

NHSJ Newsletter

第40号 2022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

昨年の会長挨拶もコロナウィルスのことから書き始めました。今この原稿を書いている2022年1月現在、オミクロン株による感染が劇的に急増し、「第6波」が到来したと報じられています。そのような中、日々、医療活動に携わっている方々には敬意と感謝の気持ちを表したいと存じます。また、さまざまな制約がある中で、研究、教育に邁進しておられる会員の皆様にもエールを送ります。

当協会は1981年(昭和56年)10月17日に設立され、本年5月の大会は第40回という大きな節目を迎えます。当協会はいままでに『緋文字』出版150年、ホーソーン生誕200年、没後150年を記念した論文集を出版してまいりましたが、この度は協会設立40周年を記念した論集を刊行したいと考えております。タイトルは『いまホーソーンを読み理由』(仮)とし、なぜホーソーンの文学を読み続けているのか、あるいは読み続けていくのか、その理由を問うことを通して、19世紀の人間と21世紀の我々をつなぎ、昨今のさまざまな災害や苦難に打ちひしがれているように見えながら、その実、生き延びている人間精神の弾性・復元力(resilience/renaissance)を再確認したいとの趣旨です。多くの会員から論集へのプロポーザルが寄せられており、刊行をぜひ楽しみにお待ちいただければ幸いに存じます。

40周年という節目に当たり、さまざまな変遷と広がりを持ちながら続いてきた当協会の歴史と今後に関心を抱くとき、別の場所でも紹介したことがあるのですが、次の詩が思い出されます。モダニスト詩人である竹中郁の『動物磁気』(1948)に収められている詩です。

もらった火

竹中郁

火を欲しい人はいないか / よい色の火です / 杉林のなかの焚火のやう / 印度の魔術の火のやう

いま卿(くは)へてゐるタバコの火は / 先刻(さつき)ゆきずりの人からもらった / ふしぎな火 / 砂金石色の貴い火

この火をもらひたい人はいないか / 順送りにもたせて生かしたときたい火 / 一人でもよい 二人なら / なほ一層よい / このタバコ吸ひ切るまでに / 誰れか 来ないか

個人的な事を記すことをお許しいただけるなら、島田太郎先生に研究発表を慫慂していただき、私が当協会に入会したのは1989年4月のことでした。ホーソーンは厳しい社会規範とそれとは裏腹の人間の寛容を作品のテーマとしました。当協会では会則でも「ナサニエル・ホーソーンを中心として、関連ある作家や文学の流れについて研究を行う」と謳い、ホーソーン以外の作家の研究にも門戸を開いています。メルヴィルを専門としている者にも発表や役職を務めることをお許し下さっている当協会の寛大さをあらためてありがたく感じている次第です。

会員の皆様も何かしらの機縁を通して日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会に参加されたことと存じます。協会での活動と交流を通じて、それぞれに何らかの「火」をもらってこられたのではないのでしょうか。若い会員の方々もいずれは senior の立場になる者として、当協会で得た知識、経験を——「もらった火」を——また次の世代へと伝えていただき、当協会が今後ますます発展することを祈念してやみません。今年の全国大会でもぜひ多くの会員の皆様にご出席いただき、その思いを共有したいと願っております。

The Male Body in *The Scarlet Letter*

Shinpei YAMAGUCHI (Kyushu University)

It is clear that Hawthorne had been interested in the human body since the 1840s. He actually describes bodies examined, compared and classified in his works such as “The Birth-Mark” and “Rappaccini’s Daughter.” In *The Scarlet Letter*, Hawthorne also utilizes representations of the body through Chillingworth and Dimmesdale. This presentation aims at clarifying these male bodies and interpreting *The Scarlet Letter* as a story of Hawthorne’s own body.

Firstly, the deformity of Chillingworth is worth being discussed. His deformed body shocks the readers of *The Scarlet Letter*. Such an unbalanced body is associated with his moral annihilation and reminds us of freak shows which were popular in the 19th century. An audience at these shows reflects on themselves through the freaks and recognizes not only their own ordinariness, but also their physical deviancy as well. Hawthorne himself gazes at his identity through describing Chillingworth’s freakishness. In those days, Hawthorne seemed to be conflicted with his career as a writer. While Chillingworth’s deformed and unbalanced body represents Hawthorne’s conflict itself, it made him recognize his complicated authorship.

Next, this chapter examines Dimmesdale’s body and demonstrates his being castrated by Chillingworth. This castration becomes punishment for Dimmesdale’s sexual adultery. Some critics interpret the scene of stripping off Dimmesdale’s clothes by Chillingworth in terms of rape. His masculinity is deprived by the rape, and he becomes physically and mentally frail. Such a state makes it seem as if his sexual desire was lost. However, his libido is recovered soon after meeting Hester and Pearl in a forest, and he indulges his passion for writing pages of the Election Sermon. The pen-penis metaphor has been often used in literature, and this scene can also be read as a sexual behavior. Dimmesdale overwhelms the castration by Chillingworth in the end.

Hawthorne attached a preface called “The Custom-House” to *The Scarlet Letter*. This preface reveals the process of writing this romance. Hawthorne as a narrator states that he cares for books no longer, and that they are apart from him. This is because he is repressed by a marketplace and engaged with his job at the custom-house. He is suffering from “pen paralysis” and losing his phallus of a writer. Though his job prevents him from writing, he comes across the capital letter A in “The Custom-House.” He places it on his breast and feels it burning. This heat makes Hawthorne develop the story of *The Scarlet Letter*. This anecdote seems a very sexual allegory. It may be connected with Dimmesdale’s overwhelming a castration.

Thus, the plot of “The Custom-House” and *The Scarlet Letter* can be interpreted as a revival of Hawthorne as a writer. Writing and sexual desire is inseparable. A gaze at bodies in this romance gives a different aspect. In other words, the representations of the body show us that Hawthorne’s completing the work is just like masturbating.

