The Japanese Shakespeare

Language and Context in the Translations of Tsubouchi Shōyō

Daniel Gallimore

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-27700-4 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-27701-1 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-29377-4 (ebk)

2

Shōyō's Shakespeare

DOI: 10.4324/9781003293774-2

The Open Access versions of this Chapter was funded by Daniel Gallimore.

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

2 Shōyō's Shakespeare

Essential Shōyō

Although he was not a native of Edo, one of Shōyō's reputations is that of an Edo *tsūjin*, or dilettante.[1] Through his education at the Imperial University and friendship with Takata, Shōyō gained an entry into the cultural life of the city that enabled him to pursue such typical *tsū* pastimes as kabuki and haiku, not to mention the pleasure quarters in his youth, and his approach to Shakespeare translation seems tainted by this outlook of the Edo dilettante. In an early essay, Shōyō compares the relationship of a translation to its source to "that of a man with a woman."[2] A comparison in the same essay of foreignisation to the then-novel "use of Western grapes" in Japanese cooking suggests a connoisseur's tastes.[3] Yet coming as he did from the Tōkai region of central Japan, Shōyō's role as an Edo *tsūjin* was inevitably to some extent a reaction to his rural origins, a pose that suited his aspirations in an era of rapid social transition, all the more so when combined with that of *Edokko*, "child" or native of Edo. This is apparent in Shōyō's adult preference for Edo to his native Nagoya and even the modern Tokyo dialect,[4] but since the "spirit of resistance" was a definite trait of the Edo character (and of Edo kabuki),[5] he may also be *Edokko* in his sometimes-brash repudiation of aspects of both his native and foreign cultures.

The *tsū* personality eschews rules and categories in favour of cultivation, and in Shōyō's case gravitates towards his dominant trait of being behind the times (*jidai okure*). A subtext of his Shakespearean polemic is that Shakespeare is as "old" as kabuki and in some respects more "cultivated" than his native Japanese drama; paradoxically, the impulse for assuming so may have originated in native cultural hierarchies such as *tsū*. This was not to discredit the values, Buddhist or otherwise, on which his culture was built, only to assert that Shakespeare's response to cultural memory and lived experience seemed to Shōyō more organised and compelling, even more sophisticated. Shakespearean drama seemed to offer a more integrated worldview than was possible within the kabuki dichotomy of tradition (*sekai*) and innovation (*shukō*), which in always rushing to keep up with the times tended to do too much and so allow the "illogical structures" for which Shōyō criticises kabuki *jidaimono*,

DOI: 10.4324/9781003293774-2

their lack of overarching narrative and the random plot transitions. He adds of Chikamatsu's *jidaimono* that

> The incidents portrayed in these plays are apt to resemble the phantasmagoric transformations of a dream: at times like reality, at times like the past, at times with a logical sequence, at times without, at times implausible and at other times quite plausible, at times showing human beings as they are not and at other times as they are.[6]

Shakespeare, who kept his distance from the modern classicism of the Jacobean theatre, appealed to Shōyō partly because he was "old," the venerable sage or *okina* by which his name was initially known in Japan. Up to 1945 Shakespeare was commonly known as *Saō* (or *Shaō*), combining a character with the same sound as the first syllable in "Shakespeare" and *ō* (the Sino-Japanese reading of *okina*), and in 1891 Shōyō portrays him as a kind of venerable Buddha who, having gained mastery over nature, appears to understand his audience better than they do themselves:

> Shakespeare's genius is a jewel of nature able to liberate the spirit of nature, to stir the rustics, the maiden and Benka of old from their apathy, but though we may price his jewel as highly as a castle, it is in itself no more than a rare stone, worth no more than any passing fad, for it is only human nature to inflate the value of the things we admire.[7]

Benka was a historical figure in the ancient Chinese kingdom of Chu who had his left foot cut off when the king refused to believe that a valuable but unpolished gemstone he had found in the mountains was real, and then his right foot by the king's successor for the same reason. It was only when Benka polished the stone that its value was recognised, and it was sold in exchange for fifteen castles. Shōyō's conceit relates to the Buddhist doctrine of the ultimate emptiness of nature: only Shakespeare knew the actual emptiness of his words, and in this section of the essay Shōyō suggests that Chikamatsu's "jewel" had similar powers. The maiden, incidentally, knew nothing, having yet to experience true "sadness."[8]

As Tsuno observes, "practical consequences" are always more important for Shōyō than "logical consequences."[9] Since it was going to take some time for Japanese scholars and theatre people to work out a practical, workable response to Shakespeare's genius, his initial reception in the Meiji era runs like a pageant comprising one colourful adaptation after another without the focus of a kabuki *sekai*, although a focus of sorts is provided by *Hamlet* as the play with which the reception begins and ends. Shakespeare's name became widely known in Japan in 1871, when Nakamura Keiu translated Polonius' "To thine own self be true" on the cover page of his bestselling translation of Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help*, and the tragedy remained at centre stage with the translations of Hamlet's fourth soliloquy by Toyama Masakazu and Yatabe Ryōkichi in their collection of translations of English verse, *Shintaishishō* (Selection of New-Style Poetry), published in 1882. The pageant reaches a denouement with Shōyō's production at the Imperial

Theatre in 1911, which demonstrated that Shakespeare could be translated and staged in the Japanese language.

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* therefore offered Meiji Shakespeareans a view of the world and even *sekai* as, more than any other play, it established the myth of Shakespeare's universality from which future Japanese encounters would proceed. Shōyō's first adult encounter with Shakespeare was with *Hamlet* when he failed Houghton's examination for writing a moralistic assessment of Gertrude's character. This understandable error is redolent of the kind of kabuki narrative where characters are arbitrarily executed for little more than being in the wrong place at the wrong time, but Shōyō took advantage of his momentary alienation by agreeing with Houghton and going the way of anti-didacticism.

Shōyō's transgressive spirit comes from within his native tradition, but his feeling for what was important about Shakespeare was shaped within the ambitious scope of his reading of Western scholarship from the 1880s onwards; this reading challenged and affirmed his existing convictions, opening up an imaginary space between his own subjectivity and Shakespeare's otherness. From Dowden he acquires the idealism that shaped his own realism, and from Moulton the inductivism that rationalises his intense involvement with Shakespeare's texts. Comparativists such as H. M. Possnett and Hippolyte Taine narrow the cultural gap by aligning Japanese tradition with universal historical forces, and Shōyō partakes of the Whiggish teleology of Thomas Babington Macaulay and the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer, both of whom are mentioned in *Shōsetsu shinzui*.[10] From Dryden he receives approval for treating translation as literature, while the dichotomy between Johnson's eighteenth-century neoclassicism and Coleridgean imagination frames Shōyō's sense of the moralistic and psychological dimensions of literature.

Shōyō's seminal response to his age of confusion comes in *Shōsetsu shinzui*; although it is about fiction and does not mention Shakespeare, it has straightforward implications for his later Shakespeare studies, especially when read in tandem with his statements on Japanese drama and in the "hidden ideals" debate that were to follow. Shōyō's stance is rhetorical rather than philosophical or even ethical. On the one hand, he seems to add to the confusion by conflating popular Edo genres such as the historical romance (*haishi*) within the single category of popular fiction (*gesaku*) in opposition to his ideal category of the modern novel (*shōsetsu*) or, as Atsuko Ueda comments with regard to the opening passage of the treatise,

> The complex, diverse genre of the *gesaku* is reduced to an entity that becomes the negative precursor to the *shōsetsu*, defined as that which is not the *shōsetsu*.[11]

This conflation is implicit also in his assumption that Shakespeare's characterisations must be so much more diverse than those in the more limited scope of his native literature. For Shōyō, however, the real complexity was to be found less in literary hierarchies than in the breadth and diversity of human behaviour which

was the proper subject of fiction, and which the adoption of a single category was meant to rationalise.

At this early stage in his career, Shōyō asserts a current superiority of fiction to drama in exploring what he understands by human nature, but in Shakespeare he will discover a writer who is equally capable of exploring human interiority by dramatic and rhetorical means. This is to say that while his native theatrical conventions may, like the categories of Edo fiction, have tended to conflate cultural practices with individual behaviour and so "expound a warped view of human nature,"[12] the logical movement of Shakespearean drama was towards a sympathy with individual desires and motives. Genres and styles may lose their relevance over time, but Shōyō's conservative view was that human nature remained constant even if its outward manifestations became more (and sometimes less) sophisticated through the accretion of cultural knowledge and experience.

From his upbringing, Shōyō acquired a straightforward Buddhist perception of human nature, which in *Shōsetsu shinzui* he categorises numerically as the 108 "worldly desires,"[13] and thus recognises that a play like *Othello* is about the destructive effects of jealousy, and that Shakespeare's comedies can be read as exercises in the Buddhist virtue of compassion. At the same time, one reason why Shōyō does not pursue a strictly Buddhist approach to Shakespeare is surely his susceptibility to nineteenth-century Victorian "optimism": for example, Macaulay's belief in the inevitability of progress and Taine's positivist assertion of the weight of racial character. Buddhism takes a more pessimistic view of history and society, problematising consciousness[14] – and therefore imagination – in addition to the five senses of sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch as sources of pleasure from which the follower seeks liberation. That the types of romantic love portrayed in both kabuki and Shakespeare, however beautiful or well intentioned, were hindrances to enlightenment hardly needed stating, but in idealising Shakespeare's imagination Shōyō's motive was clearly literary rather than religious. Similarly, his theory of "hidden ideals" that posits the authority of Shakespeare's genius as emanating from beyond the text can be said to refute the idealisation of visible authority figures in Confucianism, while the Buddhist Shōyō appears to favour a version of Christian monotheism as a metaphor for the novelist's potential:

> Fiction exposes the hidden and obscure aspects of life; it assimilates the manifold passions of human beings within its pages, which naturally causes readers to ponder on their own experience. Novelists are similar in my opinion to the Divine as the author of Creation and yet absent from Creation in the way that they strive to create a panoply of characters from whom they too are absent, and to make a realistic portrayal of everyday life. Yet the sheer infinite extent of Creation makes it all the harder for ordinary, uncomplicated folk to grasp the underlying relationships of cause and effect, so that the role of the novelist in my estimation is to identify the essential points and arrange them as materials for the reader's consideration and appraisal. This is asking a huge amount of a writer, but if carried out effectively can achieve something quite out of the ordinary.[15]

What Shōyō in effect proposes is a compromise between a Buddhist culture in which actions are understood to have consequences (and praised or condemned accordingly) and a basically Christian view that asserts the inscrutability of the Divine and ultimately of history as well. Moreover, since human nature in Buddhism was defined as attachment to existence and enlightenment as freedom from such attachments, the novel had the potential to enact the process of enlightenment through its objective depiction of, and therefore distancing from, human attachments, although (as Shōyō would argue) for the process to be convincing the author had to remain invisible; that is where Christian notions of inscrutability come in handy. Literature, in other words, had to be as convincing as history could not fail to be.

Unlike some of his contemporaries, Shōyō was never going to turn Christian himself: his motivation is pragmatic. By opening its doors to the Western world, Japan had exposed itself to infiltration by Western ideologies and religions such as Christianity, and Shōyō was not alone in hoping that Western thought systems could be harnessed to address faults in his own. His belief that Japanese literature and drama needed reform came not only from what he had learnt from his foreign professors at the Imperial University but from a native discourse that dated back to the eighteenth century and beyond. This discourse is central to the thesis of *Shōsetsu shinzui*.

Shōsetsu shinzui is divided into two parts, the first part stipulating Shōyō's ideal of fiction and the second discussing stylistic issues. The two parts foreshadow his later views on Shakespeare and Shakespeare translation, for example on lexical choice and plot construction. At the age of twenty-five, Shōyō was already well read in both Japanese and English literature and was a connoisseur of kabuki, and so could reasonably claim (as I have previously quoted) that

> art, different by nature from practical crafts, should never be created with predetermined controls. To arouse in the beholder by its sublime beauty emotions so profound that his spirit seems involuntarily to soar – that is its proper objective, and that is what makes it art.[16]

Towards the end of his life, having been engrossed for many years in Shakespeare's poetic drama, he was to reflect that he felt a kind of "floating" or spiritual elation when he translated Shakespeare.[17] The metaphor of "floating" is familiar from the "floating world" (*ukiyo*) of Edo culture, but in the wake of Japan's encounter with modernity, Shōyō wonders how the reader's spirit can continue to float in a world where old certainties have been challenged, suggesting that the literary mode of realism involves a rhetorical journey into reality that enables the reader to soar above less enlightened states of mind. Reading becomes a recovery of an integrity of outward behaviour and inner thoughts that has been sundered at earlier stages of civilisation.

The recovery of integrity underlies Shōyō's thesis that "the abiding concern of the novel is human nature (*ninjō*). Social conditions and mores (*fūzoku*) are secondary."[18] *Ninjō* and *fūzoku* were intrinsically related, because to understand what

society does to people was also to gain insight into human nature. Shōyō does not, therefore, deny the relevance of environment to character, and in his argument with romantic nationalist Takayama Chogyū was to insist that it was environment that formed character against Chogyū's view that it was heredity.[19] For Shōyō, human nature and culture flourished just as well outside the constraints of family, while human nature remained the focus of literary art. His job description of the novelist could just as readily be applied to Shakespeare:

> A writer of novels is like a psychologist. His characters must be psychologically credible. If he ends up creating characters who are incompatible with how people are, or worse still contradict the principles of psychology, those characters will be no more than a figment of his imagination rather than real human beings, and not even a clever or intriguing storyline will be able to make the work into a true novel.[20]

Characters in novels became "psychologically credible" as they intimated a reality that was always greater than themselves rather than being manifestations of reasons that were already known. Shōyō terms the latter tendency "didacticism," and criticises the didactic tendency of Edo novelists such as Tamenaga Shunsui and Bakin, observing of Bakin's epic *Nansō satomi hakkenden* (The Eight Dog Chronicles, 1814–42) that

> As a didactic novel it is unbeatable, but as a record of human nature it falls somewhat short for the simple reason that not only the behaviour but even the inner motives of the eight protagonists remain reasonable and virtuous from beginning to end.[21]

This dichotomy is something like the transition from the English miracle and morality plays, with their stock types, to the illusion of psychological depth and change in Shakespeare's plays.

What Shōyō particularly wishes to avoid is the static dichotomy he finds in Tokugawa fiction between high moral ideals, typically to do with duty and loyalty, and narratives that "luxuriate in sadism and pornography,"[22] which, because they satisfy the suppressed desires of readers – suppressed, in part, by the Tokugawa regime – may actually be more attractive than the ideals that are meant to override them. Shōyō feels that a human impulse to indulge in acts of violence and gratuitous sexuality, however compellingly evoked, is no substitute for nuanced psychological explorations, or (as he would put it) the mysterious processes of cause and effect.

Towards the end of *Shōsetsu shinzui*, Shōyō makes the following critical comparison between what he calls realism and idealism:

> It is easy enough to become a realist writer but rather more challenging to master its secrets. Contrarily, it is a lot harder to join the idealist school, but once in, the way ahead is an easy one.[23]

In other words, it may be easy enough to describe a single situation in realistic detail but far harder to develop that situation into a lucid narrative. The idealist, by contrast, needs to have acquired a high degree of knowledge and self-mastery that is comparable perhaps to a samurai's self-discipline but having done so can assert his ideals with freedom and authority. Having as it were made himself, the idealist has the licence to impose his own fiction on his readers, but against this viewpoint Shōyō insists that no amount of self-mastery can be representative of the total perspective of a readership. The realist's challenge, therefore, is to exclude his or her "own personality traits"[24] so totally from the narrative that characters are manifested as complete individuals irrespective of the author's personal beliefs and prejudices. Realism in this sense was more difficult to achieve than idealism because it shirked a moral compass.

Shōyō's norms are aesthetic rather than moral. As principal of his university's high school at the turn of the century he will espouse an ethical outlook, but according to his argument, good literature is in any case inherently moral:

> Fiction should not be treated as a vehicle for carnal indulgence but aspires instead to entertain readers by appealing to their higher sensibilities. A predisposition for refinement and delicacy of feeling are the noblest of attributes, known only to civilised and culturally advanced peoples. Ignorant barbarians seek only the gratification of their baser desires.[25]

The rhetoric is of its time and place, but what Shōyō proposes in *Shōsetsu shinzui* is not that Prospero teach Caliban his classical language, but that Caliban teach Prospero the colloquial.

