

NHSJ Newsletter

第25号 2007年2月8日
日本ナサニエル・ホーソーン協会事務局
〒156-8550 東京都世田谷区桜上水3-25-40
日本大学文理学部英文学科内
E-mail: hawthorne@c01.itscom.net
公式HP: <http://home.b05.itscom.net/nhs-j/>
郵便振替 00190-1-66463

ご挨拶

会長 當 麻 一太郎

去る5月の第25回全国大会には、大勢の皆様のご参加をいただき、様々な研究問題が提起され、充実した大会になりました。東海学園大学長の村瀬忠雄先生はじめ学園当局、倉橋洋子先生、大場厚志先生、中村栄造先生、大会準備委員の先生方および事務局の先生方の多大なご支援、ご協力によるものであり、ここに厚くお礼申し上げます。また、特別講演をされた平石貴樹先生はじめ研究発表をされた先生方、ワークショップおよびシンポジウムを担当された先生方、司会の先生方および本大会を支えてくださったすべての方々に感謝申し上げます。

第26回全国大会は、5月18日(金)・19日(土)の両日、日本大学で開催させていただくことになりました。大会準備委員の先生方、事務局の先生方を中心に充実した大会を目指したいと考えています。

次の役員改選は2007年5月ですが、一部すでに異動があったことをご報告申し上げます。大会準備委員の後任として成田雅彦先生、齋藤幸子先生、西谷拓也先生が着任いたしました。前委員の丹羽隆昭先生、入子文子先生、下河辺美知子先生にはこれまで大変長い間、協会の発展のためにご支援とご協力を賜り、感謝申し上げます。また、新委員の先生方にもご快諾いただき感謝申し上げます。

東北支部研究会は発展的に解消することになりました。阿野文朗先生には、国際渉外室の激務だけでなく東北支部研究会の発展のためにもご尽力をいただきました。毎年欠かさずNewsletterにお寄せいただいた数々の詳細緻密な情報と「支部会だより」を忘れることができません。会員諸氏を代表しましてここに厚くお礼を申し上げます。

異動ではありませんが、この紙面をお借りしまして、竹村和子先生にも衷心より感謝申し上げます。第13号からこれまでの長い間、一度も途切れることなくBook Newsの原稿をお寄せいただきました。執筆依頼の時期になると、時間と労力を注いでいただいた竹村先生のBook NewsがNewsletterに不可欠な存在であることに気づき、水や空気に対するように竹村先生に感謝する気持ちが欠けていると反省するばかりです。改めて会員諸氏を代表しここに厚くお礼を申し上げます。

2005年5月に島田太郎前会長のあとを受けてからはや一年半が立ちました。島田前会長がNewsletterに記された「ただひたすら願うことは、会員諸氏、特に若手の方々が積極的に研究発表や『フォーラム』の原稿募集に応じて、活発な研究活動を展開して下さることです」という強い想いを真摯に受け止め、2005年度から『フォーラム』を再び毎年刊行する運びとなりました。

『フォーラム』が、『英語青年』(2006年4月)の紙面で「日本における学術雑誌」のひとつとして紹介されました。この紹介によって『フォーラム』が堅実な活動をしている学会の学術雑誌であることが証されたと思います。

去る12月9日の役員会において「日本学会会議協力学術研究団体」に登録するか否かについてお諮りいたしました。その結果、満場一致で登録の申請することになりましたので、ここにご報告し、引き続き密な協力態勢を取りながらより一層の発展をめざしたいと考えております。

The Twenty-Fifth Annual Conference of the Nathaniel Hawthorne Society of Japan

Synopses of Presentations

Hawthorne's Ironic Bacchus in *The Blithedale Romance*

Kayoko NAKANISHI (Graduate Student at Kyoto University)

Dionysus in the Greek myth, or Bacchus in the Roman counterpart, is the god of theater as well as of wine. In *The Blithedale Romance*, Coverdale takes on the attribute of the god of wine when he, in his hermitage in Blithedale and a in hotel room in Boston, imagines the harvest of his vintage and the wine produced by him. In these seclusions, he is also given the attribute of the god of theater or a position as “the Chorus in a classic play,” peeping at other characters’ performances at his “private theater.”

Ironically, however, Coverdale as Bacchus has to practice temperance, for one thing, and cannot know the whole events that happen in his theater, for another. The descriptions of wine and grape-vines are ubiquitous in *The Blithedale Romance* and function as the device to give Coverdale this ironic role of Bacchus: the god of wine and theater, going dry and kept away from the stage. This literary strategy enables the author to unite four separate themes of the work into an organic whole: (1) Hawthorne's experience in Brook Farm, (2) a manifestation against the temperance movement, (3) a moral conversion and “providence,” and (4) the author's dilemma as an artist represented by the unreliable narrator.

The adaptation of Hawthorne's own discovery of a grapevine at Brook Farm and the descriptions of the temperance movement and wine in “Earth's Holocaust” reveal the important role of the wine god going dry. The parallels of *The Blithedale Romance* with *Frogs* by Aristophanes afford a better understanding of the author's use of the god of theater. The contrast of irresolute Coverdale with heroic Quicksilver, the transformed Bacchus in *A Wonder Book for Girls and Boys*, explains a deeper significance of the author's elaborate scheme of the ironic Bacchus. For Hawthorne, the failed Bacchus related to the idea of “providence” is not only instrumental in generating an organic structure but also relevant to his view of life and art.

The Stabilization of Family History as a Pictorial Record

Mamiko KOMIYAMA (The Center for Asian and Pacific Studies, Seikei University)

I discussed the contrasting roles of the daguerreotypes in the *The House of the Seven Gables* (1851). They help maintain Colonel Pyncheon's curse on his descendants, but also eventually liberate them from that curse. Although Colonel Pyncheon had died 160 years ago, he survived in the form of a self-portrait hanging in the parlor, and in a daguerreotype of his descendant Judge Pyncheon. The frowning figure in the daguerreotype expresses Judge Pyncheon's true personality, often hidden behind his smiling face, but it also evokes Colonel Pyncheon's self-portrait, and thereby haunts his descendants with his past misdeeds.

Contrastingly, the daguerreotype of the judge's corpse enables his own descendants to free themselves from Colonel Pyncheon's curse. That is, it confirms the end of the long history of the Pyncheon family, as well as the beginning of new possibilities for those associated with it. For instance, because it provides evidence of Judge Pyncheon's death, it clears Clifford, his cousin, of suspicion for the murder which had hung over him for thirty years. The daguerreotype also allows the photographer Holgrave to confirm Judge Pyncheon's death and take revenge against Colonel Pyncheon for his own ancestor Maule, whose land was unjustly taken by the Colonel. Finally the daguerreotype brings the Pyncheon lineage to an end by serving as the only record of the judge's death. Unlike modern photography, the daguerreotype could not be reproduced. For those reasons, Holgrave makes it possible to stabilize the successive Pyncheon's images fixed on the un-duplicative photograph symbolically.

Reading “Ethan Brand” Ethan, Ahab and “the Unpardonable Sin”

Toshiaki TAKAHASHI (Nihon University)

Nathaniel Hawthorne’s contemporary critic, Edwin P. Whipple, regards “Ethan Brand” (1851) as “one of the most powerful of Hawthorne’s works” and it seems that the powerfulness of the work is derived from the sentences that read “Within the ribs — strange to say — was the shape of a human heart./ “Was the fellow’s heart made of marble?” cried Bartram, in some perplexity at this phenomenon.” (CE102) By the allegorical fact that Ethan Brand’s heart is turned to marble readers are seized with fear beyond allegory. It is this powerfulness of fear that attests to the vitality of the work, and its origin consists in “the Unpardonable Sin” Ethan’s heart embraces.

So, what on earth is “the Unpardonable Sin” Ethan (or Hawthorne) mentions? I think what clearly reaches its essence are Leo Marx’s words: “The Unpardonable Sin is the great sin of the Enlightenment — the idea of knowledge as an end in itself. Now he recognizes the destructiveness of the idea. Lonely, desperate, alienated from nature and mankind, he plunges to his death in the kiln.” (*The Machine in the Garden*, [Oxford: OUP, 1964] 273) That is, “the Unpardonable Sin is the great sin of the Enlightenment — the idea of knowledge as an end in itself.” Having committed “the sin of an intellect” (CE90) like that, Ethan plunges into the flaming limekiln in consequence of his recognition of “the destructiveness of the idea,” his loneliness, despair and alienation from nature and mankind. It is difficult for us to see Ethan’s salvation and reconciliation with God in such a rebellious attitude against God. However, in the journey of Ethan’s soul as reflected in the way of his death, we find that existential questions concerning modern men are inquired into repeatedly. Further, “the Unpardonable Sin” as a moment of repeated inquiry echoes Ahab’s sin in *Moby-Dick*.

In this thesis I hope to reveal the parallel nature of both Ethan’s “Unpardonable Sin” and Ahab’s sin, and confirm the profundity of spiritual bonds between Hawthorne and Melville.

Narrative Strategy

Tetsuya FUJISAWA (Graduate Student at Okayama University)

It is generally considered that Brand’s search for the “Unpardonable Sin” is a useless attempt because all he finds the sin in his own heart. However, since Brand makes a journey, through intellectual development, he can nevertheless define what the sin is. Therefore, his journey cannot be said to be useless. Moreover, the definition of the sin changes after Brand comes back to the village. It is Brand himself that seems to assume that his search is of no use and that nobody has such a sin.

Probably most readers accept Brand’s assumption, but he does not provide any chances for them to feel empathy for him. The narrator hardly reveals Brand’s points of view or inner states, and Brand does not talk much. It seems reasonable to suppose that readers’ sympathy with the narrator alone will lead them to sympathy for Brand.

I will take two examples to illustrate this sympathy. First, there are some events about which the narrator has previously informed readers. This strategy arouses readers’ curiosity and helps them identify with the narrator. Moreover, since readers become nervous when they have a lot of things they do not know, they tend to rely on the narrator. Second, the narrator sometimes behaves as if he were a character. (Franz K. Stanzel calls him “the teller-character.”) In other words, he narrates as if he were a first person narrator, whom readers are apt to sympathize with.