The Ecology of Existence: Sympathy, Corporeality, and Dependency in Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*

Naoyuki NOZAKI (Tohoku Gakuin University)

In "Self-Reliance," Ralph Waldo Emerson writes: "And now we are men ... not minors and invalids in a protected corner, not cowards fleeing before a revolution, guides, redeemers, and benefactors, obeying the Almighty effort, and advancing on Chaos and the Dark." As is obvious from this passage, Emerson formulates an ideal form of the liberal individualist self against the background of "minors," "invalids" and presumably women, that is, figures that Rosemarie Garland Thomson calls "icons of bodily vulnerability." This paper seeks to show that in *The Scarlet Letter*, in contradistinction to Emerson's ideal of disembodied and inviolable personhood, Nathaniel Hawthorne reformulates the human body as essentially vulnerable and permeable, and accordingly, conceives of the shared condition of bodily vulnerability as constitutive to human (and nonhuman) bonding.

Hawthorne's project of newly imagining a form of community is parallel with his attempt to desubliminate the nineteenth-century notion of sympathy. In her book *States of Sympathy*, Elizabeth Barnes rightly locates a certain peculiarity in a form of sympathy that Hawthorne seeks to give shape to in *The Scarlet Letter* when she calls it "fleshly sympathy." Often invoked in political debates in nineteenth-century America, sympathy was considered mainly, if not exclusively, a benevolent human sentiment that could help one access other minds and hearts, as Adam Smith explicates in his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Yet, for most critics, Smith's reservations about sympathetic identification matter more. On the grounds that Smith explains that in a sympathetic process the subject forms only "some idea" of the other's pain via his "imagination," they consider sympathetic identification as inauthentic or even morally dubious for its distancing effects. Smith's explanation is, however, performative as well as descriptive; his emphasis on the self-enclosed nature of sympathy is partly his effort to defend the autonomy of the individual against the intrusive surges of feeling, which could act upon the body from outside. Almost invariably working in the framework of Smithian benevolence, critics have not adequately questioned a homogenizing power inherent in the process of sympathetic identification that Smith constructs.

Even though Barnes fails to explore its full implications by seeing it ultimately, as do others, as theatrical and thus illusive, a form of sympathy Hawthorne conceives of in *The Scarlet Letter* refers to a natural and material force acting upon the body, by means of which characters bond with each other. Excluded from relations of Smithian sympathy, Hester becomes ghostlike and Pearl monstrous in the Puritan society. The forest is a space of Hawthornean romance in its truest sense, since it provides the dispossessed mother and daughter with emotional sustenance and allows them to repossess their own voice. The reverberation of Pearl's shrieks in the forest, referred to as "sympathy" from a "hidden multitude" of natural entities, pierces Arthur's body and forces him to respond to her pain in a physical and even physiological manner. Arthur finally stands on the scaffold, supported by Hester and holding Pearl's hand. The three characters, qua "icons of bodily vulnerability," embody a form of human bonding both necessitated and made possible by corporeal interdependency. Though feeble and frail, they strongly stand as an antithesis to the American ideal of the autonomous and inviolable selfhood.

Acting and Performance in *The House of the Seven Gables*

Takeshi KAWASHITA (Kyoto Sangyo University)

“You talk as if this old house were a theatre,” says Pheobe Pyncheon to Holgrave in the Pyncheons’ garden. Like this, the House of the Seven Gables is compared to a theatre and the characters are referred to as actors. A number of attempts have been devoted to the study of the metaphor of theatres in this work, but little attention has been given to the characters’ behaviors, or “performance.” According to Erving Goffman, “performance” is defined as all activity which serves to influence other people in any way. Also, Richard Schechner says that “performance” is a person behaving as if they were someone else, who is separate from “them.” And “performance” is “showing doing” with awareness of others. The purpose of this paper is to explore the meanings of the characters’ acting from the perspective of the concept identified by the term “performance.”

At the beginning of the story, the cent-shop is depicted as a stage, and Miss Hepzibah, a patrician woman, acts as a plebeian. Since she doesn’t have enough for her living expenses, she has to perform as the unfamiliar role of a saleswoman. As a matter of course, her business doesn’t go well. Her situation is similar to Hawthorne’s. He also had to flatter the public readers to sell his books well; therefore, he hid his true self and played a part as a reader-friendly writer. As people naturally give a performance in everyday life, the characters in this work take the role appropriate to their situations.

There is another stage outside the House of the Seven Gables. It is a puppet play performed by an Italian boy. The play is what is called “a play within a play,” so here is an important scene where the narrator states his own views on the feud between the Pyncheons and the Maules. In the play, “little figures” show their daily activities, therefore, it could be said that the narrator explains the motif of this work: everyday life or activity itself is a drama. More noteworthy, however, is that this puppet play is a “pantomimic scene,” and the puppets don’t speak. They are just “showing doing.” Viewed in this light, this puppet play could be regarded as “performance.” So far, the study of this point appears to have been passed over.

When Holgrave recites a tale of Alice to Phoebe in the Pyncheons’ garden, he gives “a good deal of action to the parts” and “gesticulations.” Clearly, he puts on a one-man stage play. What matters here is the description of the garden, where “aristocratic flowers” and “plebeian vegetables” are grown. Thus, the class conflict of Hawthorne’s time is reflected. Also, in the tale of Alice, we get a glimpse of racial discrimination. Therefore, it should be concluded that the mass culture and its problems are taken up in the scene.

The house is depicted as a theatre and the situations of people’s ordinary life as a stage in *The House of the Seven Gables*. Hawthorne, who flattered his readers, couldn’t write his mind directly through his words, so he might describe the characters’ “performance” to present his true feelings on the issues of his time.