For Shōyō, the classical style is unsuited "for the description of passionate emotions. . . . It is lacking in directness and vigour, and appears not to take itself seriously,"[26] whereas

> The colloquial style is natural in its use of everyday language. Vivid and lucid, it has an obvious equivalent in the colloquial style of Chinese and indeed Western fiction.[27]

In the Taishō era, Shōyō will conclude that the naturalness of the contemporary language makes it suited for translating Shakespeare. What he means by classical style is the literary form of Japanese (*bungo*) that dated back to the eighth century and which Shōyō learnt at school and university as the standard for writing the language. *Shōsetsu shinzui* was written in this style, but not the kabuki plays he enjoyed or his own creative works of the Meiji era, which were written in the early modern Japanese of the Edo era that during Shōyō's lifetime evolved into the modern Japanese of today.

Modernisation was achieved mainly by the imposition of the dialect spoken by the Tokyo middle class as the national standard for writing the language, and continued earlier historical processes of phonological change and the rationalisation of grammatical inflexions and orthography, as well as introducing a considerable

number of foreign loan words and allowing the coinage of new *kanji* compounds. What Shōyō means by the colloquial in 1885 is essentially the spoken form of Edo Japanese, and what he means by the contemporary in 1928 is the modern colloquial form as it had evolved over forty years of language reform, thus abandoning various Edo archaisms that Shōyō himself may have continued to use and wished to preserve in his translations. The differences between classical and modern Japanese are more extreme than between Chaucer's Middle English and Shakespeare's English, or between Shakespeare's English and the Modern English of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Shōyō admired Shakespeare's economy of expression, but this was not the same as the emotional restraint he found in classical Japanese and was considered basically unsuited for use in modern novels and Shakespeare translation.

Classical restraint was also different from the suppression of authorial identity that was central to Shōyō's theory of Shakespeare and to the richly emotional texture (the "world of feeling")[28] he found in both Shakespeare and kabuki drama, which was written mainly in Edo or Kamigata dialect. Shōyō's abiding concern as a Shakespeare translator was with Shakespeare's rhythms, and he believed colloquial Japanese (both archaic and modern) to be inherently rhythmical and capable of rendering Shakespeare's rhythmicality and all that it meant.[29] In *Shōsetsu shinzui*, by embracing the colloquial as the appropriate vehicle for psychological realism, Shōyō also reveals why he will never translate Shakespeare in a strictly classical style. Yet neither will he ever fully abandon classical inflexions and archaisms as appropriate for conveying Shakespeare's nuances.

Edo Literature and the Aesthetics of Human Feelings

For Shōyō and his contemporaries, Shakespeare was the "hometown of the heart" (*kokoro no furusato*) and the hidden unconscious of the Meiji era.[30] As the most mysterious and at the same time representative of Western writers, Shakespeare filled a vacuum left by the native culture as it retreated from itself in the face of Westernisation (or at least up to the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution in 1889). His dramas spoke to this era of change by embodying a spirit of nature and creativity that was believed to be lacking in the native culture. Shōyō compares Shakespeare's works to "the essence of creativity" and maintains that "they are as desirable to ordinary people as the beauties of nature,"[31] but his concept of Shakespearean imagination was meaningless without some organising principle.[32] In the case of the novel, this was provided by its structure, which as an imitation of the Buddhist chain of cause and effect was "open to countless variations" and "impossible to predict."[33] Shakespeare's genius was his ability to organise the material of human feelings and desires into logical structures that were strong enough to withstand Shōyō's personal fears of loss of objectivity and identity by keeping the reader guessing and stimulating the reader into continuous introspection.

Shōyō's nativist viewpoint, although expressed previously in his critique of Fenollosa, can only have been reinforced by his reading of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*

in which the protagonist becomes seemingly detached from reality through the power of his soliloquies; the play was a casebook study in the Buddhist logic of cause and effect. Yet, as Suzuki Sadami suggests, Shōyō's reification of human feelings conflated a modern, evolutionary phenomenology of desire with the aesthetics of Edo Japan.[34] Shōyō's debt in particular to the eighteenth-century classicist Motoori Norinaga is essential to understanding the balance Shōyō strikes in his reception of Shakespeare between native thought and Anglo-American scholarship.

In *Shōsetsu shinzui*, Shōyō praises Norinaga's influential critique of *The Tale of Genji* with his view that

> Very few Japanese have read fiction with Norinaga's depth of understanding. My impression of those numerous classical scholars who brazenly insist on interpreting even such a work as *The Tale of Genji* as didactic is that they have been deceived by the little they know.[35]

While Shōyō's academic research was focussed on Shakespeare and drama, Norinaga remains a putative influence on his view of Shakespeare that was highlighted by his pupil Honma Hisao in his 1959 study.[36] Emphasising the detachment of Confucianism from utilitarian motives in Norinaga's thought, Honma argues that Shōyō's utilitarian motive for translating Shakespeare does not originate in Shakespearean drama per se, and implies a connection between Norinaga's aesthetic of *mono no aware* and Matthew Arnold's maxim of the function of criticism as being "to see the object as it really is."[37]

Norinaga asserted the explanatory principle of *mono no aware*, which has been variously translated as an appreciation of the transience of beauty, the innate pathos of things, or simply as a profound awareness of beauty, and which remains a pertinent approach in Shakespeare's reception in Japan. His conviction that "directness of feeling is the essence of humanity and the heart of the Japanese"[38] was also a political response to the dominant Confucianist ideology of a regime that subordinated individual expressions of feeling to the needs of the state. As Suzuki quotes:

> Since Confucianism and Buddhism are dedicated to giving people instruction and guidance, they often issue stern warnings that violate human feelings, considering in many respects that to act in accordance with one's heart is bad and that to pursue practice by suppressing one's feelings is good.[39]

Norinaga sought to bypass Confucianism by returning "to the thoughts and feelings of antiquity"[40] so that not only did *mono no aware* express those feelings that were typically circumscribed by the state – sexual love and love between parent and child being paramount examples – but which found their purest expression in the ancient poetry (*uta*) in which Norinaga was expert.[41] Shakespeare appealed to Meiji writers like Shōyō because his plays also thematised the expression of individual feelings against prescriptive external forces: the love of Romeo and Juliet

and of Lear for Cordelia. Shōyō could understand Shakespeare because native writers such as Chikamatsu covered similar territory and were capable of the same rhetorical tricks.

As Shōyō argued in *Shōsetsu shinzui*, the difference between the two sides was mainly one of moral purpose: Shakespeare and George Eliot did not tell their readers what to think; nor was Shakespeare necessarily any more imaginative than the Tokugawa novelists, since as Charles Shiro Inouye comments of *gesaku* fiction, "Anything c[ould] be imagined because everything is justified and/or properly condemned."[42] Bakin, in particular, was a writer whose vivid evocations of the samurai code and immersion in classical poetry allowed his imagination free rein. Shakespeare too may have had moral principles, but in Shōyō's observation it was Shakespeare's success at concealing them that unleashed readers' imaginations and invited them to impose their own ideals (or moral judgements) on Shakespeare's imagined worlds.

At the time of writing *Shōsetsu shinzui*, Shōyō apparently regarded drama as inferior to fiction, or at least to have lost its original purpose of entertaining people with the fantasies (or "enactment of legends") in which their ancestors had believed,[43] and so had been forced into a position of moral didacticism. In other words, the representation of flawed human behaviour on the stage could be tolerated only so long as it was seen to give moral instruction, which was also the position of the Meiji government, as at the same time as Shōyō was writing *Shōsetsu shinzui* it actively sought to reform the kabuki theatre.[44]

Through his encounter with Shakespeare, however, Shōyō comes to believe that drama, or at least Shakespearean drama, is better equipped even than the novel for concealing its ideals:

> I suppose that if Shakespeare had written his tragedies in prose, as novels in other words, they would have been of lesser value, which is because it would have been harder for them to conceal their ideals. The tragedy of *King Lear*, for example, would be seen to have the same moralistic purpose as a Bakin novel, because Shakespeare never gives his own opinion in the play, and so its meaning can be deduced from the surface details of the plot, interpret it as one will. To give an example from one of Bakin's novels, the characters of Mr. and Mrs. Hikiroku are depicted with great vigour and realism, but from the viewpoint of hidden ideals the story has a clear moralistic purpose. The author is clearly visible within the story. Likewise, Bashō's famous "frog" haiku has various interpretations but they all stem from the same author's point of view, and so too *The Tale of Genji*.[45]

What Shōyō means by Bakin's "clear moralistic purpose" is basically that of upholding the value system of the Tokugawa regime, and in the case of *The Tale of Genji* the Buddhist aesthetics of the Heian court. The writer whose name appears most frequently in *Shōsetsu shinzui* is in fact Tamenaga Shunsui, who died only fifteen years before Shōyō was born and is considered the most representative of writers in the genre of *ninjōbon*, or popular love stories. Even if Shunsui's stories

centred somewhat predictably on the Edo pleasure quarters, he was less crudely erotic than the humorous *sharebon* of the previous century in his portrayal of strong, compassionate women, and provided Shōyō with a model of popular literary style (*zokubun*) that would feed into his Shakespeare translations, contrasting with the restrained aristocratic style (*gabuntai*) of *The Tale of Genji*. Poet and English literary scholar Yano Hōjin claimed that

> If *The Tale of Genji* gave Shōyō a model of elegant style, then the model of popular directness comes from Tamenaga Shunsui. What Shōyō conceived as the creation of a new literary style derived from the traditional blending of classical and colloquial styles (*gazoku setchū*) is achieved in the ambitious and painstaking efforts of his Shakespeare translations.[46]

What Shōyō sees in Shakespeare is something like this aesthetic ideal of *gazoku setchū*.

All three of these writers (Shakespeare, Murasaki Shikibu, and Shunsui) occupy emotional territories that for Shōyō are broadly defined as the literature of romantic love that flourishes in reaction to official disapproval: for Murasaki the masculine world of the Heian court, for Shakespeare the Puritans, and for Shunsui the officials who towards the end of his life had him manacled and his books burnt. Shōyō's lesser antagonists are the ideologues of a regime that sought to impose uniformity on social and linguistic diversity (for example the linguist Ueda Kazutoshi, who promoted an organic view of national language based on the ideology of *kokutai* or national polity),[47] and in striving for the modern ideal of equal love between men and women he expresses frustration at both the exclusivity of the classical culture and the reductionism of the popular, the sense that nothing was possible outside static hierarchies.

At the same time, as I have mentioned, hierarchies also served to free the imagination and, in the "floating world" of the pleasure quarters stimulated the development of elaborate cultural codes that subverted as well as complied with authority. As Saeki Junko argues, Shōyō's rejection of *iro*, the aesthetic of sexual love personified by the character of Prince Genji, in favour of modern *ai* (romantic love) was also to lose "sight of the rich meanings *iro* had held in the spiritual and cultural history of Japan."[48] Shōyō's puritanism is to a large extent redeemed by Shakespeare, for example the Ovidian poetics of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the populism of the Falstaff plays, and the eroticism of Antony and Cleopatra. The exasperation he expresses in *Shōsetsu shinzui* at lowbrow audience tastes is not necessarily disapproval of what he calls "customs" or "mores" (*fūzoku*) but a realist's refusal to essentialise the local as morally ideal and a writer's determination to get to the end of the story.

Another writer who comes close to Shōyō's ideal of stylistic mixing is the late eighteenth-century "man of letters" (*bunjin*) Ueda Akinari, described as a writer who "by writing in a mixture of colloquial and classical styles" was "able to incorporate both poetic atmosphere and emotional intensity to his text."[49] Yet Akinari was not rediscovered until the twentieth century, and the literary model that both

sustains and repels Shōyō's imagination even more than Shunsui turns out to be Bakin. As he writes in his memoir,

> I wrote *Shōsetsu shinzui* in order to criticise Bakin's excessive proneness for preaching to readers, but because I had been engrossed in his fiction since I was a child, I could not help myself from imitating his way of writing.[50]

Though he wanted to "embrace" the earlier Genroku style of a century before Bakin,[51] it was nevertheless Bakin's that "prevailed" within him, and which he was naturally gifted at imitating:

> The more I realised Bakin's influence the more I came to dislike my own prose style, and yet despite this antipathy I could not outgrow it. This was a complex with which I had to struggle for many years after.[52]

The central device in *Hakkenden* of the eight dog warriors representing one each of the eight Confucian virtues (*jingi hachigyō*) seemed to the young Shōyō no substitute for the emotional complexity of Shakespeare's characters (and they were only dogs after all). Bakin's achievement was the detail and energy with which he sustained his characterisations over the extraordinary length of the work, but the energy was libidinous and Bakin's style famously opaque, and Shōyō resented the notion that any work of literature could trick him into indulging his own "licentious passions" simply in order to instil lessons about duty and loyalty already learnt in his upbringing. Bakin's opaqueness (*inbi*) might correspond with the illusory depth of a writer like Shakespeare, and have introduced Shōyō to one of the basic pleasures of reading, but in Shōyō's theory it was more of a puzzle to be solved than a stimulus for the reader's personal ideals. The fact, however, that Bakin does retain its grip on Shōyō, even into old age, is surely indicative of Bakin's literary strengths, in particular that his didacticism was as much structural as to do with its message, and that (as Lawrence Marceau argues) *Hakkenden*'s "latent or hidden message" (*inbi*)

> may have to do with the ironic distance between the virtuous heroes and the corrupt world within which they act, or it may deal with the distance between the ideals themselves and how they play through in an imperfect world. For Bakin, the juxtaposition between an overly didactic framework and a more subtle reading provides a tension that makes his work compelling even today.[53]

In other words, *Hakkenden* was not necessarily as closed a work as Shōyō's initial comparison with Shakespeare and Victorian fiction may have led him to believe, and its openness makes Bakin more a writer to be channelled than "cancelled" outright. Different from the utopian "happy ending" of Shakespearean comedy, where Bassanio and Bertram are forgiven their indiscretions, Bakin "consciously positions amorousness as the ideological antipode of benevolence but also illustrates

how desire continually resurges from within the sphere of benevolence."[54] This is the psychological flipside of *kanzen chōaku*: the slogan of "virtue rewarded and vice punished" that is frequently cited by Shōyō and that, as Kamei Hideo argued, allowed for a greater range of moral possibilities than conventional historical discourse.[55] *Hakkenden* was a work of remarkable stylistic sophistication, and although Bakin's characters may have been predestined in their roles, that did not stop them from behaving as unpredictably as any other human being; his dialogues also revealed a striking debt to kabuki style.[56] Moreover, Bakin did flout poetic justice, if not exactly in the manner of a Shakespeare, who was criticised in the seventeenth century for his tendency of allowing wicked characters such as Duke Frederick in *As You Like It* to escape punishment by embracing virtue in the course of a play.

Chikamatsu and the Kabuki World

While it is no wonder that Shōyō keeps coming back to Bakin, he still has many reasons for wanting to get away from him, not the least being Bakin's lengthy sentence structures which, in any case, were rapidly supplanted through the influence of *genbun itchi*.[57] Bakin died just eleven years before Shōyō's birth, and his earnest "dog warriors," while serving as powerful role models for the teenage Shōyō, may have seemed lacking in Shakespearean feeling as he encountered Shakespeare in his twenties. For human feelings (*ninjō*), the model was not the decadent Kasei culture of his grandparents' generation (1804–30), which works such as *Hakkenden* were meant to redress, but the artistic flourishing of the Genroku era (1688–1704), with its basis in *mono no aware* aesthetics. In the 1890s, as Jason Karlin argues, as Westernisation provoked nostalgia for a lost sense of community, Genroku culture in particular became imagined as:

> a liminal moment and space wherein differences in social status were ignored and a sense of *communitas* emerged centred on ideas of equality rather than neo-Confucian notions of hierarchy.[58]

Shōyō contributed to the 1890s Genroku boom through his Chikamatsu studies and, since Shakespeare is Chikamatsu writ large in Shōyō's mind, can even be said to coopt Shakespeare to his detachment from the Meiji establishment; Karlin argues that the Genroku boom was a reaction against the centralising, fracturing trajectory of government-led modernisation.[59] Shōyō, of course, is also a Meiji moderniser (and Shakespeare a foreigner), but his reception of Shakespeare as well as challenging past fantasies places Shakespeare's genius mysteriously beyond the borders of the synchronised time and place that modernisation promoted, and even to promote a democracy of the human spirit.