Brand’s assumption is narrated as the “teller-character’s” impression. Readers who sympathize with the narrator seem to take this impression as authentic. The narrator narrates Brand’s reminiscences of his past and his journey and, at the same time, it is the narrator who defines the Unpardonable Sin. Yet readers think of the narrator’s definition as being Brand’s. As for the sin, the narrator has it under his control. He utilizes Brand’s assumption to place the focus on the sin. Narrating as the

“teller-character,” he suggests the possibility that anyone can recreate the sin. It is likely that the German Jew and Bartram are similar to Brand in that they are in a want of love and reverence for the Human Soul.

Brand’s Eye

Hirofumi HORIKIRI (Nihon University)

The nineteenth-century was an age of revolution in visual culture, from the invention of photography by Niepce and Daguerre to the invention of cinematograph by the Lumière brothers. People tried to see nature as it was. There was no imagination but the lens, another eye, between man and object.

‘Ethan Brand’ is a story of Brand’s act of seeing; he used to watch his kiln in the forest but then goes throughout the world in search of the ‘Unpardonable Sin’ by looking into human heart. After finding that the ‘Unpardonable Sin’ is in his own heart, he comes back to the same place and watches his kiln again. Brand devotes himself to looking into the human heart and refuses to be looked at by others. As a consequence, he loses his hold on ‘the magnetic chain of humanity.’

Brand, like a camera, tries to see the human heart as it is and becomes unable to sympathize with others. However, we can see how he wants to sympathize with others by seeing what is truly in another’s heart.

Is Ethan Brand the worst sinner that is never saved?

Takashi SHIMBORI (Toyo University)

Although it is assumed that the definition of the unpardonable sin is shown in the tale “Ethan Brand” and it is taken for granted that Ethan Brand committed it, doesn’t the author imply any possibility that Ethan is saved?

Some sentences imply that Ethan Brand is not saved. First, Ethan Brand says “the unpardonable sin” is “the sin of an intellect that triumphed over the sense of brotherhood with man and reverence for God, and sacrificed everything to its own mighty claims” and Ethan’s acts surely correspond with his own definition. Second, Ethan, one of the human beings that are supposed to have been created from the soil of the ground by Yahweh God, is not allowed to return to it. Ethan’s bones burned, changed into lime and mixed with lime made of burned marble. His bones, mixed with the latter, are used as a material of resources for the remarkably developing industries in the 19th century. On the other hand, there are some descriptions implying Ethan might have been saved. First, the lime which his bones are burned into is “snow-white”. Second, his skeleton is “in the attitude of a person who, after a long toil, lies down to long repose”. Ethan says that the unpardonable sin “is the only sin that deserves recompense of immortal agony”, but he was certainly released from some form of suffering. Furthermore, who can say that Ethan is never allowed to receive the bliss of God, suggested by the description of Grayrock in the morning after Ethan burned to death, considering that he reached the same, final end, “death”, which all human beings inevitably reach? It seems that it is contradictory for the author to leave even the slightest possibility that Ethan, who committed the unpardonable sin, is saved. Did he really commit “the unpardonable sin”?

The definition of “the Unpardonable Sin” in this tale is described in Ethan’s words, not the author’s nor the narrator’s. In addition, it doesn’t seem that Ethan intended to do experiments with human beings as objects and violate the human heart from the beginning. He first began “to contemplate” and “then *ensued that vast intellectual development, which, in its progress, disturbed the counterpoise between his mind and heart*”. (Italics are mine.) His “heart ceased to partake of the universal throb”. As a result, he became “a cold observer, looking on mankind as the subject of his experiment”, and “lost his hold on the magnetic chain of humanity”. Ethan Brand is different from Roger Chillingworth, who intentionally tortures Arthur Dimmesdale without accepting Hester’s pleas to stop. Ethan, aware of his acts as sinful, stopped them and came back to Grayrock. Ethan Brand’s acts were not intentional at first. His later violation of the human heart resulted from the sad weakness and im-

perfection of human beings. This should be taken into consideration.

The complicated feelings mingling in his heart also need to be considered. First, he takes in the pride of having gained high intellect and having found out the unpardonable sin. Still, his pride is not firmly established until he reaches the top of the lime-kiln. If his pride had been firmly established, his laughter should have been more pleasant and cheerful. Second, he sneers at himself, which can be seen through his “laughter of scorn”. Although Ethan Brand was named after Ethan the sage in *The Old Testament*, he found out what he had been seeking for in his own heart, which must have been absolutely humiliating for him. Third, he feels an intense isolation, which communicates itself to Joe and makes tears come to his eyes. The fourth is his “painful” “doubt” at his reunion with his old friends, “whether he had indeed found the Unpardonable Sin”. Furthermore, it also seems that his doubt stems from the remorse toward the persons who he sacrificed for his quest, because of which Ethan “quailed” beneath old Humphrey’s eye. This remorse made Ethan react excessively to the Jewish traveler, which must have been because Ethan was touched on the raw.

Thus, Ethan came back to Grayrock in such a complicated psychological condition, and finally chose his pride. He recalls that after “his highest effort”, as “the bright and gorgeous flower, and rich, delicious fruit of his life’s labor, he ... *produced* the Unpardonable sin”. (Italics are mine.) This feeling would have made his pride fairly strong. Thinking of his experiments on the human heart in which he controlled the hearts of a number of human beings and made them commit sins, exactly as the Devil does, he was convinced that he would not be able to expiate his sin. He supposed that he did not deserve God’s mercy. At this moment, his desperation, due to his worthlessness of enjoying God’s mercy, and his pride mingled together in his heart. His God-defying and fiend-like expression at the top of the kiln resulted from his awareness of his pride in his discovery and his desperation out of severing relations with God. In the view of Christianity, Ethan Brand could never be saved because he closed his heart and did not receive the Holy Spirit. (*The New Testament*. “John” 20:22) This is really the unpardonable sin in its most fundamental meaning.

However, through dying, Ethan was able to release himself from his self-derision, an intense isolation, remorse, and desperation. The author, Nathaniel Hawthorne, who was introversive by nature, wanted to regard the human heart as a sanctuary that others are never allowed to invade. And to him the violation of the human heart seemed to be the unpardonable sin. But taking into consideration the violation of the human heart, in relation with the theological pardon in Christianity, he was not able to be completely convinced that the invasion of this sanctuary was really “unpardonable”. At the point of time when he wrote this tale, his conception of “the Unpardonable Sin” seems to have been as ambiguous as the one written in *The American Notebooks*. Also, Hawthorne could not completely deny Aylmer’s attitude to seek the scientific truth, neither could he deny Ethan’s attitude, seemingly. Hawthorne left the slight possibility of Ethan’s being saved because he could not condemn his acts, taking into consideration his psychology and destiny. Additionally, it is possible that Hawthorne wished to avoid being the final judge, not being so bold as to accept that role himself. It may be that his belief in the human weakness and imperfection prevented him from being able to describe a totally unpardonable sinner.

Special Lecture

Hawthorne: Mesmerism and the Individual

Takaki HIRAISHI (The University of Tokyo)

When I first read Hawthorne’s novels in my graduate years, I was confused by the author’s peculiar interest in mesmerism and mesmeric powers as revealed in *The House of Seven Gables* and, most clearly in *The Blithedale Romance*. Hawthorne has a pessimistic attitude toward mesmerism to be sure, but then, does he insist on confronting the theory for the sole purpose of denying it? Study guides tell me that pseudo-scientific thoughts such as mesmerism were very popular in the early nineteenth century and that Hawthorne’s future wife, Sophia, was inclined to accept these ideas naively, much to Hawthorne’s irritation. But I am still not satisfied with this reason for his meddling with such outmoded topics, however popular they may have been, in his works. I surmise that he was trying to develop his ideas of modern American fiction and modern human be-

ings. Does mesmerism in his works show, after all, that he was less modern than his credulous contemporaries?

After almost two decades, when I began reading Mark Twain, I happened to learn that Twain was also influenced by the so-called spiritualism of his day, the world of mediums and séances. He made fun of a fraudulent medium in *Life on the Mississippi*, as is well known, which does not contradict his belief in spiritualism at all; on the contrary, his biography tells us that he actually went so far as to visit a medium once to talk to his dead brother, but was disappointed by the unsuccessful results of this attempt. In fact, he was not able to converse with “the other side,” even regarding the simplest matters. His sarcastic treatment of the medium in his Mississippi book does not necessarily attest to his cool incredulity, but rather to an anger on his part at the medium who betrayed him. Most probably, Twain never convinced himself that there existed a medium anywhere who was both successful and honest. He subscribed to an English spiritualist journal for a long time, while also entertaining an interest in Christian Science, whose original doctrine was akin to mesmerism.

These biographical facts in Twain’s life mesh nicely with his obviously spiritualistic works such as *The Mysterious Stranger*, while also enhancing the reading of the work usually regarded as the most representative of modern American fiction, *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. In so far as Huck independently decides to help Jim to freedom, a decision completely opposed to the society of slavery in which he lives, the work may indeed be appraised as a monument of individualism in modern American literature. However, looking at it from a different angle, we can see that few novels are so abundant with ghosts, curses of the dead and other spiritual elements as this narrative of Huck’s. Huck, himself, is extremely superstitious. A final evaluation we must give him, therefore, would be that he is at once modern in terms of his individualism, yet pre-modern in terms of his devotion to superstition. Though general criticism of the work emphasizes the modernist aspects of the work while classifying its pre-modernism as a simple device for humor, we conclude that the two aspects are intertwined in Huck’s life, and in Twain life, and, perhaps, in human life in general.

Twain’s use of the double-sided modern individual and the pre-modern spiritualist makes me consider again the spiritualistic scenes in Hawthorne’s works. Twenty years after first reading Hawthorne, I now understand how it is absolutely necessary for Hawthorne to confront mesmerism squarely when he tries to explore in his own concept of individualism and free-will, because the kind of mesmerism, in which someone’s mind is controlled by someone else, becomes sheer denial of both of them. The deep psychology of human beings, which fascinated Hawthorne throughout his life, would also be reduced to nothing if it were simply thought of as device used for the purpose of controlling others from the outside.