Re-reading “Roger Malvin’s Burial”

“Roger Malvin’s Burial” (1832) is one of the most enigmatic stories in Nathaniel Hawthorne’s works. Although this short story has been widely studied by a large number of scholars since its first appearance in *The Token*, its literary themes, historical and cultural significances, and interpretations are still in controversy.

The purpose of this workshop was to offer new critical approaches to “Roger Malvin’s Burial.” We took the following steps to have a frank and lively discussion on Zoom Meeting: (1) A brief introduction of the three topics we were planning to discuss in the workshop, (2) group brainstorming with Mentimeter to gather ideas and keywords to discuss our topics, (3) three individual presentations based on brainstorming.

The Oak Tree in “Roger Malvin’s Burial”

Kazuya IKUTA (Kagoshima Women’s College)

“Roger Malvin’s Burial” is set in eighteenth-century Maine and most of the scenes take place in the wilderness. After the battle called “Lovell’s Fight” (X 337), Rouben Bourne and Roger Malvin lost their way home and have been wandering hopelessly in the deep and thick forest for three days. Malvin was fatally injured during the battle and tells Bourne to leave him to die. Bourne finally makes up his mind to follow Malvin’s will and abandon dying Malvin under the oak tree. Bourne ties his blood-stained handkerchief to the top of the tree and makes a promise to return to this place and lay Malvin’s bones in the grave.

The oak tree has been regarded as a symbol to represent Bourne’s sin and guilt in the novel. In fact, the narrator says that “his sin was expiated” (X 360) when the top of the oak tree breaks into fragments at the end of the story. What seems to be lacking, however, is a realistic and materialistic point of view on the tree. Following the material turn in the recent ecocriticism studies (*Crossing the Waves of Ecocriticism* 2017, *Transatlantic Ecology* 2019), I explore a possibility to read the oak tree in “Roger Malvin’s Burial” as a material.

Hawthorne usually shows little interest in the forest vegetation when he describes the forest in his novels; however, the narrator of “Roger Malvin’s Burial” tells us that “oaks and other hard-wood trees had supplied the place of the pines, which were the usual growth” (X 338) at the place Malvin is left alone. It is clear that the narrator tries to describe the forest in a realistic way. The narrator defines the oak leaves as Malvin’s death bed and mentions the possibility of finding Malvin’s bones mixed with oak leaves. It seems that he dies under the oak tree and his unburied body is materially combined with the natural environment in spite of the fact that dying Malvin expected his burial as a civilized man.

Besides, it is noteworthy that oak often appears in Hawthorne’s works as building materials. At the end of “Roger Malvin’s Burial,” “the withered topmost bough of the oak loosened itself in the stilly air, and fell in soft, light fragments upon...Roger Malvin’s bones” (X 360). The rest of this “hard-wood” oak tree would be the “oaken door” (I 47) of the prison in *The Scarlet Letter*, “oaken timber” (II 8) of the Pyncheon house in *The House of the Seven Gables*, and “the oaken frame of the farmhouse” (III 12) in *The Blithedale Romance*.

Rethinking the Father-Son Relationship in “Roger Malvin’s Burial”

Ai TAKAHASHI (Iwate University)

In reading “Roger Malvin’s Burial,” it is presupposed that Roger Malvin and Reuben Bourne feel a father-son bond. It is true that Roger regards Reuben as his son and that Reuben feels Roger is “a father” (X 340) to him. In the strict sense, however, they are not a father and son while they have been wandering in the wilderness, as Reuben has not gotten married to Roger’s daughter, Dorcas, yet. My presentation aims to reinterpret the father-son bond in this story and consider why Reuben eventually destroys his family that Roger blessed for him.

The conversations the two men have in the forest imply that their bond is a homosocial one which is cemented by the old man’s passing his daughter to the young man. Roger recognizes the nature of his relationship with Reuben when he persuades the young man to act on his request. When he mentions the young man’s responsibility for his daughter, he understands she plays an important role in fulfilling his homosocial desire. Answering his expectation for her, Dorcas is consistently loyal to him. Her loyalty to her father is suggested by her words and deeds such as the question she asks when Reuben recovers consciousness.

Unlike Roger, however, Reuben is not willing to form a strong bond with the old man. His reluctance is implied by the fact that he never calls the old man his father. It is reflected not only in the way he procrastinates the burial of Roger but also in the way he goes down in the world after getting married to Dorcas, in other words, after establishing a legitimate bond with Roger. Decisively, Reuben’s disapproval of his bond with Roger culminates in the killing of his beloved only son, Silas. The boy is considered to be “a future leader” (X 351) in the community which anticipates the return of the Indian war, and that means he is an efficient farmer as well as a skilled combatant. It is from his mother’s side that the boy inherits his competence as a farmer. That is to say, the boy represents Roger’s blessing that his bond with Reuben would flourish as a family forever. For Reuben, Silas is a reminder of Roger’s blessing, or rather, his curse, which has confined him in a homosocial community. Tormented with Roger’s blessing and/or curse, Reuben is forced to kill his son to terminate it.

The narrator makes a meaningful comment about Reuben’s moving out from the community by saying, “To be brief, the world did not go well with Reuben Bourne” (X 351). By quoting this comment, “Roger Malvin’s Burial” can be defined as a story of a man who cannot adapt himself to a homosocial world.

Not to Bury Roger Malvin’s Body: Respond to the Death of Others

Mamiko KOMIYAMA (National Institute of Technology, Nagano College)

My presentation aims to reconsider whether Rueben Bourne intended to fulfill his promise to bury Roger Malvin’s body and mourn the loss of him. If Hawthorne’s intention was for Bourne *not* to bury Roger’s body, what meaning might be lurking in Rueben’s insubordination? To explore this question, I proposed three points to discuss: [1] Examine the meaning of “disobeyed vow” in order to clarify Rueben’s motive. [2] What does the death/dead body of Roger symbolize? [3] What does “decent burial” signify in this narrative?