Like Shakespeare, Chikamatsu often wrote on romantic themes (especially in his *sewamono* domestic tragedies), was capable of totalising dramatic effects in works such as *Kokusenya gassen* (The Battles of Coxinga, 1715), and aspired to a dramaturgy that transcended theatrical and social conventions: his plays are considered

less purely theatrical and more unfettered in their level of social awareness, with Andrew Gerstle stressing the "temporal and spatial unity" of his *sewamono*.[60] In an essay written in English for the Shakespeare tercentenary in 1916, Shōyō devotes much of the space to a flattering portrait of the Genroku master:

> Chikamatsu is ingenious in rhetoric, rich in language; possesses both pathos and humour (of course, as compared with Shakespeare's, the magnitude is small and merit is inferior); has suitable talents for a tragedy as well as for a comedy; makes a free and happy passage between realism and romanticism; is gifted with clear common sense, which is a rare thing in a poet; holds a moderate view of life and morality and his attitude as a writer is always objective. . . . [T]he swan-like gentleness of his disposition can be seen from his style and a kind of tenderness which is the pervading tone of his composition. It appears that he did not attempt to propose a new idea or problem, but that he made it the aim of his art to give a pleasure and an unobtrusive lesson [*sic*]. This is also a position in which he resembles Shakespeare. He seems to have been a wonderfully rapid writer; his works may sometimes be suspected to have been composed half unconsciously and almost in spite of himself, and many defects which come from carelessness are found in them; but there is, as in Shakespeare, some unstudied charm.[61]

Shōyō does not make detailed comparisons of individual Chikamatsu plays with any of Shakespeare's, but as plays on contemporary incidents puts Chikamatsu's *sewamono* on a par with the anonymous *Arden of Faversham* (1592), which dramatised the sensational murder of one Thomas Arden by his wife Alice and her lover.[62] The *sewamono* that Shōyō lists, such as *Shinjū ten no Amijima* (The Love Suicides at Amijima, 1721), which was based on an actual double love suicide that took place in Osaka the preceding year, rely too much on recent events for their dramatic appeal in Shōyō's thinking, and therefore reflect too obviously on the so-called lesser ideals of official morality. Yet *Shinjū ten no Amijima*, which was hailed by Donald Keene as "Chikamatsu's masterpiece,"[63] offers numerous examples of what Shōyō regards as Shakespearean realism, as in the final, third act when in the early hours of the morning the paper merchant Jihei is about to depart for his tryst and love suicide with Koharu, but almost ends up forgetting his dagger:

JIHEI. I left my dagger behind. You couldn't fetch it for me. You know, Denbei, that's one good thing about being a samurai, because if I were a samurai myself and had forgotten my sword, I'd probably have to kill myself right there!

DENBEI. I'm sorry I forgot I was holding on to it for you. Here's your knife as well.

CHANTER. He hands Jihei the dagger, who fastens it securely inside his sash.

JIHEI. Difficult to relax without your dagger. Good night to you!

CHANTER. Jihei exits.

DENBEI. Come back to Osaka soon! It's always good to have you.

CHANTER. With this hasty exchange Denbei clatters shut the bolt of the door. There is absolute silence, not a sound. Jihei pretends to leave, but then creeps back stealthily inside. He clings to the door of the teahouse, and peeping inside he is startled to see shadows moving in his direction. He conceals himself by the house opposite until the figures pass.[64]

The scene is discernibly realistic in the way that people easily forget things when they are preoccupied with more serious matters such as the prospect of imminent death, and it epitomises the thematic tension between duty (*giri*) and feeling (*ninjō*). Jihei's dagger is both the instrument of his suicide and a symbol of the honour that binds the mercantile society of Osaka which, with trusted friends like Denbei around, he may be reluctant to leave. Jihei is not of the samurai class for whom the wearing of the two swords was mandatory, and (as he jokes) for whom decisions of life and death were relatively straightforward. Yet through his weakness, Jihei has been drawn into an impossible situation in which suicide is the only way he can prove his sincerity to his lover (who must also die), his wife (whom he loves), and his creditors.

What is attractive about Jihei is that while the culture might be considered psychopathic, he is far from being a psychopath himself, and in this final act seems far from certain that he is doing the right thing. His liminal situation is mirrored dramatically in the detail of the shadows "moving in his direction," which soon reveal themselves to be no more than his brother Magoemon with Magoemon's apprentice Sangorō and Jihei's son Kantarō on Sangorō's back. In a few hours the truth will be out, and Kantarō will be in the care of a surrogate father. Jihei could still belong to that world if only he could wait for the light of day and allow the norms to have their way, and Koharu traded in marriage to a man she does not love. Yet the shadows that startle him are as nebulous as his own feelings. He cannot know what the shadows are until they come close enough for him to be seen and to hear their voices. Likewise, he cannot have known what erotic love was until he had experienced it, and cannot know what death is until he has passed that threshold for himself. It is (*pace* Norinaga) such respect for human realities that drives Shōyō's anti-didacticism.

Jihei looks out from the teahouse onto the darkness of a world in which (as Dowden writes of *King Lear*)[65] moral judgement stands apart from sensual desire. There is a moral import insofar as Jihei and Koharu follow the convention of double love suicides by facing west in the direction of the Buddhist paradise, Amida, in which they hope to be united. This is where the sun will set the following evening, by which time their suicide will be news and known all over Osaka. Yet the ensuing dialogue depicts a couple who have condemned themselves to death by their transgressions; the latter can only accumulate further as they abandon their families and kill themselves in the incorrect manner (since Jihei's stabbing of Koharu is clumsily executed, and he then hangs rather than disembowels himself). Where they succeed, however, is as lovers, and just as for Norinaga erotic love and love between parents and children were the sublime examples of human feeling (*ninjō*),[66] the couple become paragons of human feeling that Chikamatsu's audience could not

fail to recognise and admire. Their true story is the historical truth that will become the poetic truth of Chikamatsu's drama. Although Chikamatsu lacks the hiddenness of Shakespearean dramaturgy, the couple's love can only be expressed aesthetically as an alternative to the social and moral norms that have destroyed them. Jihei's talk of crows may sound like pathetic fallacy, but the more he talks in this way, the more real he becomes for his audience:

KOHARU. You must be worried sick about the children.
JIHEI. I want to start crying again when you mention them. I can almost see them lying peacefully asleep with no idea, the little innocents, that their father is about to kill himself. I can forget about everything else.
CHANTER. He slumps to the ground with weeping. The cawing of crows departing their nests at dawn drown out his sobs. The thought they might be lamenting his fate makes him weep only more.
JIHEI. Listen to the crows . . . come to lead us to the world of the dead. You know what they say about whenever someone writes a prayer on the back of a Kumano amulet, then three crows will die on one of the sacred mountains of Kumano. We have always sworn our love for each other in writing each New Year, and often at the start of a new month too, so if each of our oaths has killed three crows, can you imagine how many must have bitten the dust? The crows always sound like they're calling for their lovers, but knowing the terrible thing we are about to do their cry now is "Revenge, revenge!" I have only myself to blame for the painful death you must endure. Forgive me, Koharu!
CHANTER. He takes her in his arms.
KOHARU. No, I'm the one to blame![67]

Shōyō tends to avoid systematic comparisons of the two playwrights, because while Shakespearean drama can be reduced to three genres and thirty-seven plays, a Chikamatsu play is inseparable from its traditions of chant, song, dance, and musical accompaniment, and in many cases the two genres of *jōruri* puppetry and kabuki acting; it is, specifically, musical drama. Shakespeare and Chikamatsu for Shōyō are more like the two components of a metaphor. They are unrelated but can be defined in terms of each other to intimate a new meaning, which is the nature of drama. His alleged mistake of conflating the differing contexts of Shakespeare's age with Chikamatsu's Genroku may be related to his Aristotelian view of the universality of drama as containing in itself the particular truth that is history: drama gifts to the future the lived experience of history, the more convincingly the better. His concern of the 1890s was the historical drama and historical novel, but even non-historical plays like *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* were tasked with preserving lived experience for the future. Thus, when Shōyō compares Chikamatsu with Shakespeare as he does most exhaustively in his essay of 1909,[68] he may be suggesting no more than that since the two writers each manifest a profound understanding of human nature, which constitutes the principal engine of historical change, the historical truths that their plays express are all of a piece,

reflecting on a shared human nature. The ages of Chikamatsu and Shakespeare are different in time and place but are driven by similar, even identical principles of cause and effect.

In the same essay, Shōyō lists eighteen "resemblances" between the two writers, namely

(1) they lived in historically similar periods – the early modern mercantilism of Shakespeare's London and Chikamatsu's Osaka in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries created a large urban audience for new theatrical distractions;[69]
(2) the biographical details of their lives are obscure – similar to Shakespeare's so-called "lost years" (between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-eight), relatively little is known about Chikamatsu's early life until his emergence as a playwright in the 1680s at the age of thirty;[70]
(3) they had rather similar careers before achieving fame – both were "staff playwrights," Shakespeare for the Lord Chamberlain's Men and King's Men and Chikamatsu for the Takemotoza puppet theatre, although unlike Shakespeare he never acted (or worked puppets);[71]
(4) each cultivated "a close acquaintanceship with people of noble birth" – similar to Shakespeare's likely patronage by the 3rd Earl of Southampton, Chikamatsu served a noble Kyoto family as a page after his father lost his position as a samurai for obscure reasons;[72]
(5) they both "became leaders of the dramatic world when it was still somewhat immature" – the modern bunraku puppet theatre began in Osaka in the 1680s, while the first English play written in blank verse was staged in London in 1561;[73]
(6) they borrowed widely from literary and other available sources, such as popular songs – Chikamatsu reworks the structures and plots of classical Noh plays, especially in his historical *jidaimono*, while the sources of only a couple of Shakespeare's plays remain unidentified;[74]
(7) they "both brushed up others' works, or collaborated with others" – Chikamatsu with Takeda Izumo II (one of the writers of *Kanadehon Chūshingura*), and Shakespeare with George Wilkins and others (Shōyō suggests Marlowe);[75]
(8) "both men appeared at a time when the drama was in a primitive state" – this point is certainly true of Shakespeare although less of Chikamatsu, for whom Noh drama had already been flourishing for three hundred years;[76]
(9) they worked in a wide range of dramatic genres – Shakespeare in tragedy, comedy, historical drama, and "problem plays," and Chikamatsu in historical *jidaimono* plays and contemporary *sewamono* domestic dramas (both of which usually have tragic endings);[77]
(10) they benefited from strong creative partnerships (Shakespeare with the actor Richard Burbage and Chikamatsu with the *jōruri* narrator Takemoto Gidayū);[78]
(11) neither were without adversaries; for example, the Blackfriars and Takemoto theatres – with reference to Ben Jonson, Shōyō comments that "their

opponents were not so jealous, deep or subtle; they challenged them fairly or squarely. Theirs was a real fight for art's sake";[79]

(12) they both had their work published while they were still alive – Chikamatsu also had his work published in a Japanese "folio" edition shortly after his death in 1724;[80]

(13) "both of them were praised as the first and probably last of the greatest figures in the literary world";[81]

(14) they have similar literary qualities; for example, their ability "to express more than one sentiment simultaneously" and in "the musical tone of their works" (Shakespeare in the musicality of his prosody);[82]

(15) the two are broadly similar in their dramatic influences, being "neither moralists like Bakin nor such outright revealers of the truth as Ibsen" but wishing simply for their audiences "to enjoy a glorious world, basking in the soft and amorphous ecstasies of life" – Shōyō comments on the similarity of the two writers' artistic views, Chikamatsu's that "Art is something that lies in the slender margin between the real and unreal" and Shakespeare's skill at tempering realism with fantasy (or idealism), and suggests that what Shakespeare understands by aesthetic pleasure is close to Chikamatsu's word "comfort" (*nagusameru*), which Shōyō also frequently uses;[83]

(16) they are both "equipped with a sound philosophy of life and endowed with ample common sense";[84]

(17) in the late nineteenth century they each became subject to revisionist criticism, Shakespeare by Tolstoy and Shaw and Chikamatsu by the Japanese Naturalists, who found Chikamatsu too idealistic and preferred the grittier realism of his near-contemporary Ihara Saikaku;[85]

(18) and finally, their works "have been arbitrarily adapted for the convenience of the stage," in other words are open to a wide range of theatrical interpretation – Chikamatsu arguably more so than Shakespeare because of the priority of performance over text in kabuki, although Shōyō mentions John Dryden's adaptations of *The Tempest* and other plays of the Restoration era.[86]

Shōyō's comparison is revealing of both writers and in his elusive hints at the requirements of literary genius, but it obscures the main difference between kabuki and Shakespearean drama, the former being defined by theatrical tradition and the latter by the texts. Chikamatsu comes across as the same kind of self-made man as Shakespeare's name was first known in Japan; that notion is developed by Shōyō's demands for coherent dramaturgy and character formation. Shōyō's tendency to conflate timeframes, while tendentious, is informed by his ear for different historical styles, and this explains his preference for Chikamatsu's kabuki. His 1907 essay on *Hamlet* in Japan is worth quoting at length in this regard, beginning with his viewpoint that

> The Elizabethan age is basically similar to our own Genroku and Kyōhō eras in the way that the latter broke with the Momoyama culture of the previous century, and yet displays some of the qualities of the tenth-century Heian era,

> being on the one hand extremely aristocratic and feudalistic but at the same time democratic in its openness to the wave of individualism known as the Renaissance.[87]

The Momoyama era (1573–1615) was a period of continual civil war dominated by the austere values of the samurai elite, and therefore in contrast to the mercantile Genroku culture of a century later; Chikamatsu's *Shinjū ten no Amijima* was written in the Kyōhō era (1716–36). Like Elizabethan England, Chikamatsu's Japan was a rigidly hierarchical society that was also amenable to sceptical reflection and acts of individual agency, notably through the emergence of the resilient mercantile culture of the Kamigata region of western Japan which produced Chikamatsu's puppet theatre. Kamigata (the traditional name of both the region and its dialect) was associated especially with the *jōruri* and kabuki drama that emerged in Osaka in the seventeenth century, with a preference for love stories (known as *wagoto*) and plot rather than dance. Shōyō's interest in dance drama aligns him with Edo kabuki, but as a Shakespearean he was also strongly attracted to the literary style and plots of Chikamatsu.

As will be discussed in the next section, the colloquial and narrative style of Chikamatsu *jōruri* is at a radical remove from the formal idiolect of the imperial court and nobility (both Meiji and feudal), not to mention the refinement of classical Japanese poetry. Shōyō asserts that "the fictional monarchs and princes of Shakespeare's plays" such as Hamlet, King Lear, and Macbeth "are of a lower rank than Japanese emperors" and "correspond more with the Tokugawa shoguns" in their agency.[88] As one example, "Hamlet's father sleeps in his orchard unattended by pages and courtiers," which no emperor could have ever done. Shōyō treats the episode as evidence of Shakespeare's "populism" and of why a "candid and unrestrained domestic style might go well with the classical thoughts of Shakespeare's kings and queens." This is the style of Chikamatsu *sewamono*, with Shōyō adding that Hamlet's "antic disposition" "can only be translated by resorting to" the Chikamatsu style and that Meiji Japanese was simply too integrated (and lacking in flavour) for the stylistic jumps that occurred in Shakespeare's tragedy: too laden with emotive classical echoes (and kabuki too stylised and performative) to achieve the "detachment" (*fusoku furi*) Shōyō saw in Hamlet.

Shōyō's equivalence of Shakespeare with Chikamatsu is therefore more than the unqualified pairing of two so-called classical playwrights but based first on his realist agenda and next on his pragmatic reading of Shakespeare's texts. Characters such as Hamlet discuss their states of mind in a way that is foreign to kabuki, where the action evolves more from arbitrary plot developments than individual speech acts, but Shōyō – at least in 1907 – believes that Hamlet can do so in the Kamigata dialect of Chikamatsu *sewamono*. Shakespeare is "unfettered" and kabuki "restricted" by its numerous conventions, but this is not to deny their common interest in the complexity of human relationships,[89] nor that kabuki conventions allow for a tighter dramaturgy than Shōyō cares to admit. They are also based in a calendar that is every bit as seasonal as Shakespeare's imagination, since

Barbara E. Thornbury insists (and more than Shōyō would have perhaps cared to admit) that

> Edo kabuki was not illogical but was based on a performance calendar which provided a controlling context for each play that was produced in the course of it.[90]

The romanticism that absorbs Shōyō in his 1890 studies arises from the two writers' individuality, which in Shakespeare is the inherent desire for freedom and in Chikamatsu the "spirit of resistance,"[91] and their focus on nature as a source of salvation.