Hawthorne had fostered a theme of the individual conscious which was opposed to the mesmerism of his day. One of his most famous remarks concerning mesmerism was that it would violate the “sacredness of [the] individual,” a remark made in his letter to Sophia in 1841. The “sacredness of [the] individual,” needless to say, is the very basis for his study of human psychology and sin. For this reason, then, Hawthorne must have deliberately decided to include mesmerism in *The Blithedale Romance*, in order to criticize it as a pre-modern superstition, and, conversely, to defend the idea of the sacredness of the individual.

It seems that in his previous work, *The House of Seven Gables*, he was rather ambiguous as to the effects of mesmerism; they could be benevolent, he concludes, if the mesmerist is well-intentioned, as Holgrave is toward Phoebe. But in *The Blithedale Romance*, which was published in the glory days of American spiritualism, Hawthorne takes a decisive stance. Hollingsworth’s strong voice breaks down Priscilla’s sleepwalking, which was being manipulated by Westervelt. In this sense, Hollingsworth is an American literary hero who single-handedly defeats the ill-intended mesmerist once and for all, and in so doing establishes the “sacredness of [the] individual.”

But every reader knows that Hollingsworth is not treated favorably, either by Hawthorne or by the novel’s narrator, Coverdale. He is said to be selfish after all, because he uses others for his own purposes. Hawthorne clearly finds something dangerous in individualism as such, because, as in Hollingsworth’s case, it might lead to a tendency to control others for one’s selfish desires. Hence comes Zenobia’s final and accurate description of Hollingsworth: “A cold, heartless, self-beginning and self-ending piece of mechanism! Self! self, self!”

Zenobia’s repetition of “self, self” indicates his selfish desires, while at the same time, she also means that Hollingsworth’s inherent personality fault is his individualistic self, whose “sacredness” is doubtlessly more important than his inclination to selfishness. This, at least from the point of view of the modernization of American literature, however repulsive it may have appeared to the author and the other characters. There is certainly a difference here between Hollingsworth’s individualism and Huck Finn’s. Nobody has ever accused Huck’s ‘s decision-making and free thinking to

ever be selfish while Zenobia's final damnation of Hollingsworth condemns him to be completely so. In any case, Hollingsworth's strong action against mesmerism shows that Hawthorne was a serious writer who found it necessary to deny mesmerism at the peak of its popularity, in order to establish the theme of a strong individual as the very basis of modern literature. The real hero was Hawthorne himself.

Symposium

“Hawthorne and Family”

Yoko KURAHASHI (Tokai Gakuen University)

In the Symposium, “Hawthorne and Family,” is discussed from four points of view considering the 17th to 19th century American family and social environment. The first point is Hawthorne's image of split fathers: The father in *The Scarlet Letter* is discussed in comparison with the ideal family from the 17th to 19th century. The second point is Hawthorne's image of mother: The influence of Hawthorne's mother, widow Elizabeth, on “The Hollow of the Three Hills” is discussed with consideration of the social environment of widows in 19th-century Salem. The third point is Hawthorne's newly-married couple: The domestic violence in “The Birth-mark” is discussed based on feminism. The fourth point is Hawthorne's image of his children: The influence of Hawthorne's two children on the ‘neutral territory’ is discussed in connection with “The Snow-Image: A Childish Miracle.”

“Hawthorne's Image of Split Fathers”

Hawthorne's home environment in his childhood is different from the 19th-century ideal one, of “true home,” toward which he has an influential but ambivalent feeling to his life and his works. Chillingworth succeeds in his work as a doctor but not being the head of family, a father which has been his long desire since his marriage. It is his desire to control Hester, Dimmesdale and Pearl as the head of family. For that reason he makes Hester keep his identity, lives with Dimmesdale and leaves his property for Pearl. Dimmesdale is the father of Pearl but has not succeeded in his work as a clergyman yet. Both of them struggle to be “true men” in “true home” in the 19th century. Hawthorne himself has been split between the success of his work and his home. Chillingworth and Dimmesdale are Hawthorne's image of split fathers.

Family Disruption in “The Hollow of the Three Hills”

— Mother as the Inmost Center of Family Circle —

Sachiko SAITO (Kawamura Gakuen Woman's University)

At the beginning of his career Hawthorne wrote “The Hollow of the Three Hills”, a domestic tragedy which introduces the theme of family disruption. Why did young Hawthorne have a very deep interest in the erring mother who abandoned her child, husband and parents “with whom her fate was intimately bound” and who made a home desolate? The reason can be found in the family concept of Hawthorne who suffered from a series of losses and dissociation in his childhood. Firstly, after exploring the reason why Hawthorne missed his mother in his childhood, I discuss his poignant realization that the absence of a mother was more serious for a family than that of a father, especially in seafaring towns such as Salem in the 19th century where early widowhood was a common fate. Secondly, paying attention to the fact that Hawthorne intensively read Rousseau's *Emile or Education* in 1830 when he wrote “The Hollow of the Three Hills”, I discuss the relation between the influences of Rousseau's *Emile or Education* upon the images of Hawthorne's widow mother and Hawthorne's deep interest in the erring mother in “The Hollow of the Three Hills”.

“The Birth-Mark” and Domestic Violence

Yuichi TAKEDA (Nanzan University)

I have attempted to read Hawthorne’s “The Birth-Mark” as a story of domestic violence. Representing itself as a tale of brilliant scientific investigation, “The Birth-Mark” turns out to be the story of a husband’s fatal violence toward his young wife in the domestic sphere. The narrative space is the home in which the married life of the couple is played out; the home serves as a kind of laboratory for domestic “education.” Georgiana’s death is a sign for her complete submission to her husband’s fantasies of perfection; she learns domesticity as masochistic self-effacement and becomes a “perfect” woman for patriarchy. If “The Birth-Mark” reveals anything about “Hawthorne and Family,” it would be the uncanny aspect of domestic ideology and patriarchy.

Hawthorne and His Children

Hisao INOUE (Seiwa College)

Hawthorne wrote many tales in which children take on important roles. For example, Pearl in *The Scarlet Letter*, a grandson of Peter Hovenden in “The Artist of the Beautiful,” Annie in “The Little Annie’s Ramble,” Joe in “Ethan Brand,” and Violet and Peony in “The Snow-Image: A Childish Miracle.” Of these tales, “The Snow-Image” is less admired than the other ones. It is seldom anthologized, rarely cited, and almost never praised. However, “The Snow-Image” is no less significant than the others, considering the relationship between Hawthorne and his children. As is well known, this short tale reflects Hawthorne’s observations of his own children, Una and Julian, upon whom Violet and Peony are obviously modeled.

In “The Snow-Image,” Hawthorne tries to indicate the wondrous ability of children through Violet’s and Peony’s playing with the snow-image in the yard. That is to say, he tries to indicate that children have a wonderful ability to play in the middle world between the real and the fairy world. As you have already noticed, this middle world is like the ‘neutral territory’ of “The Custom House” introduction to *The Scarlet Letter*. Hawthorne states that this neutral territory is “somewhere between the real world and fairy-land, where the Actual and the Imaginary may meet, and each imbue itself with the nature of the other.” Hawthorne regards the middle world and the neutral territory as almost the same situation.

When Hawthorne was young, he had the ability to write tales which revealed how he could feel this wondrous world or neutral territory. However, while he worked for the custom house at Salem, he lost such sensibility as he had had in his childhood and youth. In other words, he had walked away from the wondrous world and had lost the supreme bliss. Hawthorne states, “An entire class of susceptibilities, and a gift connected with them — of no great richness or value, but the best I had — was gone from me.”

During the period in which Hawthorne was writing “The Snow-Image,” he enjoyed watching his two children playing in the yard. However, he felt that his sensibility had gone from him. Through “The Snow-Image,” we notice that Hawthorne felt happiness as a father of two children on the one hand and anxiety as a romance writer on the other.

Column

ソファイアとユーナ、ホーソーンのふところへ

當麻一太郎（日本大学）

お帰りなさい。ナサニエル・ホーソーン夫人、そしてユーナ。NPR (National Public Radio), Hawthorne in Salem, BBC News, History News Network, *Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* が, “Nathaniel Hawthorne, Family Reunited in Grave”, “Author and Wife Reunited in Death”, “Nathaniel and Sophia Reunited after 142 Years” などのようにまちまちの見出しで、ホーソーン夫人とユーナの帰国を報じた。二頭馬車に乗せられた棺、花束が手向けられた二人の真新しい墓石、アリソン・ホーソーン・デミングさんがスピーチをする様子などが貼りつけてあった。ホーソーンの墓石に並んだ二人の墓石

の写真に加えて、ソファイアに宛てたホーソーンの恋文も載せられていた。

I love thee thou dearest. It is only when I am away from thee that the chill winds of the world make me shiver. Thou always keepst me warm and always wilt."