For a long time after returning from the wilderness, Rueben suffered from the lasting image and voice of Roger. In addition, he was tortured by the fact that “he could not obey the call” (X 349) over the years. When Rueben referred to the promise he made with Roger, he mainly employed the word “vow” instead of a

promise. According to the *OED*, a “vow” is realized by “perform[ing] some act” in return for some special favor. As for “obey,” there exists an absolute power balance between people who command and people who “obey.” Thus, the phrase “he could not obey the call” (X 349) indicates Rueben’s strong resistance to the paternal authority inside the tale as well as the author’s protest against the cultural requirement to act for the dead in the midst of American expansionism.

To consider what “death” and “corpse” symbolize in this work, I referred to Holgrave’s statement about “a giant’s dead body” and his descendant’s duty for the burial of the Past in *The House of the Seven Gables*. Generally, a “decent burial” is accompanied by two actions. First, a funeral ceremony acts as an actual rite at the burial ground in front of the tomb. Secondly, to be buried properly, the grief for the dead should be expressed in words and be publicly known so that the lives of the dead be made “grievable.” This must be the responsibility of the survivors and it is strongly related to the “decent burial” for the dead.

What I employed when deciphering the linkage between the “decent burial” and the funeral rite was Judith Butler’s theory of writing an “obituary,” which appeared in *Precarious Life* (2004). According to Butler, a life cannot become “a life worth noting, ... a life that qualifies for recognition” (Butler 34) until an obituary is written. The obituary, or printed note of someone’s death, “functions as the instrument by which grievability is publicly distributed” (Butler 34). Hawthorne’s Romance style, adapting the early colonial history of New England into his works, could be considered as a kind of obituary record which brings the erased lives of others back to life. I suppose this is why death and burial are the main topics for Hawthorne’s Romances.

Considering that an event to commemorate the centenary of the battle at Lovell’s Pond was held in 1825, and these kinds of rituals aimed to preserve the historical event as an official memory through confirmation by the community, Hawthorne might have resisted this nationalistic performance by offering this tale seven years later. Therefore, *not* to bury Roger’s body was not only his manifested resistance against the official narratives, but also his private way to represent the grieving of the other deaths in “Lovell’s Fight” — those who had been erased from the official narratives — Native Americans.

*All quotations from Hawthorne are taken from *The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*.

**Special
Lecture**

**Spatial Orientation in Nineteenth-century America: Toward Chronotopic Cartography
Michiko SHIMOKOBE (Professor Emeritus, Seikei University)**

In the context of the globalized world of the twenty-first century, G. C. Spivak says that we stand upon “an abstract ball covered in latitudes and longitudes, ... now drawn by the requirements of Geographical Information Systems.” Spatial orientation—the ability to maintain our physical and psychological postures in relation to the surrounding environment—is among the most important concepts for the people of the contemporary global society.

The United States has played an important role in globalization. If we focus on human movement over the whole globe as principal force of globalization, the psychological as well as political impacts of space in nineteenth-century United States—which was undergoing rapid geographical and ideological transformation—might lead to a substantial interpretation of the twenty-first-century world. Therefore, the topic of my lecture, “Spatial Orientation in 19th-century America” draws upon the specific movement of expansion, which was promoted by the zealous idea of spatial enlargement of national territory.

During the expansion era of the mid-nineteenth century, Americans were anxious about the endless space extending far beyond the visible horizon; the nation was also excited about the huge territory it had acquired so rapidly. Two kinds of cultural rhetoric controlled the political and psychological milieus of nineteenth-century United States: the Manifest Destiny and the Monroe Doctrine. The former functioned as a national rhetoric of spatial inclusion, claiming the Americans’ “manifest destiny to overspread and possess the entire continent.” The latter, on the other hand, worked as a global rhetoric of spatial division, based on which the United States declared the hemispheric independence of the American continents, which “are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers” (of the other half of the globe). Both are supported by spatial concepts for contemporary United States and are represented in the twenty-first-century political/economic/cultural rhetoric of globalization.

“Place” is the fundamental element of our thought because our experiences “have an integral environmental context or setting: ‘events take place.’” (D.C.D. Pocock). For example, in *Pierre* (Herman Melville) published in 1851, various places, such as Saddle Meadows, a room in a Manhattan apartment, a city street, and the prison where Pierre dies, arbored by Isabel’s ebon hair, represent the idea of “place” as the psychic geography of characters.

Places in literary texts are described via verbal and/or graphic signs with no topographical correlative to the real places. It is noticeable, however, that nineteenth-century American writers were conscious of making the places in their texts substantial and real. Melville and Thoreau were professional land surveyors during their younger days. Hawthorne dared to mention the correspondence between the actual locality and the imaginary events of his narrative in the preface to *The House of the Seven Gables*. Poe and Melville—both used the sea as the main stage in their tales—provided much geographical information, such as

longitude and latitude, in *Pym* and *Moby-Dick*. We can conduct original research on the geographical consciousness of American writers during the expansion era.

There are three kinds of space on Earth: land, sea, and air. Movement upon land was conspicuously performed during the nineteenth century in the United States as the Westward Movement—this expansionism was both a national event and an individual experience. The sea is the main space where the transatlantic perspective was realized by people of both the Old and New continents. Though the third space, the air, was the least accessible for the people of the nineteenth century, there were writers whose imagination was strongly inspired by the idea of flying. Thoreau felt he was “floating through the air as in a balloon” upon seeing reflections of clouds on the surface of bottomless water. In his third novel, *Mardi* published amidst expansionism under the slogan “Manifest Destiny,” Melville lets the hero, Taji, “flew on, over an endless sea” into the empty space beyond the Mardi archipelagoes: a microcosm enclosed by a circular reef as a boundary.