Kawatake Mokuami, whom Shōyō esteemed as "an embodiment of centuries of kabuki art" and up to his death in 1893 had been Shōyō's mentor in the exclusive kabuki world,[92] might seem an even apter parallel to Shakespeare, and unlike Chikamatsu Mokuami knew Shakespeare's work. Similar to Chikamatsu's proclivity for word associations (*engo*) and pivot words (*kakekotoba*), Mokuami is considered a master of seven-five syllabic meter, and his skill at onomatopoeia was the kind of detail that Shōyō wanted to imitate. Moreover, while Chikamatsu was superior at *sewamono* (which, for Shōyō, is the closer parallel to Shakespeare than his *jidaimono*), Mokuami was the more skilled at "capturing the vicissitudes of historical change" in his historical dramas.[93] In plays such as *Benten kozō* (Benten the Thief, 1862) he had shown a Shakespearean sympathy for the social outcast that related to Shōyō's understanding of the ethical dimension of dramatic literature. It also contrasted with the more cynical tone of Mokuami's Kasei predecessor, Tsuruya Nanboku.[94]

What Chikamatsu and Mokuami mainly have in common with Shakespeare, as Shōyō asserts in his *Tempest* afterword,[95] is their ability to create dramatic situations. In Mokuami's dance drama *Momijigari* (Maple Viewing, 1887), the transformation of the beautiful Princess Sarashina into a fire-breathing demon to be killed by a divine sword wielded by the warrior Koremochi exemplifies kabuki at its most sensory (and innovative); although it has no narrative equivalent in a Shakespeare play, it is theatrically equivalent to Shakespeare's general fascination with behavioural changes; for example, Othello's jealousy that is inexplicable to all except Iago and – contrary to Sarashina – appears to feminise his character. Like Shakespearean drama, a kabuki masterpiece is also accessible to a range of interpretations, for example that "the forces of rationality, order, and progressive modern world (in the person of Koremochi) stand arrayed against the forces of an older, mysterious, and superstitiously reactionary past."[96] This interpretation by Richard Emmert and Alan Cummings relates *Momijigari* to its Meiji context, and (one might add) to Shakespeare's context where in plays such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream* Shakespeare exploits past superstitions to theatrical effect. Like Shakespeare, Mokuami's achievement stands at the beginning of a new age, and there is a parallel between Shōyō's demand for coherent dramaturgy in the theatrical reform movement and the shift to classicism in Jacobean drama. At the same time, Mokuami's position at the end of the age of classical kabuki and Shakespeare's at the outset of modern

English drama implies a rather different approach to their craft. Shakespeare's alleged capacity for "hiddenness" creates a new kind of drama that is radically different from both classical and medieval models, whereas Mokuami is seeking to improve on two hundred years of kabuki tradition. It is against that tradition that modern notions such as dramatic realism will be judged.

Shōyō's Prefaces and the Cultural Hinterland

Shōyō provided prefaces to each of his Shakespeare translations as they were published by Waseda University Press between 1909 and 1928. Unlike Dr. Johnson's seminal Prefaces of 1765, Shōyō's can hardly be said to amount to a critical event, but there is a parallel between Johnson's claims for Shakespeare's genius in the wake of neoclassicism, in particular his truth to nature, and Shōyō's more incremental assertions against the modern theatre of ideas with which his translations competed. Johnson's admiration for Shakespeare arises from his comparative study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English poets, and is significant for its defence of Shakespearian tragicomedy. Shōyō's comparisons are with his native playwrights and novelists (never poets), and even if the argument about tragicomedy is a European one, the issue of generic mixing is wholly relevant to his context.

Against the ideological integrity of *shingeki* and the artistic traditionalism of kabuki, Shōyō's translations assert repeatedly that "truth to nature" is the big idea and that it does not have to end badly. Johnson and Shōyō share a belief in their critical instincts: their authority as educated men of letters to make balanced judgements. Johnson's are rooted in Enlightenment common sense, Shōyō's in his native aesthetics and the realism he first expounded in the 1880s. Shakespeare, for Shōyō, is true to nature not only because the Anglo-American critics tell him so but because his cumulative reading of the plays makes him aware of all he has known to be true from his native literature. In particular, his reading enables him to get away from single comparisons, and to realise Shakespeare's creativity across the entire canon; Shakespeare's plays are universal for Shōyō only to the extent that they make sense for him in terms of his native culture.

Titus Andronicus, for example, whose translation Shōyō completed in July 1926, becomes *chi no higeki*, "a bloody tragedy,"[97] suggesting a number of comparisons to his blood-stained kabuki. The early nineteenth-century dramas of Tsuruya Nanboku have what he calls "an unnatural congeniality" with Shakespeare's early tragedy,[98] unnatural because they both make dramatic art out of onstage gore. He writes that

> The heartless cruelty and sheer bile of a play like *Titus Andronicus* are viewed by a popular audience as one would watch Nanboku's *Ehon gappō ga tsuji* [An Illustrated Picture Book of the Crossroads of Gappō, 1810], his *Tōkaidō Yotsuya kaidan* [Ghost Story of Yotsuya, 1825], or revenge plays like *Kameyama adauchi* [Revenge of Kameyama, 1701] and *Katakiuchi Tengajaya mura* [Revenge at Tengajaya, 1781].[99]

There is a murder in every scene of *Ehon gappō ga tsuji*, but the most obvious parallel is between the horror of Lavinia's mutilation by Demetrius and Chiron and the disfigurement and murder of Oiwa by her villainous husband Iemon in Nanboku's *Yotsuya kaidan*, the most successful of nineteenth-century kabuki plays and the most famous of Japanese ghost stories. Oiwa's face is disfigured by a poisoned facial cream supplied by the family of a rival lover, and she is then accidentally killed in a confrontation with a man sent to rape her so that Iemon can sue for divorce. The final scenes in which Oiwa's ghost appears to haunt Iemon and drive him mad are especially memorable, and for a Japanese audience as sensational as the muted and mutilated Lavinia's incrimination of her assailants with the stumps of her arms.

Just at the time that Shōyō was translating *Titus Andronicus*, T. S. Eliot was to label it "one of the stupidest and most uninspired plays ever written,"[100] but Shōyō asserts its moral and poetic strengths, and if for him Nanboku is more like Thomas Kyd than Shakespeare, then he knows where Shakespeare's early tragedy is coming from.[101] In Shōyō's theory, the point of these comparisons is that if Edo drama and literature depended on sensation to advance its agenda of rewarding virtue and punishing vice, then writers such as Nanboku had developed the theatre of sensation to its highest degree. Yet realising the limitations of his culture Shōyō could understand even more easily why Shakespeare should have graduated to writing of greater psychological depth and stylistic variety. That trajectory would lead Shakespeare eventually to *Macbeth*, coming ten years after *Titus Andronicus*, and one of the eight plays whose translations Shōyō selected for inclusion in Volumes 4 and 5 of his Selected Works.

Shōyō could not have wanted to include all his translations when they were already available in cheap pocket-sized format. His selection offers a compelling overview of what he valued about Shakespeare. To start with, the ordering of the selection across the two volumes manifests a dichotomy between classicism and modernity that runs throughout his career. The five plays selected for Volume 4 – *The Tempest* (translated February 1915), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (October 1915), *Henry IV*, Parts 1 and 2 (June and July 1919), and *The Taming of the Shrew* (November 1920) – are all Elizabethan plays with the exception of *The Tempest* (for reasons that will become clear), while the three in Volume 5 – *Antony and Cleopatra* (May 1915), *Measure for Measure* (July 1918), and *Macbeth* (February 1916) – are from after 1603.

This periodic shift is reflected in Shōyō's response. The plays in Volume 4 evoke a lighter response rooted in Shōyō's classical instincts, while those in Volume 5 seem to him darker and more modern. In this paradigm, *The Tempest* is the first in line because it was the one Shōyō found easiest to translate, whereas he apparently struggled with *Macbeth*:

> In contrast with the comedies, which even if they are not uniformly carefree and relaxed do feel as if they were written in a spirit of some relaxation, the tragedies – in particular *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear*, and *Macbeth* – seem a lot more profound and meticulous in their composition, almost like the

> apocryphal sculptor of statues of the Buddha who bows three times to the statue before applying his chisel, and for this reason demand three or four times the effort to translate.[102]

This observation indicates the difficulties Shōyō encountered in translating the tragedies, which he did mainly in the 1910s, and even the transition from didacticism to realism must at some point require a serious grappling with the tragic genre. The tragedies were also more likely to be associated with the tragic genre of kabuki *jidaimono*, with the expectation that they should be translated in kabuki-style *shichigochō*. Shōyō's translations of the comedies, completed mainly in the 1920s, are mainly colloquial prose and less reliant on syllabic meter.

In his "Preface to a Commentary on *Macbeth*," Shōyō had praised the Scottish play as Shakespeare's greatest tragedy: the one that most clearly exemplified "the remarkable resemblance of Shakespeare's works to nature itself."[103] Its translation will amount to rather more than the parodies in which he had indulged as a student: something like a translation of "nature" itself. The Romantics may have managed this, but even if Shakespeare had already done most of the work Shōyō was still, in his view, encountering a work greater than any in his own tradition. He writes grandiosely that

> since Shakespeare is a born poet and fortunately not the slave of small ideals, his descriptions follow the Creator's universe, thus moving our intellect and emotions today and – between the lines – foretelling the future.[104]

Macbeth may not necessarily – word for word – be a difficult play to translate, but any mistake would feel like a desecration of the original, and Shōyō must wonder whether his translations will achieve anything like the original's rhetorical effect.

In an account of Shōyō's aesthetics, Ishida Tadahiko describes this impasse of theory and practice as the intersection of the limitless horizon of the protagonist's tragic vision with finite reality.[105] Nakamura Kan suggests that Shōyō's initial enthusiasm for the power of Shakespeare's imagination to affirm readers' individual ideals reflected a wider optimism among fin-de-siècle Japanese writers as they embraced nineteenth-century ideologies such as Naturalism, Romanticism, and socialism, but that this confidence had all but evaporated by the 1920s as none of the new movements had succeeded in creating for Japan a true and lasting modernity.[106] In other words, while Shōyō was wary of losing himself in Shakespeare's imagination, his innate caution may not have been enough to prevent himself from being swept along by the rhetoric of the Scottish play, especially when the dramatic impasse Shakespeare himself achieves between limitless imagination and finite reality was apparently beyond the scope of his native tradition. As Nakamura observes, Shōyō's Shakespearean realism (along, of course, with the efforts of such writers as Ōgai and Sōseki) obliquely failed in its intent of making readers "grow up" by facing reality,[107] leaving the nation spiritually "immature" and exposed to the rising militarism of the 1930s.

Nakamura further argues that what Shōyō learnt from *Macbeth* in particular was "the darkness of individuality":[108] that (to apply his quotation) "Macbeth does murder sleep" (2.2.37), since in Nakamura's analogy, Shōyō himself is like Macbeth through his disturbance of the cultural status quo with the agenda of reform he pursued as a young man, and rued his youthful ambition in his later years.[109] Macbeth was clearly the opposite of the "good man" (*yoki hito*) of tradition who, subduing his "passions" in the face of numerous temptations stood at the centre of the social community.[110] Casting himself in that role as an ethically responsible translator, Shōyō had to handle Macbeth's villainy with due care. Moreover, while Shōyō may have been repelled by his subject, any misreading of Macbeth's lines was also to detract from Macbeth's essential individuality. It was this inherent darkness of Macbeth's character, or rather its potential to be released among innocent Japanese readers, that made the act of translation the *yoki hito*'s control of distracting passions, while for Shōyō the tragedy's sheer "naturalness" made it a play that refused to stand still.

At the other end of the literary spectrum, and the first in the series, is *The Tempest*, where the demands made of the translator are less austere. The preface and afterword Shōyō wrote for his *Tempest* translation comprise the longest commentary he wrote on any Shakespeare play. In contrast to the Buddhist respect for nature, Shōyō's *Tempest* is a Confucian play in which the *yoki hito* Prospero takes central position. Shōyō admires the play's poetry and musicality, and the balance Prospero achieves between his inner and outer selves, which is the *yoki hito*'s ability to master his passions. Having previously been puzzled by the loose dramatic structures of Shakespeare's plots, he was pleased to encounter a play that basically adhered to the Aristotelian unities,[111] and so enabled him to get a clearer grip on what he was translating.

At one point in his afterword, Shōyō compares the unities with the role of Confucian ideals in feudal Japan in maintaining the social contract.[112] In *Shōsetsu shinzui*, the problem had not been with Confucianism itself but rather with what he saw as Tokugawa fiction's tendency to present a superficial morality that was undermined by "a distorted view of human experience" and "illogical plots."[113] Shakespeare too was a writer whose works, albeit with greater subtlety, juxtaposed a conservative social order with a subversive strain. Shōyō's challenge as a translator was to get inside that dramaturgy while avoiding any unwanted equivalence with Confucian morality and the neoclassical morality about which Dowden had been uneasy:

> Shakspere introduces into the world no little ethical code. Such a little ethical code would flutter away in tatters across the tempest and the night of Lear's agony. But Shakspere discovers the supreme fact – that the moral world stands in sovereign independence of the world of senses.[114]

That was all very well, and one of those desirably modern traits that appealed to a developing society more interested in Social Darwinism than Christianity, but for a person of Shōyō's generation raised in the years leading up to the abolition of samurai privileges in the 1870s, it must have come as some relief to find the ideals

of benevolence and harmony present not only in Prospero's comic revenge but in the unified Aristotelian structure of which Prospero is master.

Shōyō puts Shakespeare's romance comedy on a par with the tragedies but is at pains to find an appropriate rhythm of translation. While noting a transition between *sewa chōshi*, the rhythm of kabuki *sewamono*, and the more sonorous *jidai chōshi* of kabuki period plays,[115] he regrettably does not give any specific examples of how he manifests this balance in his translation, but throughout the play we can see how quieter domestic scenes, such as Prospero's dialogue in 1.2 and the comic banter of Stephano and Trinculo, give way to scenes of epic grandeur engineered by Prospero's magic, such as the wedding masque and inveiglement of Alonso and Antonio. Shōyō conceives the play's internal rhythm as follows:

> It is impossible to translate a play like *The Tempest* without in some way accounting for its delicate transitions from the historical to the contemporary, and likewise its moments of rising strength as the style changes back to the historical. These things are intuitive. Shakespeare's works contain numerous such instances where we feel a living and breathing reality, and these are especially apparent in *The Tempest*.[116]

By "historical," Shōyō presumably means those moments when we become aware of Prospero's past and the classical and biblical mythologies in which he frames his narrative, and by "contemporary" those moments that are focussed on present realities and the immediate future. His preoccupation with style and "a living and breathing reality" takes us back to the realism of *Shōsetsu shinzui*, and compared with other Shakespeare plays he finds rather few equivalents in his native drama, instead making a general comparison between *The Tempest* as a kind of "comic opera" with the sensuality of Chikamatsu and Mokuami (and, intriguingly, Max Reinhardt).[117] Yet since Shōyō follows the current critical fashion of identifying Prospero with Shakespeare himself, and he is Shakespeare's dominant voice in early twentieth-century Japan, then the translator had the potential to contribute to cultural change through the techniques he mentions, such as stylistic mixing. The irony of this analogy is that, to the extent that Prospero's magic is identified with Shakespeare's "hidden" genius, the translator's ability to grasp the essence of Prospero's character diminishes, and Shōyō seems to admit as such when he comments that

> If you translate his speeches in Tokyo dialect, he sounds nouveau riche and cannot relax, and if you translate them in the contemporary colloquial dialect they sound too rough.[118]

Shōyō's Prospero must be greater than both the entrepreneur and the man about town.

Shōyō's comments on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* focus on cultural parallels rather than translation issues, suggesting that the play's mixing of folklore and classical mythology is similar to the mixing of animist Shinto and Buddhist elements in

bunraku plays.[119] The localised aspect of Shinto, with its belief in local spirits and deities, corresponds here with the folklore, and Buddhism as a pan-Asian religion with the Greco-Roman mythology, and Shōyō makes a further comparison between Shakespeare's classical allusions and the basis of much of Edo kabuki in medieval Japanese legends and history. The stories of the Kamakura and Ashikaga eras (lasting from the twelfth century through to the sixteenth) provided kabuki with sources of plot and character that were similar, in particular, to the use Shakespeare makes of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Shōyō's basic point is that Shakespeare's creativity lies in the use he makes of his sources, and that this is a technique with which Japanese readers must be familiar from their native drama. Yet in comparing the mechanicals' play to the greatest of *jōruri* puppet plays, *Kanadehon Chūshingura* (The Treasury of Loyal Retainers, 1748; adapted later that year for the kabuki stage),[120] where the forty-seven masterless samurai (*rōnin*) are able to hide their revenge motives from the authorities partly by comic foolery, Shōyō is also aware of a subversive potential of generic mixing in both Shakespeare and his native drama.

Shōyō makes a subtle rejoinder that if *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was originally "intended as a dream play then its confusion of historical periods is all the more extreme."[121] Against his earlier unflattering comparison of Chikamatsu's *jidaimono* to the same Shakespeare comedy for their excessive use of fantasy, he makes an alternative point that like Prospero, whose language was apparently not spoken in 1920s Japan, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* might even surpass his native drama in the scope of its dramaturgy, being more clearly focussed on the single motif of the dream. In yet another essay, he was to write that the two areas in which he felt kabuki did exceed Shakespeare were in its depiction of sex and violence; this was a genre in which the female lovers are often professional courtesans rather than Shakespearean virgins, and fathers allowed their young sons to be beheaded to please the whims of a scheming official.[122] In Shakespeare's plays, with exceptions such as *Titus Andronicus*, grotesquely violent or erotic scenes usually occur offstage, for example the murder of Lady Macduff and her children, and the conventionalised sensuality of kabuki has seldom been part of Shakespeare tradition. It is this often-grotesque aesthetic, with the demands made on performers and its ideological function, that Shōyō is least able to deny about kabuki. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and its tragic counterpart *Romeo and Juliet* are both overtly physical plays, but the coupling of Bottom and Titania is an object of humour and the lovers' quarrel in the woods leads to a comic resolution that eludes the two young lovers. Sex and violence are seldom ends in themselves in Shakespeare, the language with its references to classical mythology being more shocking than what is demanded of the mise-en-scène.