ソファイアとユーナの埋葬地移転のきっかけは、*Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* が伝えるところに依れば、「ユーナによってソファイアの墓地の傍らに植えられたサンザシの木が倒れて墓標を傷つけた」(NHR 95 [Vol. 32 No.2 Fall 2006]) ことに依るらしい。

ホーソーンに寄り添うように埋葬されるべきソファイアが、3千マイルも離れたケンサル・グリーンに埋葬(二枚の写真は、倒れる前のサンザシの木と墓標)され、142年という長い間、二人は離ればなれになっていた。ソファイアが、夫の死後、アメリカを離れ、イギリスで亡くなってしまったからである。

夫の遺体がスリーピー・ホロー墓地に埋葬された1864年5月23日以来、深い悲しみに打ち萎れていても、経済的に窮していても、ソファイアを支えていたものは3人の子どもの成長と夫の残した形になっていない原稿の出版にあったように思える。

1866年のこと、ロングフェロー(Henry Wadsworth Longfellow)はローウェル(James Russell Lowell)にホーソーンの伝記を書くよう促し、ソファイアにもその旨を伝えたことがあった。しかし、ソファイアはローウェルに夫の日記を使わせようとしなかった。結局、ローウェルはホーソーンの日記を入手できず、この計画はなくなった。

この出来事は、ローウェルの知己のノートン(Charles Eliot Norton)にも伝わっていて、ノートンは、ローウェルに宛てた1866年10月19日づけの手紙の中で「ホーソーン夫人があなたの事情に応じることもせず、また、夫の伝記に関する書き物を託さないなんてなんと残念なことか。何という間違いか。[中略]ホーソーンの伝記作家がこれらの原稿を自由に使えないとしたら、適切な伝記など書けやしない」(Norton and Howe 292)とソファイアの行為を非難した。

また、ホーソーンの家族がイギリス滞在中、ホーソーンと大変強い信頼関係にあったブライト(Henry Bright)でさえ、ソファイアが夫の私的日記を出版したとき、驚きのあまり、ミルンズ(Monckton Milnes)に手紙を書き送ったと伝えられている。ブライトは手紙の中で「[日記の出版は]ホーソーンの名声を傷つける。[中略]未亡人は今は亡き夫の骨を粉にしてパンを焼いた」(Pope-Hennessy 195)と書いて彼女の出版を非難したというのである。

もしノートンの言う通り夫の日記をローウェルに託していたら、夫の名声は一層高まったかも知れない。もし誰かに出版を託して自らの手で出版するようなことをしなかったら、ブライトやイギリス人の批評家たちの攻撃も受けずに済んだかも知れない。しかし、遅く生きなければならなかった彼女のシチュエーションを考慮すれば、二人とももっと寛大な見方ができたかも知れない。

ソファイアには将来のための生活資金が必要であった。ソファイアは、ドレスデン・ポリテクニクで土木工学を勉強したい、というジュリアンの希望を叶えるため、1868年10月20日、ユーナとローズを連れてドレスデンに向けてニューヨーク



を後にした。ユーナは24歳、ジュリアンは22歳、ローズは17歳になっていたという (Loggins 304) が、金銭的に楽で無かったことは事実である。子どもたちのため、生活資金のため、『イングリッシュ・ノートブックス抜粋』の出版に精魂を注いだのであろう。夫の名を汚さないように、また知己の非難を受けないように、細心の注意を払い、日記に登場する人たち宛の手紙で彼らの名前を記載する許可を求めもした。何人に許可を求めたか不明であるが、1869年6月14日にドレスデンからパットモア (Coventry Patmore) に宛てて「[夫の] 日記の抜粋を同封します。もし原稿からその箇所を削除せよと仰ってくださいれば、そのように致します。でも、そう仰らないことを希望いたします。ブラウニング (Robert Browning) さんは、フルネームで自分のこととブラウン夫人の箇所を削らなくても良いと仰ってくださいました」(Champneys 98)と書いて許可を求めた。ソファイアの許可を求めたり、夫の記述を削除・修正をしている様子は、生活資金を稼ごうとしているというよりは、『緋文字』のヘスターが針仕事をし、一針一針にディムズデルに寄せる断ち切れぬ想いを込めている様子とイメージが重なる。「ヘスター・プリンにとって、これ[針仕事]は生きることの情熱を表現し、それ故に静める方法であった」ようにソファイアにとっても出版のためにする夫の日記の記述の削除・修正は生きる支えであったように思われる。

The Franco-Prussian War (普仏戦争) が1870年7月19日に勃発し、ドイツに外国人が住むのには危険性が高かったためソファイアの家族はイギリスに移り住むことになった。しかし、1871年の2月中旬のこと、予期しないことが起こった。以前に煩ったことのある肺炎が再発したのである。ソファイアは側にいた娘たちに「私どうしたのかしら。まるで逃げ場がないかのように無力な気分になるの」(Burton 96) と言ったという。彼女たちが部屋に入ってくると身を起こそうとして元気な姿を見せようとしたこともあったが、寝床に伏せたきりになってしまった。

ジュリアンはニューヨークに住んでいて、家族と一緒にいなかった。二人は、ベノック (Francis Bennock) 家の女中とホーソン家の召使いに助けられながら、一生懸命に母の看病をしたが、回復の見込みはなかった。意識がはっきりしているとき「疲れたわ。とっても疲れたわ。喜んで逝くわ。あなたたち二人とジュリアンのためにだけ生きたかったの」(96) という言葉を残して逝ったという。

1871年3月2日、ソファイアの訃報がイギリスの『タイムズ』に載った。

「偉大な小説家の未亡人、ナサニエル・ホーソン夫人が、病に伏せて間もないこの日曜日の朝、ケンジントン、シャフツベリー通りにある住まいで亡くなった。この夫人は、著名な夫を失った後、ヨーロッパにやって来て、ドレスデンにしばし居を構えた。そこで、旅行記やヨーロッパの美術館に関する寸評を出版する準備をした。その後、最近になって、彼女の夫の興味深く特色のあるイギリス滞在記が出版された。この作品の出版状況を見るため、昨年夏、イギリスに短期滞在をしている間、「濃霧など多くの障害があるけれど、イギリスの気候は世界中でもっとも良いところ」という夫の言葉を思いだし、イギリスに永久滞在をすることに決めた。多くの古い知己の住んでいる近所に住まいを定め、マサチューセッツ州のコンコードにあるウェイサイドの古い家から夫の好きな本および自分にとって大切な芸術品を取り寄せた。その後すぐ、最近の厳しい天候不順の折、風邪を拗らせ、数年前に罹ったことのある胸膜炎を煩った。2、3日前まで、危ぶむほどではなかったが、突然予期しない変化を来した。徐々に衰弱し、娘たちに付き添われ、幸い苦しむことなく息を引き取った。葬儀は、土曜日の2時から3時まで、ケンサル・グリーンで厳かに執り行われる。」(The Times 4 [Thursday, Mar. 2, 1871] 27000)

悲しみに泣くユーナとローズと共にブラウニング、コンウェイ (Moncure D. Conway)、チャニング (William Henry Channing)、スタージス (Russell Sturgis) らが棺側につきそって、ケンサル・グリーン墓地に埋葬した (Gould 70)。墓石には「ソファイア・ホーソン、ナサニエル・ホーソンの妻」、台石には「わたしはよみがえりであり、命である」と刻まれた。

ユーナについてはドレスデンからロンドンに越してから間もない頃の逸話がある。ユーナとローズが家へ帰る途中、汚い家が建ち並ぶ狭い路地に迷い込んでしまったことがあった。その時、ローズは早くこの不快な場所から脱出しようとユーナの腕を引いたが、ユーナは立ち止まって、灰色のぼろ服を着た汚い子どもたちを見ながら、「何時の日か、あの汚れた子どもたちを綺麗にしてあげるわ」(Burton 94) と言い、加えて「パパも、あの子どもたちは私たちの子どもたちと言うわ。また、あの子どもたちが汚いのは私たちの落ち度とも言うわ」と伝えたという。ローズが「あなた、そっくりそのままパパみたい」と言ったように、この逸話は、イギリスの貧しい子どもたちに対するホーソンの言葉を思い起こさせる。

ユーナは父親の考えを継いだ娘であったのだろう。今頃、同じ意見の父と再会したユーナは、母も交えて仲良くあれやこれや語り合っているだろうか。

ケンサル・グリーン墓地に埋葬されるまでの、ユーナの悲劇的生涯については、レイモナ・ハル (Raymona Hull) が *Una Hawthorne: a Biographical Sketch. The Nathaniel Hawthorne Journal 1976*. Ed. C. E. Frazer Clark, Jr. Colorado: Information Handling Service, 1978. 86-119 と題して纏めた詳細な伝記に委ね、ここで三人の冥福を祈りつつ、筆を擱くことにしたい。

ソファイアとユーナの埋葬地移転に関する情報は広島市立大学教授の山本雅氏に教えていただいた。また、二枚の写真は東京工芸大学教授の野呂浩氏からいただいた。お二人に感謝いたします。

引用文献

- Burton, Katherine. *Sorrow Built a Bridge: A Daughter of Hawthorne*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937
- Champneys, Basil. *Memoirs and Correspondence of Coventry Patmore*. Vol. I of 2 vols. London: George Bell and Sons, 1900.
- Gould, Elizabeth Porter. *The Brownings and America*. Boston: The Poet-lore Co., 1904.
- Loggins, Vernon. *The Hawthornes: The Story of Seven Generations of an American Family*. New York: Columbia UP, 1951.
- Maynard, Theodore. *A Fire Was Lighted; The Life of Rose Hawthorne Lathrop*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1948.
- Norton, Sara. and Howe, DeWolfe. *Letters of Charles Eliot Norton with Biographical Comment*. Vol. I of 2 vols. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913.
- Pop-Hennessy, James. *Monckton Milnes: The Flight of Youth 1851-1885*. London: Constable, 1951.

Book News

What if : Life, People, Society

Kazuko TAKEMURA (Ochanomizu University)

Historically, biography, including autobiography, is a popular genre in the United States and Britain. The U.S. Amazon.com, for instance, provides a “biographies and memoirs” category for book searching, while Amazon Japan does not have such a grouping for reference. Even so, the recent publication rush of biographies is remarkable concerning Nathaniel Hawthorne. As introduced in my past annual reviews, the following voluminous or newly-perspective biographies came out in succession during the last couple of years: Brenda Wineapple’s *Hawthorne: A Life* (2003), Philip McFarland’s *Hawthorne in Concord* (2004), and Megan Marshall’s *The Peabody Sisters* (2005).

This year two more biographical or documental works were published, *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography* by Milton Meltzer and *Elizabeth Manning Hawthorne: A Life in Letters* edited by Cecile Anne de Rocher. As its title shows, Susan Cheever’s *American Bloomsbury: Louisa May Alcott, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry David Thoreau: Their Lives, Their Loves, Their Work* is also a biographical work on the liaisons between Hawthorne and his peers. Furthermore, all books on Hawthorne published during this year (see the list below) can be said to deal with the writer’s real life to some extent.