Nineteenth-century American writers situated the nation in the global context by orientating their own place in three-dimensional space: land, sea, and air. The question: where were the nineteenth-century Americans standing?, leads to the one in our globalized world of the twenty-first century. The three-dimensional view, acquired by flying, anticipates a twenty-first-century global perspective.

Finally, to the globalized academic world, I propose a new project supported by an interdisciplinary approach in which spatial orientation is one of the chief topics. This new perspective will be provided by “chronotopic cartography,” which is now undertaken by the group at Lancaster University. Their project, based on M. Bakhtin’s theory, aims to develop “an entirely original method for generating literary maps semantically, using place names and descriptions given within the text to create GIS maps and 3D visualizations.”

As a member of the Nathaniel Hawthorne Society of Japan, I hope that our research on nineteenth-century American literature will contribute to the milieu of the twenty-first-century globalizing world by helping us better investigate the themes of space and place in the texts of contemporary writers.

Symposium

“Reading Hawthorne: Ethics, Reason, or No Reason?”

Masahiro UEHARA (Senshu University)

This symposium aims to pose a crucial question to our community of scholars: Why do we read Hawthorne? Is it because you read his works in class? Or because you like them? The question of why we read Hawthorne is critical, but seems quite often missing when we consider trends in seemingly institutionalized criticism among our literary circles.

Does one read Hawthorne’s works because they want to know what kind of person the author was—in other words, to see the world as he did, or the reality he saw in the world he lived in? Or, does one read these works in order to find in them themes (beliefs, social problems and so on) that are familiar to our contemporary world? From the very start, we have different premises on which to read literary works. Given that Hawthorne’s *oeuvre* is almost 200 years old, reading them is like acting in the 1980s mega hit franchise *Back to the Future*: Is one going to the past, or coming back to the present?

With the aim of stimulating thought among members of the Society, the symposium planned to invite three senior professors and allow them the liberty of discussing their own examples of reading Hawthorne. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, however, the original symposium was postponed to this year’s meeting and included only two panelists.

One of them, Yuichi Takeda, a former professor at Nanzan University, Nagoya, is a leading critic and scholar in Japan who has published many books and articles on 19th century American literature. It was fortunate and honorable to have him participate in the symposium because, in his long career as a scholar and teacher of American literature, Professor Takeda has dedicated himself to an important critical agenda, namely the act of reading. At the beginning of his presentation, Professor Takeda unpacked his interest in an act of reading in three phases. Given the value of these insights, please allow me to briefly introduce them here.

Professor Takeda started by questioning how we read, for example, *The Scarlet Letter* as a classic of American literature. To read classics is not simply to read texts, but to read them with an awareness of how they have been read to this point. By an accumulated bulk of various interpretations, a classic work is placed on a list as canonical. And yet, despite that, the classics do present possibilities for other interpretations. That is, a classical text invokes an idea of textuality in which a text invites various interpretations, survives them, and still calls for more readings.

What, then, is the meaning of those readings endorsed in the form of criticism or critical interpretation? Consciously or unconsciously, we all read a text by projecting onto it some prejudices and biases and by transferring our personal emotions to it. These can be interruptions and setbacks, but in spite of it all, these obstacles can also be helpful for understanding a literary text. Of course, an act of reading is not intellectually and emotionally neutral, and it does not have to be, but this point should be kept in mind. In other words, an act of reading should be reduced to neither the power of imagination nor aesthetics and artistic skills; rather, an act of reading should make clear how the dynamics of imagination, aesthetics and artistic skills become possible in certain cultural, historical and political situations. Alternatively, one may say that an act of reading explores how those dynamics are ideologically determined.

Finally comes theoretical interest. When one reads a literary text, what is happening there? Though an act of reading is fundamental in the field of literature, theorizing it has not been easy; it means deducing a general principle that we may presume controls, determines and prescribes each act of reading, yet the authenticity of such a principle must be induced from practices of reading texts. Citing Paul de Man, who writes that, "Prior to any generalization about literature, literary texts have to be read, and the possibility of reading can never be taken for granted" (*Blindness and Insight*, University of Minnesota Press, 1983, p.107), Professor Takeda draws our attention to a crucial question: How does an act of reading become possible or impossible? In criticism and critical theory, then, we pursue the conditions that make possible an act of reading.

Along with these phases, Professor Takeda explicates that *The Scarlet Letter* turns out a narrative that structures itself with a perspective to provoke and problematize an act of reading. The romance, set in colonial New England in the 17th century, was written in the mid-19th century; it emerges in Hawthorne's attempt, which is part of the nation's call for her cultural independence after her political one in the late 18th century, to read 17th century colonial New England as a text, where one can seek an origin. Namely, the romance tells us how the Puritans "read" the New World in their perception of "their" world in the 17th century. The discovery of this new world, Professor Takeda argues, is parallel with the discovery of an old manuscript by the new Purveyor in "The Custom-House," which leads to concepts such as authorship, propriety and possession.

These concepts are astutely discussed in his exemplary readings of *The Scarlet Letter* and *The House of the Seven Gables*, readings we are unfortunately unable to fully reproduce here due to issues of space. As shown by his simple two-word title "On Property," the idea of property conceived in Western culture is recounted, and Professor Takeda elegantly pointed out that the idea permeates throughout Hawthorne's works. In this way, Professor Takeda's reading of Hawthorne implicitly touched on the author's critical view of the origin and creation of "America" and the nation that has stood on it.

