剣道部出身の先生らしく、毎朝の百回の素振りではないでしょうか。川窪先生は口癖のように、「健康が一番ですよ。健康でないと研究ができませんからね。あなたは

大丈夫ですか」と私の体調を気に留めてくださりながら、「健康第一で、コツコツと論文を執筆すれば必ず誰かが見てくださいから」と優しい眼差しで私にいつも語り掛けてくださいました。今にして思えば、物事を継続して行うことの難しさと大切さを、川窪先生はこのような形で私に説いてくださっていたのだと実感します。こうして川窪先生との思い出に浸りながら自身を顧みると、私は川窪先生のご恩にまったく応えられていないことを痛感します。あるとき、川窪先生が、ふと、「いまは毎日早く布団に入りたいんですよ。就寝前に三十分、『福翁自伝』を読むのが楽しみですからね」とお話されたことを思い出します。このとき私は大いに驚愕しましたが、私も川窪先生に倣い、ホーソーンを就寝前に読むのが楽しみであると心から思えるよう、研究に邁進していきたいと思います。川窪先生、本当に有難うございました。

2018年度 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会 会計報告

(2018. 4. 1 ~ 2019. 3. 31)

収入			支出				
会費	566,000		『フォーラム』関連費	186,701	前期繰越金	2,591,410	
賛助会員	50,000		(印刷製本費	149,040)	収入計	925,431
雑収入	309,420		(郵送費	16,926)	計	3,516,841
利息	11		(発送時の封筒等	20,735)	支出計	402,426
計	925,431		大会費	0		次期繰越金	3,114,415
			大会準備委員会費	0			
			印刷費	77,760			
			国際渉外室費	10,000		キャッシュポジション	
			謝礼費	0		郵便貯金	1,781,643
			支部研究会費	40,000		みずほ銀行普通預金	1,269,303
			(東京、中部、関西、九州	各 10,000)	現金	63,469
			通信費	67,748			
			事務費	20,217			
			人件費	0			
			雑費	0			
			計	402,426			

上記の通り相違ありません

2019年3月31日

会計 中西佳世子 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

2019年4月1日

監事 進藤鈴子 井上久夫

- * 「会費」には、2019年度からの新入会員が、2018年度に納付した会費（6,000円）が組み込まれている。
- * 「雑収入」のうち256,470円は、国際会議から余剰金として本学会に配分されたものである。
- * 「前期繰越金」については、2018年度の振込依頼が前倒しとなったために、2017年度の収入に納付された2018年度分の会費の一部（99,000円）が組み込まれている。
- * これまでの「編集室費」は、2018年度より「『フォーラム』関連費」として本会計に組み込まれている。

顧問 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（京都大学名誉教授）
 牧田徳元（金沢大学名誉教授）

役員

会 長	西谷拓哉（神戸大学）	事務局	鈴木孝
副 会 長	高尾直知（中央大学） 城戸光世（広島大学）		生田和也（鹿児島女子短期大学） 稲富百合子（関西学院大学非常勤講師）
監 事	大野美砂（東京海洋大学） 中村栄造（名城大学）		内堀奈保子 川村幸夫
理 事	内堀奈保子（日本大学） 大野美砂 大場厚志（東海学園大学） 川村幸夫（東京理科大学） 佐々木英哲（桃山学院大学） 鈴木孝（日本大学） 高橋利明（日本大学） 辻祥子（松山大学） 中西佳世子（京都産業大学） 中村栄造 中村善雄（京都女子大学） 成田雅彦（専修大学） 橋本安央（関西学院大学） 藤村希（亜細亜大学）		小宮山真美子（長野工業高等専門学校） 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） 野崎直之（中央大学非常勤講師）
		会 計	大川淳（京都ノートルダム女子大学） 高橋愛（岩手大学）
		編 集 室	高尾直知 城戸光世 佐々木英哲 竹野富美子（東海学園大学） 中西佳世子 古屋耕平（神奈川大学）
		資 料 室	竹井智子（京都工芸繊維大学） 田島優子（宮城学院女子大学）
		国際渉外室	伊藤淑子（大正大学） 上原正博（専修大学）
		大会準備委員	大野美砂 辻祥子 中村善雄 橋本安央