What is noticeable in the recent biographical works is that they tend to cast light on the people surrounding Hawthorne, whose own histories or relationships with the writer had not quite been pursued before in spite of frequent mentions of them in Hawthorne criticism. One such blind spot is his elder sister, Elizabeth Manning Hawthorne (1802-83). Ironically enough, despite Hawthorne’s “injunction that none of this [biographical work] should be attempted” (Elizabeth’s letter; de Rocher 169), biographical and historical matters have been studied quite a lot about the writer as well as his family and his ancestors, compared with the cases of his contemporary “major” writers such as Emerson, Melville, Whitman, etc. Moreover, new-his-

toricist and feminist studies have extended their scopes further to the author's relationships with his relatives and acquaintances such as his uncle, Robert Manning, his sisters-in-law, the Peabody sisters, and his society in Concord and Salem. But so far there has been scarcely anything about his own two-year elder sister. Nevertheless, she exchanged with her brother "the poems and essays they had created" (Loggins 230; de Rocher 6) in their younger days, when they "spent long hours alone, day and night, reading, fantasizing, and writing" (de Rocher 6). Their younger sister, Maria Louisa Hawthorne, seems not to have shown such literary inclination as her siblings did.

Elizabeth Manning Hawthorne, all her life long, engaged herself in writing letters to her family, friends, and acquaintances, which are now contained at Bowdoin College, the Peabody-Essex Museum, and several other libraries. Cecile Anne de Rocher's newly-published book selects 118 letters out of them and includes these in three sections chronologically: 27 letters from 1814 (when Elizabeth was 11) to 1842 (a few days before the marriage between Nathaniel and Sophia); 70 letters from 1851 (just after the publication of *The House of the Seven Gables*) to 1871 (Sophia's death); and 21 letters from 1871 to 1882 (one year before Elizabeth's own death).

Certainly, Elizabeth's epistles help us reexamine the social milieu of nineteenth century America as documents of personal views of the social and political vicissitudes of that period, as the editor claimed. But more importantly (at least to me), they reveal the gender inequality of her time in the choice of the tenor of life. Her correspondence shows her infatuation for literature. For instance, Elizabeth wrote in the following way to Elizabeth Peabody, her sister-in-law, who ran a bookstore (a gathering place for Transcendentalists): "If you do not want this volume of Balzac, I should like to keep it for Nathaniel to read, next Sunday.... But do you believe that such conversations as are related in some of his volumes could ever have been uttered?" (63). This was written in 1840. It is uncertain what novel "this volume of Balzac" means. Surely, however, she was very quick to read contemporary French novels with a critical discernment for literary works.

Some of her letters to Sophia, her brother's wife, indicate the same wish of hers, saying, for instance, she "should have returned it [the fourth volume of Carlyle] sooner, but wished to keep it for Nathaniel to read, which he did with great pleasure" (62). But this letter also demonstrates to its recipient her strong bond with her brother through their literary affinity, which she assumed they formed together since their childhood. Here is registered Elizabeth's highly complicated feelings: her conscious or unconscious restraint of her ambition to be a professional writer, her desire to support her brother to be a writer in place of herself, her repressed jealousy toward him, (despite or because of this) her excessive attachment or supposedly incestuous love for him, her hatred and emulation of his brother's wife, etc.

She lived her life unmarried. Her "birth so soon after a marriage" (1), which "would have sent the parents before interrogation [like Hester Prynne in a seventeenth-century Puritan colony]" (1), may have deeply influenced her psyche during her early childhood, when she lived with her mother and siblings at the dwelling of her paternal family because of their father's long absence from home due to his occupation as a sea captain. This background of hers as well as her traumatic experience shared with Hawthorne of living a parasitic life with their maternal family after their father's untimely death might have molded her into a reflective child and, as she grew up, into the same type of literary person as her brother--or, I'd imagine, into more deeply-thinking a novelist than him owing to her assumed positionality as a woman writer in nineteenth-century America. It is intriguing to stretch our imagination, guessing what if Elizabeth would have written a novel. As for Hawthorne criticism, it may be helpful to reread Hawthorne's texts, tracing his sister's numerous personal letters.

Susan Cheever's *American Bloomsbury* came out just at the end of this year. The term, "Bloomsbury," may seem to be anticlimactic to those readers who have expected to know about "literary" affinities between the British and American circles of the experimental writers. But rather this book, delineating vividly the personal association among five of the writers in the Concord community, is a pleasant and, in a sense, instructive reading for Hawthorne scholars interested in supplying a sort of missing link in his career through their own imaginations. Yet Cheever's depiction of the writer's relationship with Margaret Fuller is too romanticized. Richard Williamson's *The Impact of Franklin Pierce on Nathaniel Hawthorne* could provide us with detailed information about the association between the writer and the politician. Unfortunately, however, its publication scheduled for the end of this year was delayed until March 2007.

Critical Companion to Nathaniel Hawthorne may be handy for both Hawthorne scholars and students, which consists of "Biography," "Works," "Related People, Places, and Topics," and "Appendices," including the chronologies of the writer's life and major works, selected bibliography of secondary sources, contemporary reviews, documents about the relationship between Hawthorne and Melville, and excerpts from Henry James's *Hawthorne*. The lists "for Further Reading" at the end of

some of the entries are helpful for students, and the "Index" is massive and convenient.

Milton Meltzer added a new work, *Nathaniel Hawthorne*, to his numerous biographies of litterateurs, such as Poe, Melville, Whitman, Emily Dickinson, Carl Sandberg, and Langston Hughes. This one, composed of twenty short (4-10 pages) chapters sketching Hawthorne's life in chronological sequence, makes a good introduction for students to the writer's activities and his days, with well selected illustrations--pictures, portraits, and photos. Russell Roberts's biography, more compact (about forty pages in all) and containing painted pictures and photos, is merely for novices.

Charles Tidler, an American playwright living in Canada, adapted "Rappaccini's Daughter" for the stage. Its premiere was given in the U.S. in 2003 while the script was published in 2005. Tidler's free adaptation alludes to present biotechnological issues such as, in his words, "frankenfood, agribusiness, cloning, bio-copying, [etc]" (6). In this sense Hawthorne's dark story published in 1844 can be said not only to address his contemporary issue of industrialization but also to foresee future consequences of the development of technology. "If you could take possession of the keys to the universe, ... [w]hat would you do?," said Tidler. This may also be Hawthorne's question posed to the readers of today, when advances in science and technology have come to realize Rappaccini's ambition to some extent. Incidentally, the nexus between Hawthorne's texts and modern industrial society has also been lately reexamined, for instance, in Andrew Loman's *Somewhat on the Community System: Representations of Fourierism in the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne* (2005), Betsy Klimasmith's "Architectural Determinism and the Industrial City in *The Blithedale Romance and Ruth Hall*" in *At Home in the City: Urban Domesticity in American Literature and Culture, 1850-1930* (2005), Milette Shamir's "Hawthorne's Romance and the Right to Privacy" in *Inexpressible Privacy: The Interior Life of Antebellum American Literature* (2005), Teresa Goddu's "Hawthorne and Class" in *What Democracy Looks Like: A New Critical Realism for a Post-Seattle World* (2006), and so forth.

Books on N. Hawthorne published in 2006 in the U.S. (excluding reprinted editions)

- Cheever, Susan. *American Bloomsbury: Louisa May Alcott, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Henry David Thoreau: Their Lives, Their Loves, Their Work*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- de Rocher, Cecile Anne, ed. *Elizabeth Manning Hawthorne: A Life in Letters*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *Miscellanies: Biographical and Other Sketches and Letters*. Boston & New York: Adamant Media Corporation.
- Meltzer, Milton. *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography*. Minneapolis: Twenty-First Century Books.
- Murfin, Ross C., ed. *The Scarlet Letter* (Case Studies in Contemporary Criticism). 2nd Revised Ed. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, Russell. *Nathaniel Hawthorne* (Classic Storytellers). Hockessin, Del.: Mitchell Lane Publishers.
- Wright, Sarah Bird. *Critical Companion to Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. New York: Facts on File.

Journal essays published in 2006 in the U.S.

- Adams, Fred C. "Blood Vengeance in *The Scarlet Letter*." *Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* (hereinafter referred to as *NHR*) 32.2: 1-12.
- Berson, Joel S. "Some Errors in Recording Hawthorne's Withdrawals of the Massachusetts Historical Society *Collections* and the *Gentleman's Magazine*." *NHR* 32.1: 71-73.
- Bonnet, Michèle. "Consuming Tragedy and 'the little cannibal' in *The House of the Seven Gables*." *ATQ* 20.2: 481-97.
- Cañadas, Ivan. "A New Source for the Title and Themes of *The Scarlet Letter*." *NHR* 32.1: 43-51.
- Chainer-Nowacki, Jessica. "Current Bibliography." *NHR* 32.2: 60-95.
- Church, Joseph. "A Problem of Conception and Creation in Hawthorne's 'The Artist of the Beautiful.'" *NHR* 32.2: 13-22.
- Coale, Samuel Chase. "Review of *The Half-Vanished Structure: Hawthorne's Allegorical Dialectics* by Magnus Ullén and *Men Beyond Desire: Manhood, Sex, and Violation in American Literature* by David Greven." *NHR* 32.2: 39-41.
- Dolis, John. "Review of *Hawthorne's Shyness: Ethics, Politics, and the Question of Engagement* by Clark Davis." *NHR* 32.2: 45-49.
- Gollin, Rita K. "Charles Ives's Hawthorne." *NHR* 32.2: 23-36.
- Hall, Julie E. "Review of *The Peabody Sisters: Three Women Who Ignited American Romanticism* by Megan Marchall." *NHR* 32.1: 74-80.