Following Professor Takeda's lead, the second panelist, Uehara, discussed the ending of *The House of the Seven Gables*, questioning Holgrave's remark that the parchment "is what the Pyncheons sought in vain, while it was valuable." The remark can be read in two different ways: On the one hand, "the parchment is, *while* it was valuable, what the Pyncheons sought in vain," and, on the other, "the parchment is what the Pyncheons sought in vain, *during which time* it was valuable." With this difference, the validity of the parchment as an official document is questioned, and this uncertainty can be explained by understanding that the document has been through two different regimes, namely the colonial and republican.

東京支部研究会

2021年、東京支部研究会では下記の活動を行いました。今回の研究会も昨年に引き続き、新型コロナウイルスの感染拡大防止のためZoomを利用した開催となりましたが、他支部からも大勢の先生方にご参加いただき、大変活発な議論や意見交換が行われました。12月開催の読書会では、ホーゾーンと自然との関係を扱い、エコクリティシズムの観点から再考を試みたテキストの前半4つの章を題材に、4名の発表者が、作品から読み取れるホーゾーンの自然との関わりや、作品解釈の新たな視点などを紹介してくださいました。2022年も、研究発表・作品研究・招待講演・読書会を開催する予定です。

△2021年2月27日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：成田 雅彦 氏 (専修大学)

題目：「ハナ・ダストンの肖像

——ホーゾーンと19世紀アメリカの国家・女性・インディアン問題との接点を探る」

司会：内堀 奈保子 氏 (日本大学)

△2021年3月28日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：貞廣 真紀 氏 (明治学院大学)

題目：「ヨーロッパの心臓から——F. O. Matthiessenの地政学」

司会：上原 正博 氏 (専修大学)

△2021年7月24日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：田島 優子 氏 (宮城学院女子大学)

題目：「シンパシーによる和解——『七破風の屋敷』における中間領域」

司会：伊藤 淑子 氏 (大正大学)

△2021年9月11日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：石川 志野 氏 (慶應大学大学院生)

題目：「園芸家の庭——『七破風の屋敷』における果樹と階級」

司会：新井 景子 氏 (武蔵大学)

△2021年11月20日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：内堀 奈保子 氏 (日本大学)

題目：「ケアの視点から読む『緋文字』」

司会：高尾 直知 氏 (中央大学)

△2021年12月18日(土)午後3時より (Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【読書会】

テキスト：Petersheim, Steven. *Rethinking Nathaniel Hawthorne and Nature: Pastoral Experiments and Environmentalism*. Lexington Books, 2020.

司会・発表：小宮山 真美子 氏 (長野工業高等専門学校)

発表者：生田 和也 氏 (鹿児島女子短期大学)

高橋 愛 氏 (岩手大学)

松丸 彩乃 氏 (成蹊大学大学院生)

(鈴木 孝 記)

中部支部研究会

2021年度は、新型コロナウイルス感染症のために、3月に対面で開催予定の研究会を延期して、9月にZoomで開催しました。Zoom会議の良さはあるものの対面の良さには捨てがたいものがあります。ウイズコロナの新たな局面を迎え、Zoom会議と対面のハイブリッドな方法を模索中です。

△2021年9月26日(土)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：竹野 富美子 氏(東海学園大学)
題目：「グローバル・ヒストリーから見るエドガー・アラン・ポー」
司会：林 姿穂 氏(三重県立看護大学)

△2021年12月4日(土)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

発表者：森岡 稔 氏(名城大学他非常勤講師)
題目：「ラパチーニの娘」をユング心理学で読み解く」
司会：林 姿穂 氏(三重県立看護大学)

(倉橋 洋子 記)

関西支部研究会

今年は、昨年に延期したふたつのシンポジウムと読書会、そして新しい研究発表を加え4回の例会をオンラインで開催いたしました。10月例会からは、本部事務局で開設して頂いた全会員メーリングリストを用いて案内をお届けしております。2022年は対面開催が再開できることを願っておりますが、引き続き、多くの方にご参加頂ける形を検討して参りたいと思います。

△2021年3月27日(土)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【シンポジウム】

題目：「英米文学における“夫婦”のかたち——私的空間の男女」
司会・進行：竹井 智子 氏(京都工芸繊維大学)
講師：稲富 百合子 氏(追手門学院大学)
「ホーソンとソファエア——夫婦の軌跡」
講師：水野 尚之 氏(京都大学名誉教授)
「夫婦の轍——ジェイムズ家の夫婦のありよう」
講師：水野 眞理 氏(京都大学名誉教授)
「兄妹(きょうだい)は夫婦になれるか？」
講師：中村 善雄 氏(京都女子大学)
「私的空間のジェイムズと女性タイピスト——現実／想像の声を聞く」

△2021年8月21日(土)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【研究発表】

- (1) 発表者：藤沢 徹也 氏(広島商船高等専門学校)
題目：「『古い指輪』における作中人物の粹物語への反応——「伝説」への賞賛と不満の真意」
司会：井上 久夫 氏(関西学院大学名誉教授)
- (2) 発表者：吉田 朱美 氏(近畿大学)
題目：「Cliffordのトラウマ、大西洋をわたる——*A Tale of Two Cities*, *Silas Marner* および *Mrs. Dalloway*に聴く *The House of the Seven Gables*のこだま」
司会：水野 眞理 氏(京都大学名誉教授)
- (3) 発表者：島貫 香代子 氏(関西学院大学)
題目：「ホーソンとフォークナーの人種意識——『七破風の屋敷』と『土にまみれた旗』を中心に」
司会：山下 昇 氏(相愛大学名誉教授)

△2021年10月9日(土)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【読書会】

テキスト: Colacurcio, Michael J. *The Province of Piety: Moral History in Hawthorne's Early Tales*.
Harvard UP, 1984.