In the final part of his preface, Shōyō devotes a whole five pages to an analysis of Puck, mainly comprising a monologue in the words of a Japanese Puck.[123] This character observes that Japanese folklore also has its tradition of native spirits and goblins, notably the *kappa* who were believed to lure travellers to their deaths in lonely roadside bogs. Shōyō refers to a study of Japanese folklore published six years before his *Dream* translation by his contemporary Yanagita Kunio, considered the "father" of Japanese folkloristics and known for his linguistic theory of

centre and periphery: that new words created in cultural centres such as Kyoto do not always have the momentum to replace existing synonyms in outlying areas.[124] This reference makes striking, if oblique sense in the context of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, where the mechanicals' play in the final act unconsciously satirises the behaviour of the upper-class lovers and where one of Shakespeare's purposes is to harmonise English folklore with the Christian ideal of marriage. For Shōyō too, there is perhaps a comic realisation that ignorance of the folklore and mythology that underlies a work like Shakespeare's *Dream* can itself lead to unfortunate errors; such details are essential for containing the play's imaginative power.

Shōyō praises *Measure for Measure* for its "psychological naturalness,"[125] referring primarily to the integrity of the lovers in contrast to Angelo's hypocrisy and Isabella's pleas for mercy, which he regards as even more dramatic than Portia's in *The Merchant of Venice*.[126] He writes that although the play may be faulted in places for obscurity of plot and "unnatural" characterisation,

> it is, compared with native *jōruri*, *kusasōshi* story books and the popular novels of Bakin, of profound psychological interest, displays its writer's characteristic realism and lightness of touch, especially in its depiction of comic types, and vividly captures the city life of three hundred years ago.[127]

Shōyō draws a parallel between the narrative device of Duke Vincentio's disguise as Friar Lodowick and the Kamakura regent Hōjō Tokiyori, who in 1256 resigned from his position to take the Buddhist tonsure.[128] Shōyō does not elaborate the comparison, but Tokiyori had been known as a reforming administrator, who according to legend travelled the country incognito to inspect the living conditions of the people; one such episode was preserved for posterity in the Noh play *Hachi no ki* (Potted Trees), attributed to Zeami.[129] Unlike Vincentio, Tokiyori's retirement was due to ill health, and he forestalled political chaos by dividing the roles of regent and family head between his cousin Nagatoki, a benevolent administrator who lacked the will to seize absolute power, and his infant son Tokimune, who eventually succeeded to both roles to become one of the most ruthless of Kamakura statesmen. These two figures can be said to combine the two sides of Angelo's character as both repressed and repressive, an unfortunate combination that Shōyō calls *dojingata*, a chauvinist type unsuited to running a big city, since as well as being a type of ceramic figurine *dojingata* can also mean someone who is both uncouth and a stickler for rules.[130] The analogy would also align him with types such as Puck and Caliban who exist only inside their native culture.

What Shōyō does not mention in his preface, although perhaps the comparison was too obvious to need repeating, is that the plot of *Measure for Measure* is strikingly the opposite to a Chikamatsu *sewamono* like *Sonezaki shinjū* (The Love Suicides at Sonezaki, 1703) where the lovers Tokubei and Ohatsu have little choice but to kill themselves in the end, and unlike with Claudio and Juliet there is no possibility of salvation from within the system. For Shōyō, the appeal of *Measure for Measure* is surely that not only does it seek to put the kind of demi-monde associated with *sewamono* in its place but it does so through the inherent interest of the

narrative and characterisation, especially of straight characters such as Angelo and Isabella, who are made interesting by the hiddenness of Shakespeare's dramatic genius; his argument with Tokugawa literature is as much with the society that produced the works as with individual writers.

Shōyō's view of *Antony and Cleopatra* is more oblique. He finds it Shakespeare's "most enthralling work,"[131] being enchanted by the image of the mature couple outromancing the forces of reason and propriety:

> If Cleopatra is obviously a human Venus, then Antony on the River Cydnus is like Tannhäuser when he first enters the forest of pleasure [i.e. Venusburg].[132]

Shakespeare's tragedy was as pleasurable as anything in Shōyō's native tradition, and in the person of Cleopatra the pleasure was recognizably "Oriental." Shōyō's experimental musical drama *Shinkyoku Urashima* (1904) had adapted the plot and structure of Richard Wagner's early opera *Tannhäuser* to the folktale of Urashima Tarō, mentioned in the eighth-century *Nihon shoki*, which records the mythological and historical origins of the Imperial line. The parallel between Shakespeare's "demigods"[133] and the poor fisher boy Urashima and Princess Otohime is clearly on a different scale from the realism of Chikamatsu's *sewamono* and the superhuman warriors of kabuki *jidaimono*. It opens up a creative, eroticised space that (in the struggle between the sacred and profane) is at one remove from kabuki's medieval and early modern settings and from Christian history in Shakespeare's case, and more than anything else expresses the power of drama to detach audiences from the passing of time. In his preface, Shōyō also paraphrases Dowden's Wagnerian assessment of the couple as characters who

> insinuate themselves through the senses, trouble the blood, ensnare the imagination, invade our whole being like colour or like music. The figures dilate to proportions greater than human, and are seen through a golden haze of sensuous splendor.[134]

About the two parts of *Henry IV*, Shōyō observes that the power struggles between the king and his barons are similar to those of medieval Japan, and that the tavern scenes with Falstaff and his cronies recall a similar populist vein in Edo culture, but that altogether the plays seemed more modern in sensibility than, for example, the depiction of lowlife characters in the late Tokugawa fiction of his childhood reading.[135] Through Shakespeare's conflation of the early fifteenth century with the Elizabethan present, Henry's usurpation of his cousin, King Richard II, and Prince Hal's final rejection of Falstaff after his coronation could be said to harbour the political realities of the modern age, but for Shōyō the power struggles of medieval Japan must have seemed like more of the same, while – for a more modern parallel – the escapades of the comic duo in Jippensha Ikku's classic *kokkeibon* novel *Tōkaidō Hizakurige* (Shank's Mare, 1802–22) served mainly to affirm the richness and variety of a culture that did not need modernising. Jippensha's comic novel, which Shōyō read in his youth, recounts the journey of two accident-prone male

travellers along the main Tōkaidō road from Kyoto in the west to Edo (present-day Tokyo) in the east. Like Shakespeare's plays, it is sympathetic in its characterisation but (for all its literary qualities) was primarily meant to promote domestic tourism, which is a fate that Shōyō desires neither for Shakespeare nor for his native literature.

In his preface to *The Taming of the Shrew*, Shōyō compares the boisterous induction scene, as well as the various crudities that characterise this early Shakespeare comedy, with the genre of popular *niwaka* farce that continues to this day with its clever punch lines, *niwaka* meaning "offhand" or "impromptu."[136] *Niwaka* farces are typically based on scenes from mainstream kabuki plays, and as an Osaka rather than Tokyo tradition situates a character such as Petruchio within the softer mercantile culture of the Kamigata region. Yet Shōyō's comparison also hints at the cultural embeddedness of the play's chauvinism. He translated the play in 1920, shortly after propertied British women over the age of thirty had been given the right to vote. Japanese women were not granted suffrage until 1946, although a suffrage movement had existed since the nineteenth century, and in 1920 the lives of Japanese women were largely governed by their menfolk, particularly their fathers, in a system that was not very different from that of Elizabethan society.

There were plenty of strong women in kabuki: geisha who sacrifice their lives for their lovers and know exactly what they are doing, loyal wives and jealous mothers-in-law, and so on, but they did so in the context of a strict patriarchy, and it is to such a society that a Japanese Petruchio would have his Kate conform, all the more so in the Kamigata context. Yet through Kate's robust rejection of Petruchio's advances, Shakespeare's play could also be said to look forward to a world in which a woman's freedom to assert her independence was the accepted norm, with Shōyō commenting that

> it is interesting how this play, which is still regarded . . . as evidence of the chauvinistic instincts of the male psyche, also looks forward to a world in which perfect equality between men and women might be easily achieved.[137]

Shōyō, for his part, supported the advancement of women in the theatre with the admission of actresses such as Matsui Sumako to the Bungei Kyōkai, but the fact that they were forbidden from having relationships with the male members echoes the discipline Petruchio imposes on Kate to tame her shrewish behaviour.

Shōyō and Modernity

With his reputation for being "behind the times," Shōyō can be expected to have a complex relationship with modernity. He wishes to modernise his native drama and literature, but (as Tsuno Kaitarō argued) his essentially comic vision sets him apart from the tragic individualism of younger contemporaries such as Sōseki and Shimazaki Tōson,[138] and this vision is rooted in his Shakespeare studies. To start with, the coherent structures he finds in Shakespeare are at odds with a modernist sense of life's incompleteness, and whereas the Japanese modernist responds to

formlessness and disintegration with new forms and a strong belief in self, it is enough for Shōyō that Shakespeare merely affirms him in his reality. Against the confessional mode of early twentieth-century I-novelists such as Tōson and Shiga Naoya what Shōyō rather likes about Shakespeare is his capacity for hiding his inner feelings, and when Shōyō does talk about himself it is usually in a histrionic mode that comes "after the event," which it therefore congratulates its speakers for having survived. Shōyō also has a greater faith in history than many moderns. In his Aristotelian view, poetry is secondary to history, with little of the urgency of the moment, and his own position as translator comes a somewhat distant third place, as he indicates in a speech he gave in 1928 to mark the completion of his Shakespeare translations that is typically "Meiji" in its florid comparisons with past adventurers:

> this publication has been a perilous undertaking at this ominous time when the publishing world has been threatened by economic recession and, if I may adopt a maritime metaphor, the winds have been fierce and the waves high. Yet not only have the vessels been laden with a cargo of incomparable value, namely the works of William Shakespeare, but they have been Japanese boats, ramshackle rigged vessels of a former age, thirty-five to forty of them, among them the good ships *Hamlet* and *Romeo*. Weathering the storm of this terrible recession has without doubt been a feat of great danger. Taking arms against this sea of troubles was my editor, the redoubtable Shimanaka, whose gallantry recalls the heroic voyage by the merchant Kibun to transport *mikan* fruits to Edo in the early eighteenth century, the illicit exploits of Zeniya Gohei in the last century, and even the greatest of them all, Yamada Nagamasa in the early period of the Tokugawa shogunate. My own role has been that of the ship's carpenter, as it were, and though my worries have been nothing as great as the master carpenter Jūbei in Rohan's story *The Five-Storied Pagoda*, it was at least my responsibility to prepare the boats for voyage, and while the company may never have suffered the hardships of a Pericles or an Alonzo, it was by no means all plain sailing. The fact that we reached harbour without serious incident and on time is surely an achievement that deserves congratulation.[139]

Shōyō's role as translator, therefore, is not even to beautify Shakespeare but to keep the plays "afloat," and in this regard he must also be referring to his efforts to sustain popular interest in Shakespeare during the economic stagnation of the 1920s. Shōyō does not doubt the historical "truth" of his precious cargo: it is the present that is unstable and threatening, while a spirit of adventure is clearly better suited than any modern ideology for steering Shakespeare's "truth" to harbour.

A consequence of Shōyō's anti-ideological stance is that he may on the face of it stand for not very much at all; Tsuno suggests that his commitments can be reduced to the family (*katei*), especially his own, and to education (*kyōiku*).[140] His deepest – because closest – antagonism is toward the Naturalism of Shimamura Hōgetsu. The Japanese Naturalism that emerged at the end of the nineteenth

century was based in realism but from the perspective of rigorous subjective observation that for Shōyō was a distraction from the import of Shakespeare's texts; Tsuno contrasts Shōyō's noisy, declamatory teaching style at Waseda with Hōgetsu's quieter classroom at the same university in which students focussed on what they could "honestly" say about a text.[141] A typically Naturalistic response to Shakespeare was made by the novelist Shiga Naoya who, on seeing the Bungei Kyōkai *Hamlet* in 1911, was at once appalled by the frivolity of Doi Shunsho's Hamlet and drawn to the "sensitivity" (*kanjusei*) of Tōgi Tetteki's Claudius, whom Shiga saw as a man whose life had been turned upside down by his brother's death and marriage to his brother's widow;[142] Hamlet, like Shōyō, talked too much.[143] In an earlier intervention, a story by Shimazaki Tōson, Tōson quotes Lorenzo's lines from the final scene of *The Merchant of Venice*, adding the crucial (and italicised) word "perhaps":[144]

> *Perhaps* in such a night
> Troilus, methinks, mounted the Trojan walls
> And sighed his soul toward the Grecian tents
> Where Cressida lay that night.
> (5.1.3–6)

Tōson cannot tell for sure.

Hōgetsu's Naturalism was a systematic attempt to introduce a modern European literary school into a culture whose traditional aesthetics was based partly on an awareness of seasonal change, but differed from the objectivity of Shōyō's realism and from Norinaga's eighteenth-century aesthetic of the pathos of things. For Sōseki, Naturalism was still too deterministic to allow the kind of radical engagement with Western culture he deemed necessary for the survival of Japanese culture in the modern age, and similarly he refutes Shōyō's assumption that Shakespeare's take on reality is his own. Sōseki is more interested in what happens when modern Japanese people start behaving like Hamlet and Ophelia than in what Shakespeare and even his culture teach him to be "true." This discrepancy (*zure*) is captured in the haiku he wrote summarising the plots of Shakespeare's plays, as in the following for *As You Like It*:

> *yo wo shinobu*
> *otoko sugata ya*
> *hanafubuki*

Renouncing the world in the guise of a man. A cascade of cherry blossom.[145]

The poem is inspired by Rosalind's lines as she prepares to abscond from the cruel world of her uncle Duke Frederick's court disguised as a young man, "I could find in my heart to disgrace my man's/apparel and to cry like a woman" (2.4.4–5), but the image of falling cherry blossom intimates a deeply felt dichotomy of renunciation and eroticism in Sōseki's native context.