- Idol, John L. "Review of *From Fiction to Libretto: Irving, Hawthorne, and James as Opera* by Nassim Winnie Balestrini." *NHR* 32.2: 55-59.
- Jones, Wanda Faye. "Scopolamine Poisoning and the Death of Dimmesdale in *The Scarlet Letter*." *NHR* 32.1: 52-62.
- Joseph, Mary. "Nathaniel and Sophia Reunited after 142 Years." *NHR* 32.2: 96-100.
- Kesterson, David B. "Review of *The Elizabeth Manning Hawthorne: A Life in Letters*. Ed. Cecile Anne de Rocher." *NHR* 32.2: 50-54.
- Kopley, Richard. "A Contemporary Narrative Response to Hawthorne's 'The White Old Maid.'" *NHR* 32.1: 63-70.
- MacLeod, Glen. "Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Boston Athenaeum." *NHR* 32.1: 1-29.
- Neary, John. "Shadows and Illuminations: Spiritual Journeys to the Dark Side in 'Young Goodman Brown' and *Eyes Wide Shut*." *Religion & the Arts* 10.2: 244-70.
- Reynolds, Larry J. "Review of *Sophia Peabody Hawthorne: A Life, Volume 1* by Patricia Dunlavy Valenti." *NHR* 32.2: 37-38.
- Sayers, William. "Gardens of Horror and Delight: Hawthorne's 'Rappaccini's Daughter' and Boccaccio's *Decameron*." *NHR* 32.1: 30-42.
- Ullén, Magnus. "Reading with 'The Eye of Faith': The Structural Principle of Hawthorne's Romances." *Texas Studies in Literature & Language* 48.1: 1-36.

Books to be added to my 2005 list.

- Balestrini, Nassim Winnie. *From Fiction to Libretto: Irving, Hawthorne, and James as Opera*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang P.
- Greven, David. *Men Beyond Desire: Manhood, Sex, and Violation in American Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Levine, Robert S., ed. *The House of the Seven Gables* (Norton Critical Edition). 2nd Revised Ed. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Loman, Andrew. *Somewhat on the Community System: Representations of Fourierism in the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne*. London: Routledge.
- Tidler, Charles. *Rappaccini's Daughter*. Victoria, B.C., Canada: Ekstasis Editions.

Journal essays to be added to my 2005 list.

- Colacurcio, Michael J. "'Red Man's Grave': Art and Destiny in Hawthorne's 'Main-street.'" *NHR* 31.2:1-18.
- Cook, Jonathan A. "The Biographical Background to 'Rappaccini's Daughter.'" *NHR* 31.2: 34-73.
- Crouse, Jane S. "'If they have a moral power': Margaret Fuller, Transcendentalism, and the Question of Women's Moral Nature." *ATQ* 19.4: 259-79.
- Dunne, Michael. "Nathaniel Hawthorne's Calvinist Humor." *Studies in American Humor* 3.12: 1-16.*
- Gollin, Rita K. "'The Fairest Hope of Heaven': Hawthorne on Immortality." *NHR* 31.2: 74-89.
- Hoeverler, Diane Long. "Beatrice Cenci in Hawthorne, Melville, and Her Atlantic-Rim Contexts." *Romanticism on the Net* 38-39 (May-Aug.). Guest-eds. Joel Pace, Lance Newman and Chris Koenig-Woodyard. Université de Montréal.
- Jay, Elisabeth. "'Who Are You Gentle Reader?': John Updike--A Month of Sundays." *Literature & Theology* 19.4 : 346-54.
- Mayer, David R. "Artemisia Gentileschi as Artist Model for Miriam in Hawthorne's *The Marble Faun*." *NHR* 31.2: 19-33.
- Novak, Frank G. Jr. "The Satanic Personality in Updike's Roger's Version." *Christianity and Literature* 55.1: 3-26.*
- Raskin, Annie. "Hawthorne and the Daguerreotype--Portraits Gleaned from the Sun." *Mind's Eye* (Spring): 5-15.*
- Sweeting, Adam W. "Preserving the Renaissance: Literature and Public Memory in the Homes of Longfellow, Hawthorne, and Poe." *American Studies* 46.1: 23-43.
- Taylor, Olivia Gatti. "Cultural Confessions: Penance and Penitence in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun*." *Renascence* 58.2: 134-52.
- (Asterisks indicate that the essays are listed in Jessica Chainer-Nowacki's "Current Bibliography" but not available to me yet.)

仙台支部研究会

阿野文朗（東北大学名誉教授）

仙台支部研究会は、この度、2006年3月をもって「発展的解消」することとなりました。

私たちの研究会が「仙台談話会」(Sendai Symposium)として産声を上げたのは1985年6月のこと。振り返ると、前半の11年間は、私が勤務していた東北大学川内キャンパスの狭い外国語非常勤講師控え室（後では少し小奇麗な会議室）で、後半の10年間は、東北大学定年後勤務した仙台白百合女子大学の会議室（後ではマルチメディアルーム）で例会を開き、細々ながら21年間、活動してきたこととなります。最初の頃のレギュラー・メンバーは、故・横沢四郎先生（盛岡大学）、岡部敏氏（東北工業大学）、両角千江子さん（宮城学院女子大学）、秋葉勉氏（東北学院大学）、小島良一氏（東北薬科大学）、野呂浩氏（当時、尚絨大学院短期大学）、遠竹護氏（東北学院大学）、藤田秀樹氏（現在、富山大学）などで、それに運営の責任者として私に加わり、ほぼ毎月、月末の土曜午後には例会を開いていました。そして、談話会が軌道に乗るようになってからは、月1回の例会で2人ずつ発表を行ったりして、一同熱意に溢れていたのを思い出します。

これは談話会誕生前のこととなりますが、1881年10月11日、日本ホーソン協会が呱呱の声を上げると同時に、仙台で「編集室」の仕事をお引き受けし、私たちが第1号から第6号までのニューズレターの編集・発行に関わったことがあります。毎年、出来上がったニューズレターが笹氣印刷から届くと、やがて談話会のメンバーとなる皆さんに集まっていたいただき、手分けして封筒に住所氏名を手書きしては、全国の会員の皆さんにお送りしたことを覚えています。（談話会が誕生したのは第4号発行の後でした。）

1993年、大学改組のため私が東北大学大学院国際文化研究科のアメリカ研究講座に所属するようになってからは、講座の院生たち（清水菜穂さん、柴田和枝さん、山田恵さん、熊本早苗さん、加藤道代さん、安西久美子さんなど）も時折、例会に参加するようになり、談話会が若返った感がありました。そしてまた、北海道の藤女子短期大学を退職された後、しばらく仙台に居住されたヘンリー・ジェイムズの専門家、故・板垣憲先生が私たちの仲間に加わってください、談話会はいっそう充実することでした。

後半は、遊佐重樹氏（仙台白百合女子大学）、山田恵さん（仙台白百合女子大学）、柴田和枝さん（東北大学・非）、高橋行男氏（仙台白百合学園）が新たに常連となり、更に、宮城学院女子大学や東北大学の院生たち（泉沢みゆきさん、大浪雅子さん）が加わって、そして嬉しいことに白百合の学生たちも時々発表を聞きにきてくれ、少人数の集まりながら賑わいを見せました。その他、芳野総子さん（仙台白百合女子大学）、香西史子さん（当時、仙台白百合短期大学）、中山悟視氏（当時、東北学院大学院生）、木村幸恵さん（高校職員）なども短期的に研究会に加わっていただきました。

仙台研究会には、仙台以外からも多くの方に参加していただきました。成城大学の八木敏雄氏は、同僚の大庭勝氏、北川和男氏と共に訪れ、「魔女裁判と“Young Goodman Brown”」と題する話をしてくださり、そしてまた、アメリカ＝ホーソン協会元会長でSUNY GeneseoのRita K. Gollinさん、Salem State CollegeのPatricia Parkerさん、Wesleyan UniversityのJoel Pfister氏にも面白い話をしていただきました。最初の頃でしたが、荒このみさん（当時、津田塾大学）にも東北大学の取り散らした非常勤講師室での例会にきていただいたことがあります。改めて皆さんに感謝申し上げる次第です。

例会では、それぞれ自分で設定したテーマについて順番で発表してきましたが、Norman H. Pearson編纂のホーソン選集に収録された短編を一つずつ取り上げ、これまでの批評にない新解釈・珍解釈(?)を試みたり、新刊の研究書の書評をしたり、そしてまた、手に入ったヴィム・ヴェンダースのドイツ語バージョンの『緋文字』(1972)やリリアン・ギッシュの『真紅の文字』(1926)をマルチメディアルームで鑑賞したこともありました。個人的なことで恐縮ですが、私自身、前半最後の例会で、東北大学を会場として発表するのこれが最後と考え、定年退官する1日前の1996年3月30日に、ホーソンとストウ夫人について発表したことを覚えています。そして、仙台白百合女子大学での専任教授としての最後の年度の、最後の月の、最後の研究会では、自分の研究と重ね合わせて、1950年代後半以降の日本におけるホーソン研究の流れについて話す機会を与えていただき、例会終了後には、皆で研究会の「発展的解消記念パーティ」を開いて、仙台支部研究会の歴史に一応のピリオドを打つことでした。

実は、このまま研究会を続けていけないのかと、解散を惜しむ声もありましたが、少子化が進む中、大学関係者は学生募集の業務などでますます多忙となり、研究会で一定の人数が一堂に会するのが、残念ながら必ずしも容易でなくなったという現実があります。それに会場確保の問題などもあり、結局、こらでいったん研究会を解散し、後は相互の連絡を保ちながら、各自単独研究に切り替えて行くことにしようということになりました。

21年間、全国の会員の皆さんには陰に陽にいろいろとお世話になりまして、ここに紙面をお借りし、改めて感謝申

し上げる次第です。研究会では、在仙の皆さんにお世話になりましたが、取り分け岡部氏には、「編集室」1年目から最後の例会に至るまで、何かと支えていただきました。併せて心よりお礼を申し上げます。

ありがとうございました。

東京支部研究会

東京支部研究会は年6回を予定し、そのうち1回を読書会としています。開催月は原則として、7, 10, 11, 12, 2, 3月(会場：日本大学文理学部)で、時間は3:00~5:00p.m.です。

△2006年3月25日(土)：3月例会

司 会：高尾 直知氏(中央大学)

研究発表：①野崎 直之氏(中央大学・院)

「瘧」におけるアミナダブの働きについて

②中村 善雄氏(長岡技術科学大学)

機械身体の考古学—ホーソーンの短編を中心に

△ 7月22日(土)：7月例会

司 会：川村 幸夫氏(東京理科大学)

研究発表：①西山 里枝氏(昭和女子大学・院)

The Blithedale Romance における死をめぐって

②中村 文紀氏(日本体育大学・非)

インテリ男の正体—

O'Connor, “Everything That Rises Must Converge” の Julian をめぐって

△ 11月11日(土)：11月例会

司 会：谷岡 朗氏(日本大学)

研究発表：①大内田 優子氏(日本大学・非)

ホーソーンの時間

②成田 雅彦氏(専修大学)

『七破風の屋敷』再見—

モールの呪いと Transatlanticism

△ 12月9日(土)：12月例会 <読書会>

司 会：川村 幸夫氏

発表者：川村 幸夫氏

笠原 慎一郎氏(昭和女子大学・院)

富樫 壮央氏(麗澤大学・院)

長島 万里世氏(日本大学・院)

小沢 和光氏(学習院大学・院)

T e x t : Davis, Clark.