- (1) 報告者: 小川 恭佑 氏 (関西学院大学大学院生)
担当章: Chapter 3 The Puritan Bias: Nature, Virtue, and "The Gentle Boy"
コメンテーター: 丹羽 隆昭 氏 (京都大学名誉教授)
- (2) 報告者: 竹井 智子 氏 (京都工芸繊維大学)
担当章: Chapter 5 Visible Sanctity and Specter Evidence: "The Tryal of G.B."
コメンテーター: 成田 雅彦 氏 (専修大学)

△2021年12月12日(日)午後2時より(Zoomによるオンライン開催)

【シンポジウム】

- 題目: 「アンテベラム期の作家と住まい」
司会・発表: 真田 満 氏 (龍谷大学非常勤講師)
「メルヴィルの1850年代前半作品における住まいと秩序」
講師: 古屋 耕平 氏 (神奈川大学)
「持たない暮らしは可能か?—メルヴィルのカントリー・ハウス」
講師: 辻 祥子 氏 (松山大学)
「「広い広い世界」から牢獄へ—メルヴィルの『ビエール』と家庭小説の住まい」
講師: 中西 佳世子 氏 (京都産業大学)
「揺らぐ家庭とホーゾーンの炉辺—『七破風の屋敷』を中心に」

(中西 佳世子 記)

九州支部研究会

九州支部では、本年度の研究会開催はありませんでした。

(青井 格 記)

事務局だより

1. *NHSJ Newsletter* 第40号をお届けします。
2. 第39回全国大会は、2021年5月21日(金)・22日(土)の両日に、新型コロナウイルスの感染拡大防止のため、Zoomによるオンラインにて開催いたしました。開催に向けて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40回全国大会は、2022年5月20日(金)・21日(土)の両日に、Zoomによるオンラインでの開催を予定しております。2022年4月の時点での感染状況によっては、希望する発表者および会員を対象に、同じ空間でのオンライン参加も可能となるよう、龍谷大学に対面会場をコモンスペースとして設置する予定です。詳細は本*Newsletter* 16-17ページ「第40回大会のお知らせ」、並びに、来年度にご連絡いたします大会案内をご確認ください。ただし、新型コロナウイルスの感染状況によっては、予定を変更することがございます。あらかじめご了承のほどよろしくお願い申し上げます。変更の場合には、学会サイトや会員メール連絡網にてご連絡させていただく予定です。感染が早く収束し、会場で多くの会員の皆さまとお会いできることを祈っております。
4. 本年度より、全会員用のメール連絡網 (googlegroups) を作成いたしました。連絡網で使用するメールアドレスのご変更等ございましたら、事務局へご一報ください。
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。名簿情報を更新いたします。
6. 会員の方々のご著書・論文等は、資料室にお送りくださるようお願いいたします。

(鈴木 孝 記)

編集室だより

今年から、編集長が高尾直知先生から城戸に交代となりました。高尾先生にはこれまでの様々なご尽力に心より感謝申し上げます。今後ともどうぞよろしく願いいたします。

新たなデザインの元お送りする第2弾、『フォーラム』第27号には、3本の論文投稿があり、現在審査を進めています。書評は、初めての試みとして、古典的研究書を対象とした書評エッセイ2本と、新しい洋書と和書の研究書を紹介する3本を予定しています。これからも充実した学会誌をお届けできるよう、鋭意努力してまいります。会員の皆様、特に大会や例会等にご登壇の際には、ぜひ積極的にご論文の投稿を検討頂ければと思います。今回ご投稿してくださいました皆様、また書評執筆をお引き受けくださいました皆様、またお忙しい中いつも色々と支えて頂き、詳細なコメントをくださる編集委員の先生方に、心から御礼申し上げます。

投稿にあたっては、事務局機関誌『フォーラム』(hawthorne.forum@gmail.com)宛のメールに、Microsoft Word文書で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(お名前、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お書きください。詳しい投稿規定は、日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会ホームページ及び『フォーラム』巻末に掲載されていますので、そちらを必ずご参照ください。スタイルは*MLA Handbook*最新版に準拠してくださいませよう、お願い申し上げます。

・編集委員：城戸光世(編集長)、佐々木英哲、高尾直知、竹野富美子、中西佳世子、古屋耕平

・編集室：〒739-8521 広島県東広島市鏡山1-7-1

広島大学総合科学部 城戸光世研究室気付 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会編集室

(城戸 光世 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。

高野泰志・竹井智子(編著) 中西佳世子・柳楽有里・森本光・玉井潤野・吉田恭子・島貫香代子・杉森雅美・水野尚之・四方朱子・山内玲(著)『テキストと戯れる——アメリカ文学をどう読むか』松籟社(2021)

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・ホーソーン協会資料室

〒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40回大会のお知らせ

日 時：2022年5月20日（金）、21日（土）

場 所：オンライン開催（+龍谷大学 大宮キャンパス or 深草キャンパス）

《第40回大会概要》

2022年度の全国大会は、第40回という節目の記念大会です。本来であれば会員のみなさまと祝杯をあげたいところですが、社会情勢に鑑みて、残念ながら今回も懇親会は不開催とさせていただきます。なお、すでに会員専用メーリングリストでご案内しているとおり、今大会はオンラインをベースとしつつ、前回とは若干異なる実施形態を予定しています。最新情報については学会公式サイトをご覧ください。

大会自体は例年通り、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、山下昇先生にご登壇いただきます。シンポジウムは成田雅彦先生にとりまとめ役をお願いし、高橋勤先生、竹内勝徳先生をお招きした上で、大野美砂先生とともにアメリカン・ルネサンス期における白人至上主義の言説を議論していただく予定です。ワークショップでは「日曜日に家にいて」をテキストに選び、池末陽子先生を中心に、植村真末先生、川下剛先生、林姿穂先生が、他作家との比較や日常性という主題をめぐり、新鮮な視点から話題を提供していただきます。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】