Hōgetsu's Naturalism reaches its peak with his theatrical adaptation of Tolstoy's *Resurrection* for the Geijutsuza in 1914. Shōyō admired Shakespeare for his stylistic diversity, but this was not necessarily the same – although Shōyō himself felt it probably *was* the same – as the diversity and differentiation at which Tolstoy excelled, and at which Tolstoy felt Shakespeare was sorely inadequate. For Tolstoy Shakespeare's characters lacked a reason for living (or social purpose), and he memorably lambasts *King Lear*:

> Lear's vacillations between pride, anger, and the hope of his daughters' giving in, would be exceedingly touching if it were not spoilt by the verbose absurdities to which he gives vent, about being ready to divorce himself from Regan's dead mother, should Regan not be glad to receive him, – or about his calling down "fen suck'd frogs" which he invokes, upon the head of his daughter, or about the heavens being obliged to patronise old people because they themselves are old.[146]

In short, "All [Shakespeare's] characters speak, not their own, but always one and the same Shakespearian, pretentious, and unnatural language, in which not only they could not speak, but in which no living man ever has spoken or does speak."[147] For Shōyō the appeal of Shakespeare's tragedy was its lack of obvious "moral purpose," and so it was inevitable that he should respond in kind to Tolstoy's anti-Bardolatry. In the light of Tolstoy's Christian convictions, Shōyō makes pointed reference to the religious origins of both European and Japanese drama, being aware that the primitive purpose of performance to appease the gods has been transferred to the modern purpose of "consoling" (or entertaining) a modern audience, which is a largely upper-class one at that.[148] On Tolstoy's side, Shōyō is also critical of bardolatry, which he sees as no substitute for true religion.[149]

Shōyō is less able to refute the dramatic strengths of George Bernard Shaw, and in 1913 he translated Shaw's play about a high-class brothel madam, *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. Having bought his wife Sen's freedom from a Tokyo brothel in order to marry her, Shōyō had no wish for the licensing of prostitutes in the Edo era to degenerate into the kind of prostitution endemic in nineteenth-century European cities, and he praises Mrs. Warren's daughter Vivie, who finally rejects her mother on account of the latter's lucrative profession, as a paragon of modern womanhood;[150] this is in marked preference to Nora's "selfish" abandonment of her husband and children in Ibsen's *A Doll's House*, which exceeded even *Hamlet* in its influence on the late Meiji and early Taishō theatres. Shōyō argued this point in a lengthy anti-feminist tract entitled *Iwayuru atarashii onna* (The So-Called "New Woman," 1912).[151] Prostitution also flourished in Shakespeare's London, but Vivie rang true against Shakespearean heroines such as Isabella and notably Marina in *Pericles* who, having been sold into the brothel in Mytilene. manages to preserve her virtue by persuading potential clients that they too should preserve theirs. Marina's rhetorical prowess is a striking analogy of what Shōyō knows to be the purpose of Shakespeare's "hiddenness," namely that of preserving Shakespeare's "honour" (and potential for compromise) by keeping his personal ideals

hidden from view. Moreover, Shōyō's rhetoric about "ramshackle rigged vessels of a former age" comes to seem less old-fashioned (and more prescient) when set against George Orwell's view that Shakespeare deserves appreciation if only because he has "survived," and that he has done so not because of his ideas (since, as Shōyō knows, he has none) but because of his language;[152] this is a point that Shōyō the translator is in a better position to appreciate than Tolstoy, who never translated Shakespeare. He is more unreserved in his appreciation of the dramaturgy of Ibsen's modern social realism, which (unlike Shakespeare) was a theatre of ideas. Shōyō is always impressed by the rigour of Ibsen's dramaturgy but finds him lacking in "warmth" compared to Shakespeare and Chikamatsu.[153]

Dowden's "Bottomless Lake" and Victorian Shakespeare

That Shōyō can speak up to the Russian novelist with relative confidence is a reflection of national confidence in the wake of Japan's victory against Russia in the Russo-Japanese war only two years earlier. Just as the Imperial Japanese Navy had been supported by British training and technology, so too is Shōyō supported in his utilitarian viewpoint by over two decades of absorption in the Western critical heritage. In his theory of "hidden ideals," Shakespeare's ability "to reflect the ideals of [his] many hundreds of readers"[154] seemed exactly to fulfil utilitarianism's goal of "the greatest good for the greatest number," while the mainly Victorian scholars Shōyō encountered as he started to study Shakespeare in the 1880s offered alternatives to the exhausted dichotomies of Edo culture. As one example, Richard G. Moulton's statement that "it is the exceptions to the universality of retribution that make the free atmosphere in which alone the highest morality can develop"[155] offers a striking alternative to the dominant revenge motif in kabuki drama. Even if Shōyō could not accept the Christian notion of an external redemptive power as the counter to retribution from his Buddhist perspective, Moulton's understanding of "comedy in Shakespeare" as "story raised to its highest power"[156] did accord with his anti-didacticism. As he argues about fiction in *Shōsetsu shinzui*, for Shōyō the realism of a Shakespeare play is inevitably superior to whatever moral lesson is imparted at the end, even more so with comedy where the narrative potential is not jeopardised by tragic denouements. Shakespearean realism was also conducive to the kind of "free atmosphere" in which moral reflection thrived, and in that sense differed from the typical arbitrariness of kabuki plot construction that supported a tragic, fatalistic view of the universe in which morality was seldom up for discussion, but limited to the lowest common denominator of accepting the arbitrariness of fate and punishing those who believe they can overcome it.

Moulton's rationalism is a breath of fresh air for Shōyō, but the major influence both on his view of Shakespeare and in the "hidden ideals" debate is Anglo-Irish scholar Edward Dowden. Shōyō frequently quotes Dowden and paraphrases his insights into the plays, sometimes without attributing the source. Dowden's popular *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (1875) remained at the top of Shōyō's recommended Shakespeare reading in his primer of 1928.[157] Like Shōyō, Dowden's star had shone early, since at only twenty-six he was appointed to the

first chair of English literature at Trinity College, Dublin, and having made his name six years later with the publication of *Mind and Art* he remained active as a scholar of mainly Shakespeare and Romanticism, dying in 1913. Dowden's preference for the nascent Protestant work ethic he found in the Elizabethan Shakespeare over the rising Celtic nationalism of Parnell and Yeats connects him with Smiles' *Self-Help* and Shōyō's instinctive conservatism, and his positivism with that of Taine's and Moulton's scientific criticism.

While *Shōsetsu shinzui* was instrumental in shaping Shōyō's view of Shakespeare before he read Dowden,[158] in 1980 the Meiji theatre historian Matsumoto Shinko suggested convincingly[159] that Shōyō's image of the "bottomless lake" as a trope for Shakespeare's creativity was drawn from a passage in Dowden's *Mind and Art*:

> Shakspere, like nature and like the vision of human life itself, if he does not furnish us with a doctrine, has the power to free, arouse, dilate. Again and again we fall back into our little creed or our little theory. Shakspere delivers us; under his influence we come anew into the presence of stupendous mysteries, and, instead of our little piece of comfort, and support, and contentment, we receive the gift of solemn awe, and bow the head in reverential silence. These questions are not stated by Shakespeare as intellectual problems. He states them pregnantly, for the emotions and for the imagination. And it is by very virtue of his very knowledge that he comes face to face with the mystery of the unknown. Because he had sent down his plummet farther into the depths than other men, he knew better than others how fathomless for human thought those depths remain.[160]

What is "fathomless" for Dowden is not so much Shakespeare's creativity as the mystery of human existence, but the point for Shōyō is that Japanese writers who sought to emulate that creativity risked losing themselves in a trajectory that only Shakespeare had mastered and which was both profounder than and separate from their own intellectual and emotional experience. That warning becomes the conclusion of his satirical essay "The Bottomless Lake" (Soko shirazu no mizuumi, 1891), the most rhetorical expression of his theory of hidden ideals, whereas the reference to Matsuo Bashō's "frog" haiku ("An old pond. A frog jumps in. The sound of water.") insinuates a precedent in Japanese culture for the ambitious writers and intellectuals of Meiji to jump right in:

> I see a pond lined with exquisite pines, and there is Bashō's frog on the bank. Someone is jumping in right now, followed by tens of thousands more. The legend has taken its full course, for only a lake with no bottom could hold so many thousands of people. It is a place famous for its remarkable beauty, unusually celebrated in the common mind. People revere this famous place as the lake without bottom; it is unique in history. There have been countless other bottomless lakes but this lake is the most beautiful under heaven. In England there is a great swamp that is comparable, and another such place

> in Germany. The swamp in England is called "Shake-sphere," in Germany *Gyōten* [Goethe, the word means "astonishment," denoting Romantic awe]. It is madness to lose yourself in these places. Take heed while you can, and value your independence. We need only look at the people drowning in the lake to see that it is a deadly place.[161]

Shōyō did not know German but places Goethe alongside Shakespeare in his essay, perhaps aware at this time of Dowden's devotion to the German writer[162] and of how Goethe's synthesising of classicism and romanticism reflected Shakespeare's dual debt to Greco-Roman classicism and amenability to nineteenth-century Romanticism. Shōyō's own relationship to the two traditions is also worth considering, but it is Dowden's grasp of Shakespeare's uniqueness that reverberates with the author of *Shōsetsu shinzui*:

> If to lay hold of Michael Angelo and to strive with him to be the most strenuous feat achievable by the critical imagination in the world of plastic art, to deal with Shakspere requires more endurance, a firmer nerve, and a finer cunning. The great ideal artist – a Milton, a Michael Angelo, a Dante – betrays himself in spite of the haughtiest reserve. But Shakspere, if an idealist, was also above all else a realist in art, and lurks almost impregnably behind his work. "The secrets of nature have not more gift in taciturnity."[163]

Dowden adds that "Shakspere possessed that most baffling of self-defences – *humour*. Just when we have laid hold of him, he eludes us, and we hear only distant ironical laughter."[164] Shōyō himself seems touched by "ironical laughter" in the hyperbole of his account of his own efforts to lay hold of Shakespeare's genius:

> From the point of view of his freedom of expression, Shakespeare is like the ancient goddess Marishiten [the female bodhisattva Marīcī in Sanskrit]. His style is like that female buddha in its solemnity and subtlety. Its divine power has a mysterious sacred virtue that can take many forms. Neither sun, moon, nor heaven can see it, nor can any man ever do so. Sometimes it has three faces, sometimes six or eight pairs of hands; it can fight with many weapons at once; it can hunt the boar, joust with sword, pike, bar, and mallet, unleash the bow from its quiver, start a fire, flail a rope. Against this monster, we Japanese are armed only with our classical language of old.[165]

Shōyō's colourful comparison of Shakespeare to a female deity is not as transgressive (and "unsexing") as it might seem since Marishiten was venerated as early as the ninth century by the samurai class as a model of self-mastery and by the merchant class in the late Edo era as a goddess of wealth and prosperity. She would have therefore been well-known to Shōyō's family, as his father was a samurai and his mother from a merchant family.

Dowden's particular contribution to Shakespeare criticism (and one that enables him to view Shakespearean elusiveness objectively) is his periodic theory of

Shakespeare's development.[166] Foreshadowing A. C. Bradley's forensic analysis of tragic "flaws" in his more influential *Shakespearean Tragedy* (1904), Dowden's periodic theory is rooted in Victorian character formation. Shōyō summarises Dowden's periodic grouping in the opening paragraph of the *Macbeth* preface:

> There are four main periods in his career according to the development of his techniques, dramatic structures and ideas. The first period comprises his formative years, the tragedy of *Romeo and Juliet*, and a number of what we might call light-hearted satirical comedies. The second period gives us his more spirited comedies and the history plays, the third his profound tragedies and the tragicomedies (cheerful on the surface and pitiless underneath), while the fourth is one of quiet dignity, characterised by a graceful and animating blend of tragic and comic elements.[167]

Dowden's conclusions resulted from careful analysis of the evidence of Shakespeare's corpus. His inductive reasoning, which was expounded more thoroughly by Moulton, appealed to Shōyō who, detached even more completely from Shakespeare's world than was Dowden, had few grounds for asserting general premises of his own. Dowden's distance from Shakespeare's world was that of his Victorian Protestantism, and (as I have mentioned) this association takes Shōyō back to Samuel Smiles and the self-made man of Shakespeare's initial reception in Japan, for even if Meiji writers could not hope to imitate Shakespeare's creativity they might at least succeed *like* Shakespeare.

For Dowden, it turns out that the secret of Shakespeare's success is that he does not change, that *pace* Polonius's "truth to self": "Shakspere in 1590, Shakspere in 1600, and Shakspere in 1610, was one and the same living entity,"[168] and usefully for Shōyō Dowden bases his assumption on the evolutionist Spencerian biology that Shōyō had imbibed at the Imperial University.[169] Shakespeare nourishes his imagination with an appetite for experience and "information" that Dowden compares to "the Arctic whale" which "gulps whole shoals of acalephæ and molluscs,"[170] while the individual remains the same. The growth in Shakespeare's intellect

> implies the avoidance of injuries which interfere with growth, escape from enemies which bring sudden end; and therefore strength, and skill, and prudence in dealing with the world. It implies a power in the organism of fitting its movements to meet numerous external co-existences and sequences. In a word, we are brought back once again to Shakespeare's resolute fidelity to the fact.[171]

It is presumably Shōyō's own "fidelity to the fact" that will bring him close to Shakespeare and enable him to succeed as a scholar and translator.

This "fidelity to the fact" imposes an aesthetic discipline which is stricter than conventional morality but which will enable the poet to achieve the mimetic ability that Shōyō praises. The rules of writing, in Shakespeare's case of structure and

versification, represent an order or what Dowden calls "ideality" that is "somewhat higher than the common life of vulgar accident," and it is through a rigorous devotion to such "a system of rules and precepts"[172] that in time

> A deeper order takes authority over our being, and resumes in itself the narrower order [of "rules and precepts"]; the rhythm of our life acquires a larger harmony, a movement free and yet seen as that of nature.[173]

This is the stylistic freedom that Shōyō will endeavour to imitate, as the potential not only of Shakespeare but of all writers is arguably even more relevant to the Meiji *bundan* than Shakespearean realism. In Shakespeare's early plays, as Dowden explains, "structure determines function" while "in the later plays organization is preceded by life."[174] For Shōyō, the distinction is between the late Edo fiction of Bakin and Ryūtei Tanehiko that emphasised situation rather than character and a modern, advanced category towards which contemporaries such as Ozaki Kōyō were aspiring that was based firmly in character, and in which event and situation arose from character rather than the other way round.[175]

A final context for Dowden's thesis of character formation is Shōyō's ideas on Japanese historical drama, which he criticises for its general lack of historical perspective and detachment of historical figures from any believable context: these plays lack Dowden's sense that people become who they are through a process of interaction with that context. Shakespeare, on the other hand, creates

> a semblance of the people of past times that, deftly interspersed with details from the amateur historical accounts, succeeds in conveying a highly believable image of actual human beings dressed in the garb of history from out of the deserts of eternity, in other words of the course of cause and effect in human affairs.[176]

While "Waga kuni no shigeki" was mainly addressed at the *katsureki* "living history" plays of his contemporary Fukuchi Ōchi, Shōyō was also critical of Chikamatsu's characterisations of historical figures who, "blessed with supernatural strength and courage, divine powers, or unreasonably sharp intellect," appear as "inhuman" as "their physical attributes are superhuman."[177]

Dowden and Moulton have nothing in return to say about Japanese literature, but Shōyō's sense of cultural inferiority is echoed by H. M. Possnett's foundational *Comparative Literature* (1886), which (with Dryden and Johnson) was a major reference for a series of lectures he gave on comparative literature at Waseda between 1891 and 1892.[178] Possnett for his part had read Basil Hall Chamberlain's pioneering Noh translations of 1880, commenting that

> The characters and names of the Japanese plays translated by Mr. Chamberlain, in his *Classical Poetry of the Japanese*, show want of individual characterisation, and predominance of allegorical or abstract ideas and natural description.[179]

Possnett's book is to do with the proper balance of the group and individual in the development of national literatures, arguing for example that "excessive individualism is almost as fatal to dramatic progress as a corporate life in which all differences of personality are lost."[180] Comparing Wordsworth's poem "To the Cuckoo" with Indian and Chinese (and, by implication, Japanese) nature poetry, the latter would definitely fall on the side of the corporate and social:

> Only as a representative of his species does the Indian poet describe the seasons, only as such does the Chinese poet or philosopher describe or speculate. The Oriental knows not that concentrated personal being which looks on Nature as peculiarly connected with itself alone, and is for ever pacing round the haunts of its childhood, "seeking in vain to find the old familiar faces."[181]

This submersion of individuality is probably not conducive to Shakespeare's dramatic realism which, as Possnett argues, requires

> personal freedom from communal restraints, various types of personality, and, coexisting with this freedom and variety, a fund of social sympathies and a belief in the dignity and mysterious greatness of individual being.[182]

Shōyō's greatest challenge as a writer himself, and one that draws him to Shakespearean drama, is to grasp the universal dimensions of individual character, which is Dr. Johnson's view that "in the writings of other poets a character is too often an individual; in those of Shakespeare it is commonly a species."[183]

Johnson was constrained from making excessive judgements by his neoclassical decorum, but for Shōyō there is the opposite concern, aptly described by Possnett, that

> nothing is more difficult than to see an ideal without expanding it into universality even in the prosaic accuracy of scientific reasoning, how much more in works peculiarly belonging to the imagination.[184]

There is, as I have argued,[185] a Romantic side to Shōyō as he loses himself in his Shakespeare and Chikamatsu studies of the 1890s, culminating in his Wagnerian musical drama, *Shinkyoku Urashima*; Tsubouchi Shikō recalls that his adoptive father once told him, perhaps at the time that he was writing *Shinkyoku Urashima*, "Through my gestation in the works of Chikamatsu and Shakespeare, I should be considered a 'New Romantic.'"[186] Shōyō must be able to state his own Romantic proclivities in order then to step away from them; perhaps even more than Dowden, whose theories were founded on a Hegelian idealism that Shōyō did not necessarily understand, it is Moulton's inductive criticism that enables him to find the objectivity he desires, and so project him towards the Shakespeareans of the early twentieth century.