Hawthorne's Shyness: Ethics, Politics, and the Question of Engagement.

(Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2005.)

(高橋利明記)

中部支部研究会

研究会は年3回、原則として2月、7月、11月を予定しております。なお、都合により2006年2月と7月開催予定の研究会は各々3月と9月に開催しました。

△2006年 3月 4日(土)：午後2時から

場 所：東海学園大学経営学部 三好キャンパス

発表者：進藤鈴子氏(名古屋経済大学)

題 目：「1850年代の黒人文学：『ゲーリー一家の人々』を中心に」

司 会：鈴木元子氏(静岡文化芸術大学)

△ 9月 2日(土)：午前10時30分から

場 所：東海学園大学名古屋キャンパス

発表者：大場厚志氏(東海学園大学)

題 目：「ホーソンとポーについての断想」

司 会：横田和憲氏(金城学院大学)

△ 11月25日(土)：午後2時から

場 所：金城学院大学

発表者：横田和憲氏(金城学院大学)

題 目：「“A Virtuoso's Collection”の語り手について」

司 会：倉橋洋子(東海学園大学)

(倉橋洋子記)

関西支部研究会

△2005年12月18日(日)(関西大学文学部小会議室)

発表者：丹羽 隆昭氏(京都大学)

論 題：「ホーソンと歴史—『メリーマウントの五月柱』を中心に」

司 会：福岡 和子氏(京都大学)

△2006年7月22日(土)(関西大学文学部小会議室)

発表者：白川 恵子氏(同志社大学)

論 題：「ホーソン・魔女狩り・インディアン」

司 会：水野 尚之氏(京都大学)

(入子文子記)

九州支部研究会

第22回

△2006年4月1日(土) (北九州市立大学 3号館218教室)

(1) 発表：山村 栄子(北九州市立大学大学院修了生)

「ナサニエル・ホーソンと女性 —母親と2人の姉妹たち—」

司会：村田 希巳子(北九州市立大学(非))

(2) 発表：乗口 眞一郎(北九州市立大学)

「ホーソン文学の女性に関する2つの論文について」

1. Revising Hawthorne's Feminism (Nina Baym)

2. Working Women and Creative Doubles:

Getting to *The Marble Faun* (David Leverenz)

司会：吉田 禎子(北九州市立大学(非))

第23回

△2006年6月24日(土) (北九州市立大学 3号館218教室)

- (1) 発表：生田 和也（北九州市立大学大学院）
「ホーソン文学の子ども像：短編小説を中心に」
司会：城戸 光世（北九州市立大学）
- (2) 発表：吉川 美津子（北九州市立大学大学院修了生）
“What Milly knew” – A Study of *The Wings of the Dove* –
司会：乗口 眞一郎（北九州市立大学）

第24回

△2006年9月9日（土）（宮崎大学教育文化学部講義棟3階313室）

- (1) 発表：川下 剛（九州大学大学院）
「『大理石の牧神』におけるホーソンの教育」
司会：大杉 博昭（元宮崎大学）
- (2) 発表：青井 格（近畿大学九州工学部）
“Roger Malvin’s Burial” を読む
司会：村田 希巳子（北九州市立大学（非））
- (3) 発表：高島 まり子（鹿児島女子短期大学）
“The Gentle Boy” と *The Scarlet Letter* の比較
司会：乗口 眞一郎（北九州市立大学）

第25回

△2006年12月9日（土）（九州市立大学 3号館218室）

- (1) 発表：稲富 百合子（長崎大学非常勤）
「“The Gentle Boy” – 家庭小説と歴史小説の間で –」
司会：城戸 光世（北九州市立大学）
- (2) 発表：薬師寺 元子（北九州市立大学非常勤）
「Thoreauの“完全で美しく均整のとれた世界”」
– *Walden* 最終章より –
司会：塩田 弘（福岡大学）

研究発表終了後、恒例の忘年会を行った。
会場 門司港地ビール工房（門司区東港6-9）
TEL：093-321-6885

△読書会

*Twice-Told Tales*の中から、短編“The Gentle Boy”を取り上げ、*The Scarlet Letter*と関連づけながら、その技法、人物性格、時代背景などを論議する。

司会：高島 まり子

（乗口眞一郎記）

編集室だより

『フォーラム』について

現在『フォーラム』12号の編集作業中です。2007年3月発行をめどにしております。

編集委員について

『フォーラム』12号の編集委員は下記の通りです。

編集委員：倉橋洋子（編集委員長）、川窪啓資、竹村和子、成田雅彦、増永俊一（敬称略）

収入		『フォーラム』11号会計報告（2005.9－2006.8）		支出	
繰越金	368,801	『フォーラム』11号発行費			475,820
『フォーラム』11号費用	700,000	（内訳 印刷費（600部）	421,050		
		封入手数料（244件）	10,300		
		郵送費（244件）	44,470		
利息	9	振り込み手数料			315
収支合計	1,068,810	通信費			3,070
		支出合計			479,205
残高	589,605				

編集室：〒470-0207 愛知県西加茂郡三好町福谷西ノ洞21-233

東海学園大学経営学部 倉橋洋子研究室気付

日本ナサニエル・ホーソン協会

資料室だより

これまでに以下の書籍・論文の寄贈がありましたのでご報告します。

『テキストの内と外』東海英米文学会編，成美堂，2006

『アメリカ・ゴシック小説：19世紀小説における想像力と理性』ドナルド・A・リンジ著，古宮照雄・谷岡朗・小澤健志・小泉和弘訳，松柏社，2005

萩原力，1850年のホーソン批評－「緋文字」の場合，専修人文論集 75，2004

萩原力，ポオとホーソンの作品－類似点と不同性を中心に－，専修商学論集 80，2005

萩原力，1850年のホーソン批評（2）－「ブライズデイル・ロマンス」の場合，専修人文論集 78，2006

Masunaga, Toshikazu, Innocent Children and Embedded Capitalism: A Fabricated History in *Grandfather's Chair*, The Kwansai Gakuin University Humanities Review 10, 2006

増永俊一，歴史と解釈－ホーソン作品における歴史性をめぐって－，エクス言語文化論集4（関西学院大学経済学部研究会），2006

増永俊一，ホーソンと歴史と宗教と－「ロジャー・マルビンの埋葬」とその歴史性－，キリスト教文藝 22（日本キリスト教文学会関西支部），2006

矢作三蔵，Aの文字は見えたのか－試みとしての隠喩論－（アメリカ・ルネッサンス研究ノート－ホーソン），学習院大学文学部研究年報 47，2000

矢作三蔵，神なき森－H.D.ソローのコスモス－，学習院大学文学部研究年報 49，2002

矢作三蔵，オルゴールの音色－ホーソンとソローの交流－，学習院大学文学部研究年報 50，2003

ご協力ありがとうございました。

資料室を充実させていきたいと存じておりますので，今度とも皆様方のご協力をお願いいたします。

住所：〒278-8510（郵便物は郵便番号のみで配達されます）

千葉県野田市山崎2641 東京理科大学理工学部教養科 川村（幸）研究室内

日本ナサニエル・ホーソン協会資料室

T E L : 04-7122-9219 (川村(幸) 研究室直通) 04-7122-9158 (教養科事務室直通)

E-mail : kawmyuk@rs.noda.tus.ac.jp

(川村幸夫記)

国際渉外室だより

△2006年度のthe Nathaniel Hawthorne Society大会は、7月13日から16日にかけて、the Ralph Waldo Emerson Societyおよびthe Poe Studies Associationとの共催で、“Transatlanticism in American Literature: Emerson, Hawthorne, Poe”と題して開催されました。会場となったOxford Universityには全世界から研究者が集まり、大変な盛況だったという報告をいただきました。また、日本からも、ホーソン研究者のみならず、エマソン、ポウ、メルヴィルなど、南北戦争前期を研究する学者が集まり、刺激的な大会となったようです。

△来年度も、いくつかの海外学会でホーソン関係のセッションが開かれます。渉外委員会の調べた限りでは、American Literature Society, Modern Language Associationなどで例年のようにホーソン関係のセッションが催されるようです。

△来年度のALAは、2007年5月24日から27日にかけて、ボストンで開催されます。ここでは、“Rewriting Hawthorne: James, Morrison, Faulkner, etc.”と“Transatlantic Tribulations: Hawthorne in Transit”というタイトルで、米国ホーソン協会主催のセッションがおこなわれるようです。これらのセッションに関しては、タイトルに沿うようなものなどどのような方向からの発表でも審査の対象となります。発表を希望する場合は、発表時間20分の要旨1-2枚分を、いつものようにSamuel Coale教授 (samcoale@cox.net) にお送りください。〆切は2007年1月15日となっています。(ただし、ALAのホームページでは、要旨の送付先は米国ホーソン協会次期会長のBrenda Wineapple教授 (bwineapple@earthlink.net) 宛となっています。おそらくどちらでもいいのだと思いますが、ご注意ください。)