- ・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

「日曜日に家にいて」を読む

司会・講師：池末 陽子 氏（龍谷大学）

講師：植村 真末 氏（大阪大学非常勤講師）

講師：川下 剛 氏（京都産業大学）

講師：林 姿穂 氏（三重県立看護大学）

<概要>『トワイス＝トルド・テールズ』（1837）収録のスケッチ「日曜日に家にいて」は、今まであまり取り上げられてこなかった作品です。コロナ禍の中で「非日常」がなんとなく「日常」と化し、さらには仕事に追われ日曜日の感覚さえ失われつつある昨今、本作品を通して、あらためて「平穏な日常」あるいは「日曜日の過ごし方」について考えてみたいと思います。本ワークショップでは、同時代作家ポーとメルヴィルおよび現代作家オースターの作品との比較やこの短編に見られるホーゾーンの日常性の考察など、各講師が持ち寄ったアイデアについて短い発表を最初におこないます。その後ご参加の皆様には、「日常性とは何か」というテーマを軸に、自由に活発な議論を展開していただければと願っております。毎日お忙しくお過ごしのことと存じますが、日曜日の穏やかなひとときを空想し、聖歌とオルガンの幻聴に癒しを求めていただければ幸いです。

- ・特別講演

講演者：山下 昇 氏（相愛大学名誉教授）

演 題：ホーゾーンの継承者としてのフォークナー

- ・総会
- ・懇親会：開催しません

【第2日】

・シンポジウム

アメリカン・ルネサンスと白人至上主義の運命

司会・講師：成田 雅彦 氏（専修大学）

講師：高橋 勤 氏（九州大学）

講師：竹内 勝徳 氏（鹿児島大学）

講師：大野 美砂 氏（東京海洋大学）

<概要>アメリカが揺らいでいる。コロナ禍の影響、トランプ後、民主党バイデン政権の混迷で政治、経済が不安定なだけではない。昨年来の BLM 運動、合衆国議会議事堂襲撃事件、Critical Race Theory—社会主義化とも言われる急激なリベラリズムの台頭の中で、いわゆる伝統的なアメリカが姿を変えつつあるのが昨今の情勢だと言っても間違いないのではないか。その中でも、白人というものの立ち位置が大きく変貌を余儀なくされていることは否定できないだろう。

今回のシンポジウムでは、こうした現代アメリカの大きな動き、とりわけ白人至上主義に焦点を当て、アメリカン・ルネサンスの作家たちの視点を通してこの問題を考えたいと思う。19世紀アメリカは奴隷解放の闘争、インディアン制圧、そしてマニフェスト・デスティニーが国を動かした時代であった。しかし、アメリカン・ルネサンスの作家たちが活躍した時代は、白人の概念が構築されていった時代でもあった。そして白人至上主義が静かに、しかし、強力に社会の中心に据えられていった。この動き、あるいは白人と異人種との独特のアメリカの関係形成の上で、エマソン、ソロー、メルヴィル、そしてわれらがホーソーンはどんな言説を紡ぎ出したのか。四人の論者たちの報告を受けて、フロアを巻き込んだ議論を展開できればと考える。

・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）：橋本 安央（関西学院大学）E-mail: yasunaka@kwansei.ac.jp
4. 応募締切：2022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. 【対面参加の場合】大会の開催地区以外に居住している大学院生会員が研究発表（ワークショップ、シンポジウムを含む）をする場合、交通費の一部を協会が助成いたします。今大会では、関西以外の地域に居住している大学院生が対象となります。助成希望の方は事務局までご連絡ください。

《大会準備委員会より》

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。

（橋本 安央 記）

2020年度 日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会 会計報告

(2020. 4. 1 ~ 2021. 3. 31)

<u>収入</u>	<u>支出</u>		
会費	672,000	『フォーラム』関連費	178,957
賛助会員	60,000	(印刷製本・封入・発送)	
雑収入	45,500	大会費	100,800
利息	8	大会準備委員会費	0
計	777,508	印刷費	77,880
		国際渉外室費	10,000
		謝礼費	0
		支部研究会費	40,000
		(東京、中部、関西、九州 各 10,000)	
		通信費	41,050
		事務費	17,925
		人件費	0
		雑費	0
		計	466,612
		前期繰越金	3,585,777
		収入計	777,508
		計	4,363,285
		支出計	466,612
		次期繰越金	3,896,673
		キャッシュポジション	
		郵便貯金	3,245,643
		みずほ銀行普通預金	628,997
		現金	22,033

上記の通り相違ありません

2021年3月31日

会計 大川淳

高橋愛

監査の結果、上記の通り相違ないことを証明します

2021年4月1日

監事 中村栄造

大野美砂

*雑収入は第38回大会（沖縄）の会場使用料の払い戻しである。

*大会費は第39回（東京）の会場使用料である。実施方法が対面から遠隔に変更となったことに伴い、払い戻しされる予定である。

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)

役員

会長 西谷拓哉 (神戸大学)
副会長 高尾直知 (中央大学)
城戸光世 (広島大学)
監事 大野美砂 (東京海洋大学)
中村栄造 (名城大学)
理事 上原正博 (専修大学)
内堀奈保子 (日本大学)
大場厚志 (東海学園大学)
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)

事務局 鈴木孝
稲富百合子 (追手門学院大学)
内堀奈保子
大川淳 (京都ノートルダム女子大学)
小宮山真美子 (長野工業高等専門学校)
常光健 (神奈川大学非常勤講師)
中村文紀 (日本大学)
野崎直之 (東北学院大学)
会計 生田和也 (鹿児島女子短期大学)
高橋愛 (岩手大学)
編集室 城戸光世
佐々木英哲
高尾直知
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 新井景子 (武蔵大学)
伊藤淑子 (大正大学)
大会準備委員 上原正博
大野美砂
辻祥子
中村善雄
橋本安央