Moulton's particular argument was against a judicial type of criticism that evaluated rather than analysed, and (as I have mentioned) could be highly "retributive" in its judgements; he comments tartly that

> in traditional philosophy wise men have sought to make the whole moral government of the universe synonymous with the judgement on the sinner.[187]

Moulton's approach favours accident over fate, redemption over retribution, and above all the autonomy of individual character. He writes that

> a man's character is the momentum of his past: new influences may change the character, but in the absence of these the character acquired in the past is a real force carrying the individual in definite directions.[188]

Moulton's modern scientific criticism (which anticipates the archetypal criticism of Northrop Frye) enables Shōyō to develop the arguments of *Shōsetsu shinzui* and, in his 1890 essay "Shōsetsu sanpa" (Three Schools of Fiction),[189] apply generic categories to his contemporary fiction, above all to see how in both Shakespeare and Chikamatsu it is character that creates situation and not the other way around.[190] Moulton's grasp of the complex relationship between plot and character in Shakespearean drama represents a distinct break from the arbitrary moralism of *kanzen chōaku*:

> Shakespeare in his handling of story gives recognition to accident as well as retribution; the interest of plot at one point is the moral satisfaction of nemesis, where we watch the sinner found out by his sin; it changes at another point to the not less moral sensation of pathos, our sympathy going out to the suffering which is independent of wrongdoing.[191]

Moulton is of course critical of biblical assertions of retribution as "an invariable principle,"[192] and this willingness to give "chance" a chance sits well with Shōyō's anti-didacticism and awareness of cause and effect as explanatory rather than retributive. Moreover, inductivism does not have to imply commitment to the individual object (and the implied threat of "retribution" if that commitment is withdrawn) but rather a Shakespearean sympathy that through the act of translation may transform an unknown and potentially threatening foreign text into an object of beauty in the target culture. There is a moral dimension to Shōyō's Shakespeare, but it is at one remove from the city hall bureaucrats who could tolerate kabuki only so long as it imparted a wholesome moral message: Meiji kabuki, and Shōyō's own trajectory of reform, can be said to begin with the summoning of kabuki leaders to a meeting at the new Tokyo City Hall in 1872 at which they were "ordered to adhere strictly to historical accuracy and truth" in exchange for official patronage.[193] Shōyō's Shakespeare is closer rather to a Coleridgean nexus of the ethical and aesthetic, namely that Shakespearean drama entails a moral respect and sympathy for the otherness and uniqueness of characters and situations.

A Note on Editions

Shōyō's reading of Western criticism prompts and supports him in his agenda of reform, but where he garnered greatest credibility among his peers was through his knowledge of Shakespeare's texts, which began with his knowledge of the numerous English editions that appeared over his lifetime. *Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori* does not list specific editions, presumably because Shōyō would have wanted to recommend only the latest and most authoritative one (which he does), but as a student at the Imperial University he was fortunate that his own textual studies began with the popular Cambridge and Globe Shakespeares, edited by William George Clark and William Aldis Wright, which were first published in the 1860s and were among the university library's early purchases.[194] Clark and Wright pursued a professional "critical" approach, collating a single text out of the available variants that the editors deduced to represent the "mind" of the author. That was not necessarily Shōyō's game but it did support – and possibly instil – his preference for "critical commentary" "on the meaning of words, grammar, and so on as they appear in the source" over "interpretation," which as he writes professorially

> can be an extremely profound and profitable method for the more perceptive readers, but for the less perceptive "a little learning is a dangerous thing," and for the inattentive can lead to undesirable errors.[195]

What Shōyō wanted, therefore, from a Shakespeare edition was not to be told what the play meant but primarily a gloss on the difficult language.

The Globe Shakespeare did not include notes, and Shōyō may have struggled with the small font size, but the Cambridge Shakespeares were in a friendlier format with extensive notes that were probably surplus to his needs. It is likely that he used a variety of editions for his translation work, but Toyoda comments that he consulted the Macmillan editions by Kenneth Deighton, "especially for his early translations."[196] Deighton edited all but a handful of the plays between around 1890 and 1910, with his introductions providing concise summaries of the critical and editorial histories, the texts uncluttered by footnotes, and the endnotes giving the rhetorical glosses that Shōyō needed for his work. Methuen's Arden series (1899–1924), under the general editorship of Sōseki's teacher W. J. Craig until Craig's death in 1906, surpassed both the Globe and Deighton editions on all these counts, being based on the authoritative Globe and Cambridge texts, and indeed Deighton edited three plays for Arden himself, but when Shōyō made his heavily annotated translations of the first acts only of *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* in the 1890s it is probable that he looked to Deighton for the answers. Deighton's coolly forensic verdict on Hamlet's madness, argued over several pages with reference to previous commentaries, suits Shōyō's theatrical view of the play:

> it appears that in every single instance in which Hamlet's madness is manifested, he has good reason for assuming that disguise; while, on the other

> hand, wherever there was no necessity to hoodwink any one, his thought, language, and actions bear no resemblance to unsoundness of intellect.[197]

Dowden, editing the First Arden *Hamlet* in 1899, is more emphatic about the prince's mental aptitude:

> Hamlet's . . . subtlety sees every side of every question, thinks too precisely on the event, considers all things too curiously, studies anew every conviction, doubts of the past, interrogates the future; it delights in ironically adopting the mental attitudes of other minds.[198]

The one edition Shōyō does specifically recommend in *Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori* is the New Shakespeare published under the editorship of Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson, beginning with *The Tempest* in 1921. It seems that the editors' innovative and rational punctuation appealed to Shōyō, enabling him both to grasp the surface meanings more easily and to adapt them to his logical reading method (*ronriteki dokuhō*), discussed in Chapter 4, since in his Shakespeare primer he translates Wilson's "Note on Punctuation" in full.[199] In his short essay, Wilson reveals himself to be a man after Shōyō's heart in his appreciation of Shakespeare's dramatic poetry, declaring that "As he wrote Shakespeare had the living voice ever sounding in his ears, the flesh and blood of his creations ever moving before his eyes."[200]

Wilson claims to have kept the original punctuation as much as possible, but to have added quite a lot of commas, and indeed the following speech by Miranda is heavily punctuated:[201]

> *Miranda* [*turning*]. If by your art – my dearest father – you have
> Put the wild waters in this roar – allay them:
> The sky, it seems, would pour down stinking pitch,
> But that the sea, mounting to th' welkin's cheek,
> Dashes the fire out . . . O! I have suffered
> With those that I saw suffer: A brave vessel,
> [*in a whisper*]
> (Who had no doubt some noble creature in her!)
> Dashed all to pieces: [*sobbing*] O the cry did knock
> Against my very heart . . . poor souls, they perished . . .
> (1.2.1–9)

That the two editors use dashes to indicate "special dramatic significance" and avoid exclamation marks (with which "Shakespeare was very sparing in his use") unless they have been "compelled" otherwise indicates the heightened drama with which they interpret Miranda's speech:[202] mainly out of dismay at the storm and shipwreck she has just witnessed (and knows her father to have caused) but also structurally to assert the importance of poetic phrasing to the play's dramaturgy (the Shakespearean sense that language creates situation). The punctuation further indicates

that the speech is not meant to be spoken quickly by a vulnerable and momentarily traumatised Miranda, and Wilson concludes his Note helpfully that

> *The Tempest* is a particularly beautiful example of dramatic pointing; and we feel confident that if, after glancing at this brief note, the reader will turn to the second scene and follow for a moment or two the pause-effects in the exquisite dialogue between Miranda and her father, he will not only master its principles without difficulty but will become a complete convert to Shakespearian punctuation.[203]

Although this advice comes too late for Shōyō himself, since he had already translated the play and is simply recommending the New Shakespeare to Japanese readers, his translation contains frequent pauses (indicated by Japanese commas) and is emphatically dramatic in its phrasing:

> *Chichiuesama, anata no hōjutsu de mizu ga ano yō ni sawagu no nara, dōzo are wo*
> father, – by your magic – the water – in that way – if you move, – please – [the water] –
> *shizumete kudasare. Nami ga ōzora no hō wo utte, ano hikatte iru hi wo kesanakereba*,
> you calm (respectful) – waves – great sky – hit, – the shining sun – extinguish (conditional),
> *ima nimo makkurona kusai mono ga tenjō kara futte kisō*
> presently – the pitch black – stinking thing – from heaven above – looks like it will fall –
> *ja. Ā, ano kurushimu no wo mite ita node, watashi mo issho ni*
> (archaic copula) oh, – that suffering – because I was seeing, – I too – together with them –
> *kurushimimashita! Ano migotona fune . . . . . kitto, nanika rippana mono ga norikonde ita*
> suffered! – that splendid boat (ellipsis) – surely, – some kind of noble person was boarded –
> *de arō ni . . . . . minna konagona ni natte shimōta! Ā, ano nakigoe de*
> (speculative tense) (ellipsis) – all – to pieces – they have become! – oh, – by those wailing
> *watashi no kono mune ga itō natta! Kawaisō ni, minna shinde shimōta no ja!*
> voices – my – this heart – came to hurt! – how pitiful, – they all died (emphatic particles)![204]

This is a modern colloquial translation that makes full use of the punctuation marks introduced into Japanese writing through the process of Meiji language reform. What he loses in translating *The Tempest* into modern Japanese rather than kabuki style is the unique intonation of kabuki actors, but what he gains is an opportunity

for modern actors to modulate their voices according to the contours of Shakespeare's dramatic poetry.

Language Reform and the Age of Translation

Shōyō's Shakespeare translations are an outstanding product of the process of language reform known as *genbun itchi*, his particular contribution being the copula *de arimasu* in contrast to Futabatei Shimei's *da*. As Indra Levy succinctly explains, whereas the *da* copula (which has become standard usage in modern Japanese) "binds statements directly to the narrator as a speaking subject with a distinct personality," "the expository *de ar*[*imasu*] does not bear any kind of vocal imprint at all, instead representing protagonistic feelings as transcendental verbal truths."[205] Shōyō's preference is indicative of his argument for "hiddenness" in literature, the *de arimasu* ending being a feature of his Shakespeare criticism, and it tended to a rhythmical style that prioritised literary features above semantic content.

In the 1880s, when Shōyō made his initial experimental version of *Julius Caesar* in classical *jōruri* style, he can hardly have imagined that he would end up translating the rest of Shakespeare in the vernacular that became modern Japanese. *Genbun itchi* was still a few years off, and the two standards of the written language remained – as they had been for the previous thousand years – Chinese (*kanbun*) and classical Japanese. Prominent writers such as Akinari were praised for their skill at combining Japanese syntax with Chinese characters in the style known as *wakan konkōbun*, and this style remained the norm of Meiji literature, including Shōyō's novels of the 1880s. The time-honoured *kundoku* method of reading Chinese texts according to Japanese syntax was adapted to the translation of Western texts in the early Meiji era, although more successfully to "the sphere of narrative context"[206] than to highly metaphorical texts such as Shakespeare's poetic dramas, while the richly allusive style of classical Japanese literature (*gabuntai*) made that an awkward vehicle for Western poetics.

Native stylistic mixing was for Shōyō a familiar and compelling analogy of Shakespearean style, but the two were not the same, and by the time that Shōyō started to translate the Complete Works in 1909 the classical written style had been largely supplanted by the modern vernacular, which was after all a closer formal equivalent to the vernacular standard of Shakespeare's early modern English. While Shōyō's translating style was considered old-fashioned by the likes of Sōseki, it still followed the trend of *genbun itchi* in the sense that his translations after 1909 are written in a modern vernacular rather than strictly classical Japanese, and while archaisms lent depth and variety, he was not opposed in principle to adopting a contemporary register.

Shakespeare's language may have been "for all time," but the colloquial was not the same as the contemporary for Shōyō since it included for example the urban patter of Chikamatsu's *jōruri* scripts. More crucially, his argument for the treatment of drama as literature presupposes a translating style at one remove from everyday language. Shakespeare's literariness combined what Shōyō calls "warmth" (its metaphorical dimension) and "rhythm," and Shōyō's strategy was definitely

not one of disdain for the contemporary but rather to elide contemporary with classical elements. His implied hope that his translations might themselves serve to enlarge the modern language is not as fanciful as it might seem when one considers their wide readership as bestsellers in the 1920s and the rapid pace of language change in the twentieth century. Arguing on the one hand that the contemporary language was too limited for Shakespeare, Shōyō suggests that a colloquial – rather than strictly contemporary – standard of translation allows for "a more flexible and pliant" style "than [he] had expected":

> A writer like Shakespeare, with his wealth of vocabulary and lucid style unmatched in English literature before or since, can simply not be translated into the Tokyo dialect of today, even allowing for slang. (There are two or three brave souls who have tried, but to look at their translations, Ophelia and Juliet sound like bar girls and students, and Portia, Lady Macbeth, and Gertrude like the proprietresses of a tea shop or inn. They speak a vulgar language associated with the mistresses of company men.) . . . Yet even this contemporary language has the potential to become less narrow-minded and richer in vocabulary. . . . For if one is to add to what is broadly defined as a contemporary style a language that is prescribed by the rules of the colloquial (whether in current use or not), a Japanese comprised of both the contemporary and classical alike, the vulgar and refined, having both native and foreign influences, then the vocabulary will no longer be impoverished. . . . This vocabulary may not be listed in dictionaries like *Gensen* . . . or *Daigenkai*, but it is rich and broad.[207]

Shōyō may be excusing his partiality for kabuki style, but his view that the language of Shakespeare in Japanese will be subtly but ineffably different from the contemporary norm makes complete sense.

Shōyō's translations, although coming mainly after the pioneering translations of Western fiction in the 1880s and '90s by Futabatei Shimei and others, also contribute to the Westernisation of the language that was fundamental to *genbun itchi*, such as the use of personal and impersonal pronouns and relative clauses that were largely absent from classical Japanese. As ever, Shōyō's priorities are defined by Shakespeare's rhetoric (his sense, as Nakamura puts it, that in Shakespeare "the world of feeling is always bigger than the world of ideas"),[208] and he lists five characteristics, namely (1) the wealth of vocabulary, (2) what he calls the "delicate prosody," (3) the use of repetition and juxtaposition, (4) the tendency for rhyme at the end of scenes, and (5) the proliferation of adjectives;[209] the next chapter focusses on the first three of these. Shakespeare's rhetoric called for creative solutions, and, defined as it was as much by dramatic as poetic parameters, exemplifies what another of Shōyō's pupils, the Japanese literature scholar Igarashi Chikara, regarded as "true rhetoric":

> Writing without affectation means the abolition of unnatural ornament and classical conventions; it does not mean that all stylistic devices should be regarded as unnecessary.[210]

At the same time, we can find numerous examples of archaic and obsolescent usage, some of which are listed in the next chapter and which Shōyō has his own literary reasons for deploying.

Shōyō started seriously translating Shakespeare some ten to twenty years after the great age of Meiji literary translation, when the journalist Morita Shiken in particular was prominent in establishing a conscious strategy for engaging with the "intention of the original" (*genbun no ishu*) in a way that could only extend the linguistic norms of the target language.[211] Shōyō mentions the "hybrid literary style" of Shiken (who died in 1897) in his 1907 *Hamlet* essay,[212] and although he seems to feel that it is too "hybrid" "to capture Hamlet's characteristic of detachment"[213] the new linguistic norms were basically in place by 1909, and Shōyō's Shakespeare translations by default display all the grammatical features of "European-influenced style" identified by Kisaka Motoi in his 1987 study.[214] First of all, they are usually faithful in their translation choices, "you" and "thee" of course but also the ubiquitous "it," but they also contain numerous relative clauses (a rarity in classical Japanese), they use inanimate subjects with transitive verbs (the life "that struts and frets his hour upon the stage," etc.) and inanimate subjects in the passive voice ("What's done cannot be undone"), they invert normal Japanese word order to follow Shakespeare's, and they make free use of causative constructions. Meiji translation also tended to privilege sound and pronunciation as a result of its engagement with the Roman alphabet and Western linguistic theories, as Shōyō does, although he is old-fashioned in his use of Chinese characters, which were inevitably associated with the *kundoku* method of the past.[215]

* * * * *

Finally, Satō Isao argued for the relevance to Shōyō's project of John Dryden's model of translation as paraphrase as an effective compromise between awkward literalism (metaphrase) and creative rewriting (imitation),[216] since more than other Meiji translators Shōyō tends to domesticate while maintaining a scholarly faithfulness to the source text; the next chapter gives several examples of his paraphrases, which for example in the case of relative clauses can hardly be avoided. In 1891, Shōyō translated Dryden's ode "Alexander's Feast, or the Power of Music" (1697),[217] which tells the true story of a feast that Alexander held following the defeat of the Persian king Darius at Persepolis in 331 BC. As Alexander becomes gradually more intoxicated, his bard Timotheus sings songs on his lyre that lead the conqueror through a series of powerful emotions: first praising him as a god, then of the pleasures of wine, then of the sad death of the brave Darius, then of the beauty of Alexander's lover Thäis, and finally of anger at the deaths of Alexander's soldiers, driving Alexander to destroy the Persian palace (although without further loss of life). The final stanza invokes Saint Cecilia, the patron saint of music, concluding that while Timotheus "raised a mortal to the skies,/She drew an angel down." (ll. 169–170).[218] This act of musical exchange may be an apt analogy for what is happening in Shōyō's translations as he responds in kind

to the music of the source, and which Alfredo Michel Modenessi conceives in similar terms:

> The idea that translating literature is best compared with playing music applies to Shakespeare extremely well. Regardless of the style to which the musician subscribes and the language into which the translator works, neither the creative interpreter of music nor the creative interpreter of literature will ever (seek to) play, perform, or interpret (translate) their services exactly the same as someone before. This is not (only) a matter of competition; it is how the act of interpreting occurs.[219]

This chapter has mainly explored the basis of Shōyō's Shakespeare in his native culture, but just as Shakespeare's rhetoric forces him back into his culture, that culture may exert a corresponding pressure to attain equivalence between source and target, which although – and because – illusory motivates him to translate Shakespeare to a high level of scholarship and literary accomplishment.