△また、来年度のMLA大会は、2007年12月27日から30日にかけて、シカゴで開催されます。こちらでは、“Critical Overviews: Where Are We Now?”と“Is There a Case for the Late Hawthorne?”と題されたセッションが開かれる予定です。こちらも応募の要領は同じで、20分の発表のための要旨1-2枚分を、Samuel Coale教授にお送りください。〆切は3月1日です。

△今年のホーソン関係の大ニュースは、ソファイアとユーナの墓所が、ロンドンからコンコードに移ったことです。再埋葬は2006年6月26日におこなわれ、ホーソンの子孫らによる埋葬のあと、オールド・マンズの庭園で記念式がおこなわれ200名ほどの人が出席したということです。この墓所移転に関しては、ホーソンの娘ローズが興した修道会 (Dominican Sisters of Hawthorne) が関わっており、ロンドンの墓所の改築の必要があったため、これを機にコンコードへの移転を決定したようです。

(高尾直知・中村文紀記)

事務局だより

1. *NHSJ Newsletter* 第25号をお届けします。今回も<Book News>として竹村和子氏から原稿をお寄せいただきました。また、「コラム」として當麻一郎氏の「ソファイアとユーナ、ホーソンのふところへ」を掲載しました。ご両名にはこの場をお借りして心より感謝申し上げます。
2. 第25回全国大会を無事終えることが出来ました。会場校東海学園大学学長をはじめ、村瀬先生、倉橋先生、大場先生および大会の運営にご協力をいただいた教職員の方々に御礼申し上げます。
3. 第26回全国大会は平成19年5月18日(金)・19日(土)の両日に決定し、大会会場は日本大学文理学部に決まりました。
4. 新名簿を作成します。同封の書類にご記入いただき、返信用封筒にてご返送ください。
5. 新入会員を歓迎いたします。ご推薦下さい。

この*NHSJ Newsletter*とともに振替用紙が同封してある場合は、会費をまだお納めいただいていないことをお知らせ

するものです。それを用いてご送金ください。なお、振替用紙をもって領収書に換えさせていただきます。別の領収書をご必要な際はご一報ください。

6. 本協会宛で下記の書籍が贈呈されました。ご報告します。

- (1) 藤野早苗, 「不屈の精神で挑む農場経営ーエレン・グラウゴー『不毛の大地』ー」, 『アメリカ文学にみる女性の仕事ーハウスキーパーからワーキングガールまでー」, 野口啓子・山口ヨシ子編著, 彩流社, 2006, 2.
- (2) 伊藤淑子, 「醜い」女工の美しい秘密ーレベッカ・ハーディング・デイヴィス『製鉄工場における生活』ー」, 野口啓子・山口ヨシ子編著, 彩流社, 2006, 2.
- (3) 山口ヨシ子, 「若い娘が都会で働くときードロシー・リチャードソン『長い一日』ー」, 野口啓子・山口ヨシ子編著, 彩流社, 2006, 2.
- (4) 成田雅彦, 「父なき世界の感情革命ー『若草物語』とアメリカン・ルネッサンスー」, 『若草物語』, 高田賢一編著, ミネルヴァ書房, 2006, 2
- (5) 『ヘンリー・ソロー研究論集』日本ソロー学会 第32号 2006.3.
- (6) 入子文子, 「小さな赤い手ーくあざ>の凶像学ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (7) 水野眞理, 「挿絵は誰に何を見せるかーホーソーン『おじいさんの椅子の全歴史』の場合ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (8) 巽 孝之, 「超絶時代のフィルム・ノワールーエミリー・ディキンソンの形見函ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (9) 伊藤詔子, 「ポーと新たなサブライムの意匠ーナイアガラ・スペクタクルから暗黒の海へー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (10) 城戸光世, 「ホーソーンとコールーモラル・ビクチャレスクな風景ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (11) 大杉博昭, 「ことばの画家ホーソーンー視覚芸術との出会いと展開ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (12) 島田太郎, 「メルヴィルの美学の変遷」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (13) 水野尚之, 「劇作家ヘンリー・ジェイムズ」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (14) 中村善雄, 視覚文化のモダニズムーヘンリー・ジェイムズにみる写真と言語テキストの邂逅ー」, 『視覚のアメリカン・ルネサンス』, 武藤脩二・入子文子編著, 世界思想社, 2006, 3.
- (15) 入子文子, 『アメリカの理想都市』, 関西大学出版部, 2006, 3.
- (16) 丹羽隆昭, 「巻頭言」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (17) 中村栄造, アメリカン・くダメ男>の源流を訪ねてーリップ・ヴァン・ウインクルとイカバット・クレーンを中心にー」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (18) 大場厚志, 「ホーソーンの「ブルフログ夫人」ーくダメ男>の系譜と強い女」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (19) 倉橋洋子, 「ホーソーンの子供像と空想ー『緋文字』と『ワンダー・ブックを中心にー」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (20) 横田和憲, 「大森林に浮揚する白き雌鹿の影ーメルヴィルの「ホーソーンとその苔」についてー」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (21) 溝口健二, 「ホイットマンの見たブルックリンー『イブニング・スター』の記事を中心としてー」, 『テキストの内と外』, 東海英米文学会編, 成美堂, 2006, 3.
- (22) 伊藤詔子, 「ウォールデン地史から土地倫理と環境正義の文学までーカウンター・ナラティブの水脈ー」, 『豊かさとは環境』, 秋元英一・小塩和人編著, ミネルヴァ書房, 2006, 10.

(高橋利明記)

第26回全国大会のお知らせ

日 時：2007年5月18日(金)・19日(土)

場 所：日本大学文理学部

〒156-8550 東京都世田谷区桜上水3-25-40

会員の方々には、次の規定をご参照の上、奮って研究発表にご応募ください。

1. 発表者は会員であること。
2. 発表要旨として横書き400字詰め原稿用紙2枚程度(日本語)を1部提出してください。
3. 研究発表は5月18日(金)、開会后ただちに行います。研究発表は3名または4名を限度としますので、多数の場合は選考による制限もあることを予めご承知ください。
4. 勤務先、職名、連絡先を明記した略歴を1通つけてください。
5. 発表時間は1件25分(質疑応答と併せて40分)とします。
6. 応募締め切りは2007年2月末日です(事務局必着)。

特別講演、シンポジウム、ワークショップのテーマ、またお引き受けいただける先生方が決定しましたのでご報告いたします。

特 別 講 演：「アメリカを旅する《物書き》のイギリス女性たち」

大井 浩二氏(関西学院大学名誉教授)

シンポジウム：「アメリカン・ルネサンスとトランスナショナルリズム」

司会・講師 西谷 拓哉氏(神戸大学)

講師 大杉 博昭氏(宮崎大学名誉教授)

講師 進藤 鈴子氏(名古屋経済大学)

講師 水野 眞理氏(京都大学)

ワークショップ：「「アリス・ドーンの訴え」を読む」

司会・講師 岩田 強氏(光華女子大学)

講師 山中 康裕氏(京都ヘルメス研究所長、京都大学名誉教授、精神科医)

講師 小宮山 真美子氏(成蹊大学研究員)

顧問	阿野文朗(東北大名譽教授)	鴨川卓博(京都女子大)	川窪啓資(麗澤大)
	島田太郎(昭和女子大)	萩原 力(専修大名譽教授)	牧田徳元(金沢大名譽教授)
	松山信直(同志社大名譽教授)	師岡愛子(日本女子大名譽教授)	

役員

<p>会長 當麻一太郎(日本大)</p> <p>副会長 丹羽隆昭(京都大) 矢作三蔵(学習院大)</p> <p>監事 辻 祥子(松山大) 進藤鈴子(名古屋経済大)</p> <p>理事 秋葉 勉(東北学院大) 入子文子(関西大)</p> <p>川村幸夫(東京理科大) 倉橋洋子(東海学園大)</p> <p>齋藤幸子(川村学園女子大)</p> <p>佐々木英哲(桃山学院大) 高橋利明(日本大)</p> <p>竹村和子(お茶の水女子大) 成田雅彦(専修大)</p> <p>西前 孝(岡山大) 西村千稔(小樽短大)</p> <p>乗口眞一郎(北九州市立大)</p> <p>増永俊一(関西学院大) 松阪仁伺(兵庫教育大)</p>	<p>事務局 高橋利明</p> <p>鈴木 孝(日本大)</p> <p>谷岡 朗(日本大)</p> <p>中村文紀(日本体育大・非)</p> <p>堀切大史(日本大・非)</p> <p>会計 齋藤幸子</p> <p>編集室 倉橋洋子 川窪啓資 竹村和子 成田雅彦</p> <p>増永俊一</p> <p>資料室 川村幸夫 大野美砂(千葉商科大)</p> <p>奈良裕美子(明治大・非)</p> <p>国際渉外室 高尾直知(中央大) 中村文紀</p> <p>大会準備委員 成田雅彦 齋藤幸子</p> <p>西谷拓哉(神戸大学) 高橋利明</p>
--	--

2005年度 日本ナサニエル・ホーソン協会 (会計報告)

(2005. 4. 1 ~ 2006. 3. 31)

<u>収入</u>	<u>支出</u>		
会費 1,048,000	編集室費 700,000	前期繰越金 1,818,156	
賛助会員 60,000	大会費 174,436	収入計 1,228,902	
雑収入 120,880	大会準備委員会費 60,370	計 3,047,058	
利息 22	印刷費 149,555	支出計 1,357,827	
計 1,228,902	国際渉外室費 10,000	次期繰越金 1,689,231	
	謝礼費 50,000		
	支部会費 84,000		
	(仙台 7,000)		キャッシュポジション
	(東京 45,000)		郵便貯金 1,689,231
	(名古屋 6,000)		
	(関西 20,000)		
	(九州 6,000)		
	通信費 55,660		
	事務費 15,806		
	人件費 55,000		
	雑費 3,000		
	計 1,357,827		

上記の通り相違ありません

2006年3月31日

会計 齋藤 幸子

監査の結果、上記の通り相違ないことを証明します。

2006年4月1日

監事 辻 祥子
監事 進藤 鈴子