Notes

1 See Tsuno Kaitarō, *Kokkeina kyojin – Tsubouchi Shōyō no yume* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2002), 11–14, and Tsubouchi Shikō, *Tsubouchi Shōyō kenkyū* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1953), 10.
2 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Honan ni tsukite" (1885), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 2 (1977), 717.
3 Ibid.
4 Tsuno, 14–15.
5 See Nishiyama Matsunosuke, *Edo Culture: Daily Life and Diversions in Urban Japan, 1600–1868*, trans. and ed. Gerald Groemer (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), 49–51.
6 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Waga kuni no shigeki" (1893–4), in *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* (1969), 287–8.
7 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen" (1891), in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 3 (1978), 165–6.
8 Ibid., 164.
9 Tsuno, 137.
10 Spencer is not mentioned by name but his evolutionism is implicit in Shōyō's statement that "It is not easy to resist . . . the process of natural selection. Macaulay once suggested that the growth of civilisation will make art redundant, and his argument was a logical one. . . . Yet it relates only to the art that originates in the past and not to the novel of today, which dates back only to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries": Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Shōsetsu shinzui" (1884–5), in *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* (1969), 16.
11 Ueda Atsuko, *Concealment of Politics, Politics of Concealment: The Production of "Literature" in Meiji Japan* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 29.
12 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 4.
13 Ibid., 16.
14 The so-called "sixth sense" in Buddhist teaching.
15 Ibid., 19.
16 Ibid., 45, trans. Twine.
17 Tsuno, 260.
18 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 16.
19 Sadoya Shigenobu, *Tsubouchi Shōyō – dentōshugisha no kōzu* (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1983), 87.

20 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 16.
21 Ibid., 17.
22 Ibid., 3.
23 Ibid., 56.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., 23.
26 Ibid., 33.
27 Ibid.
28 For Shōyō, a fundamental difference between Shakespeare and his classical heritage is that whereas *ninjō* were thought ultimately to reside in the person of the Emperor, Shakespeare's "feelings" clearly belonged somewhere else, and so simply by exposing himself to Shakespeare's "feelings" through the act of translation and allowing those feelings to stimulate all the rational choices he had to make in translating Shakespeare's texts, he is able to exercise his individual feelings in Shakespeare translations independently from the assumptions of classical literature even if he was still one of the Emperor's "subjects." As a corollary of *botsurisōron*, Shakespeare translation enables Shōyō to see himself for the individual that he is. See Nakamura Kan, *Tsubouchi Shōyō ron – kindai Nihon no monogatari kūkan* (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1986), 63–8.
29 For Shōyō, the rhythms of the source text can be articulated by the reader to manifest their essential interiority, but that interiority is likely to be obscured by literal translations made into native poetic forms, and is therefore usually better conveyed by prose translations that are rhythmical and tonally sensitive rather than strictly metrical.
30 Shōyō called the Daisō lending library in Nagoya, where as a teenager he read his way through most of Tokugawa fiction, *kokoro no furusato* (Kobayashi Yoshihito, *Tsubouchi Shōyō* [Tokyo: Shimizu Shoin, 1969], 25), and Tsubouchi Shikō uses the same phrase to describe his relationship with Shakespeare (Tsubouchi Shikō, 176). Having learnt how to read his native literature at the Daisō, Shōyō transfers that skill to the reading and translation of Shakespeare, who thereby becomes a second "spiritual hometown" (since *kokoro* can mean "soul" or "spirit" as well as "heart"), although what probably both Shōyō and Shikō mean is that it is at the Daisō and within Shakespeare that he felt most at ease.
31 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 164.
32 See Suzuki Sadami, *The Concept of Literature in Japan*, trans. Royall Tyler (Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2006), 155.
33 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 17. In this section Shōyō compares human behaviour to a chess game that the novelist must describe as if watching it.
34 Suzuki, 163.
35 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 20.
36 Honma Hisao, *Tsubouchi Shōyō – hito to sono geijutsu* (Tokyo: Shōhakusha, 1959), 6, 162.
37 Ibid., 10.
38 Quoted in Suzuki, 163.
39 Ibid., 85.
40 Suzuki, 88.
41 Rebekah Clements also refers to Norinaga's foresighted approach to vernacular translation as "a more accurate means of 'seeing' the source text than commentaries, which merely tell you about it second-hand": Rebekah Clements, *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 87.
42 Charles Shiro Inouye, "Promoting Virtue and Punishing Vice: Tarantino's *Kill Bill* and the Return of Bakumatsu Aesthetics," *Post Script* 28, no. 2 (2009): 92.
43 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 14.
44 The government's efforts to reform kabuki began as early as 1872 with its call to leading actors to adhere more strictly to historical accuracy and avoid immoral content that might offend foreign visitors. As a result, Ichikawa Danjūrō IX developed a realistic style of drama and acting that met with only limited success, and politician Suematsu

Kenchō's Society for Theatre Reform (founded in 1886) proposed the Westernisation of theatres with the use of actresses rather than *onnagata* impersonators in female roles and removal of the *hanamichi* platform running through the audience for the purpose of dramatic entrances and exits. The use of impersonators and the *hanamichi* were thought to invite immoral behaviour but have never been abolished, and were not opposed by Shōyō, who called instead for more realistic "Shakespearean" playwriting.

45 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 168–9.
46 Yano Hōjin, "Tsubouchi Shōyō to bungaku kyōiku," *Tsubouchi Shōyō Kenkyū Shiryō* 1 (1969): 7.
47 See Lee Yeounsuk, *The Ideology of Kokugo: Nationalizing Language in Modern Japan*, trans. Maki Hirano Hubbard (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010), 87–90.
48 Saeki Junko, "From *Iro* (Eros) to *Ai=Love*: The Case of Tsubouchi Shōyō," trans. Indra Levy, in *Translation in Modern Japan*, ed. Indra Levy (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 92.
49 Noriko T. Reider, *Tales of the Supernatural in Early Modern Japan: Kaidan, Akinari, Ugetsu Monogatari* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002), 83. Ueda was, with Bakin, the most prominent of *yomihon* writers, and is best known for his collection of supernatural tales, *Ugetsu monogatari* (Tales of Rain and the Moon, 1776), filmed as *Ugetsu* by Mizoguchi Kenji in 1953.
50 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Kaioku mandan" (1925–6), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 12 (1977), 348–9.
51 The Genroku era (1688–1704) was a period of cultural flourishing in which Chikamatsu became active as a writer for the puppet theatre, and is associated with the rising – but politically impotent – merchant class in the Kamigata area around Kyoto and Osaka. Genroku style arose in reaction to the oppressive Tokugawa shogunate based in Edo (now Tokyo), being flashy and hedonistic and in Chikamatsu's case escapist.
52 "Kaioku mandan," 348–9.
53 Lawrence E. Marceau, "Cultural Developments in Tokugawa Japan," in *A Companion to Japanese History*, ed. William M. Tsutsui (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 130.
54 Daniel Poch, *Licentious Fictions and the Nineteenth-Century Japanese Novel* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 62.
55 Ibid., 82.
56 Glynne Walley, "Translator's Introduction," in Kyokutei Bakin, *Eight Dogs, Or, "Hakkenden": An Ill-Considered Jest*, trans. Glynne Walley (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2021), xxx. *Hakkenden* has been adapted for kabuki performance.
57 Pre-Meiji written Japanese was barely punctuated. One of the effects of *genbun itchi* was to normalise shorter, punctuated sentences in the Western style.
58 Jason Karlin, *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan: Modernity, Loss, and the Doing of History* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014), 166.
59 Ibid.
60 C. Andrew Gerstle, "Introduction to Chikamatsu," in *Early Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology, 1600–1900*, ed. Shirane Haruo (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 240.
61 Tsubouchi Yūzō, "Shakespeare and Chikamatsu" (1916), in *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, ed. Israel Gollancz and Gordon McMullan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 545–6.
62 Ibid., 544–55.
63 Donald Keene, *World Within Walls: Japanese Literature of the Pre-Modern Era, 1600–1867* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976), 255.
64 Torigoe Bunzō, ed., *Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1975), 497.
65 Edward Dowden, *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1875), 227.
66 Norinaga writes that "If one searches the bottom of one's heart it is impossible not to find love there, especially the type of love forbidden by man. And try as one might to suppress it, there will be only melancholy and bewilderment in one's heart. As love is

thus unreasonable, the love poems which come forth on such occasions are especially touching. It is also natural that there should be many love poems that suggest impropriety and licentiousness. Be that as it may, poetry follows the principle of the sorrow of existence and attempts to express without adornment the bad as well as the good. Its aim is not to select and arrange for the heart that which is good or bad": *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, trans. and ed. Tsunoda Ryūsaku, Wm. Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene (New York: Columbia University Press, 1964), 32. Norinaga is referring to classical poetry but in *Shōsetsu shinzui* a similar view is applied to drama and fiction.

67 Torigoe, 507.
68 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Chikamatsu tai Shēkusupia tai Ipusen" (1909), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 10 (1977), 769–814. Trans. *"History and Characteristics of Kabuki: The Japanese Classical Drama" by Shōyō Tsubouchi and Jirō Yamamoto*, ed. Matsumoto Ryōzō (Yokohama: Heiji Yamagata, 1960), 207–39.
69 Ibid., 770–1 (Matsumoto, 208).
70 Ibid., 771–4 (Matsumoto, 209).
71 Ibid., 774–6 (Matsumoto, 211–12).
72 Ibid., 777 (Matsumoto, 212–13).
73 Ibid., 777–9 (Matsumoto, 213–14).
74 Ibid., 779–81 (Matsumoto, 214–15).
75 Ibid., 781 (Matsumoto, 215).
76 Ibid., 781–4 (Matsumoto, 215–17).
77 Ibid., 784–5 (Matsumoto, 217–18).
78 Ibid., 785–7 (Matsumoto, 218–19).
79 Ibid., 787–8 (Matsumoto, 219–20).
80 Ibid., 788–90 (Matsumoto, 220–1).
81 Ibid., 790 (Matsumoto, 221).
82 Ibid., 790–3 (Matsumoto, 221–3).
83 Ibid., 793–4 (Matsumoto, 223–4).
84 Ibid., 794–5 (Matsumoto, 224).
85 Ibid., 795 (Matsumoto, 224–5).
86 Ibid., 795–6 (Matsumoto, 225).
87 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Nihon de enzuru *Hamuretto*" (1907), in *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei*, vol. 2, Sasaki Takashi (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Centre, 1997), 199.
88 Ibid., 200.
89 "The world of the Kabuki play is not the almost limitless universe in which the characters of Shakespeare and Sophocles move. But within the limits set for them, the greatest Kabuki heroes are not merely the puppet figures of melodrama": Earle Ernst, *The Kabuki Theatre* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1974), 243.
90 Barbara E. Thornbury, *Sukeroku's Double Identity: The Dramatic Structure of Edo Kabuki* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, 1982), 77.
91 Protagonists such as Jihei and Tokubei in another Chikamatsu *sewamono*, *Sonezaki shinjū* (1703), act against social norms. In Edo kabuki, the "spirit of resistance" is embodied in a different way by a character like the samurai Sukeroku in the 1713 drama of the same name, who – like Shōyō in the 1880s and '90s – is continually picking fights.
92 Quoted by Yamamoto Jirō, "History of *Kabuki*" (1951), in Matsumoto Ryōzō, 46.
93 "Waga kuni no shigeki," 288.
94 The Kasei culture of the Bunka and Bunsei eras (1804–29) was a townsmen's culture like Chikamatsu's Genroku but more decadent.
95 Tsubouchi Shōyō, trans., "Temupesuto," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 42.
96 Richard Emmert and Alan Cummings, "Introduction, 'Viewing the Autumn Foliage'," in *Kabuki Plays on Stage: Restoration and Reform, 1872–1905*, ed. James R. Brandon and Samuel L. Leiter (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003), 307.

97 Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Taitasu Andoronikasu* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1926), 11.
98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., 11–12.
100 Thomas S. Eliot, "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation," in *Selected Essays: 1917–1932* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950), 67.
101 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Shēkusupiya atto randomu" (1931), in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 5 (1978), 302. Hieronimo bites out his tongue in the final scene of Thomas Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* (1580s).
102 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Batsu ni kawaete" [In Place of an Epilogue], in *Makubesu* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1935), 3–4.
103 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 163.
104 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Azusa miko" (1891), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 8 (1977), 168. Trans. Poch, 173.
105 Ishida Tadahiko, *Tsubouchi Shōyō kenkyū* (Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press, 1988), 335.
106 Nakamura, 224–6.
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid., 72.
109 Ibid., 212.
110 The traditional ideal of the cultured man praised in works such as Yoshida Kenkō's *Tsurezuregusa* (Essays in Idleness, 1330–2).
111 "Temupesuto," 30.
112 Ibid.
113 "Shōsetsu shinzui," 42. In his *Tempest* afterword, Shōyō compares Shakespeare himself to the eighteenth-century neo-Confucianists for his artistic ability to see two sides of a problem, which is his genius of concealing his personal opinions ("Temupesuto," 30).
114 Dowden (1875), 227.
115 "Temupesuto," 49.
116 Ibid., 45–6.
117 Ibid., 42–3. Shōyō does, however, suggest that while the plot has no parallel in Noh or *jōruri*, Prospero resembles two popular samurai characters in nineteenth-century kabuki, Saitō Tarōsaemon and Gorōbei Masamune (34), and also compares the role of Caliban to that of *kyogen mawashi* in kabuki as a supporting character who is essential to the development of the plot (50).
118 Ibid., 48.
119 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Manatsu no yo no yume," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 179.
120 Shōyō calls it *inaka shibai Chūshingura shiki* ("a Chūshingura style of country play"). Ibid., 178.
121 Ibid., 179.
122 Discussed in *Kansai no senjōteki higeki* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1933).
123 "Manatsu no yo no yume," 182–6.
124 Yanagita's *Shakujin mondō* [Discourse on Stone Deities], published in 1910.
125 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Ishaku hōshaku," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 5 (1977), 217.
126 In a supplementary preface written for the revised version published after *Shōyō senshū* in 1933: Tsubouchi Shōyō, *Ishaku hōshaku* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933), 3. He was likely influenced in this view by Anna Jameson's comparison of the two heroines in her influential *Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical, and Historical* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1832), 32–3, which is one of the very few works of Shakespeare criticism by female authors listed in *Shēkusupia kenkyū shiori* (91).
127 "Ishaku hōshaku," 222.
128 Ibid.

129 Ibid., 223. In *Hachi no ki*, Tokiyori, disguised as an itinerant monk, knocks on the door of the poor Tsuneyo, begging for a place to stay for the night as it is snowing heavily outside. Tsuneyo not only grants the monk's request but burns his precious potted plum, cherry, and pine trees to keep his mysterious guest warm. The Angelo equivalent are the relatives who have cheated Tsuneyo out of his land, and it is with land that he is handsomely rewarded when Tokiyori's identity is finally revealed. The comparison may have been of more than incidental significance to Shōyō since *Hachi no ki* was known as one of the favourite plays of Tokugawa Ieyasu and remained popular as a model of samurai chivalry (*bushidō*).
130 Ibid.
131 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Antonī to Kureopatora," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 5 (1977), 3.
132 Ibid., 8–9.
133 Ibid., 9.
134 Ibid.; Dowden (1875), 306–07.
135 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Henrī yonsei dainibu," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 484–5.
136 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Jajauma narashi," in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4 (1977), 663.
137 Ibid., 664.
138 Tsuno, 27.
139 Quoted in Kawatake Shigetoshi and Yanagida Izumi, *Tsubouchi Shōyō* (1939; repr., Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1988), 740. Bunzaemon Kinokuniya (Kibun) made a fortune in the early eighteenth century exporting *mikan* tangerines from his native Wakayama to the capital at Edo, and one year risked storms in the Pacific to ensure that the fruit reached Edo in time for an annual festival; he later supplied the people of Osaka with salted salmon when they were threatened by an epidemic. Gohei Zeniya followed the call for the liberalisation of Japanese trade in the early nineteenth century at a time when such trade was still strictly forbidden, and may have taken his boats as far as Tasmania. Nagamasa Yamada is the best known of these three for his involvement with the Red Seal ships (*shuinsen*) during the early seventeenth century, a system established under the warlord Hideyoshi Toyotomi in 1592 to advance Japanese trade in south-east Asia and protect it from piracy but soon after abolished by the Tokugawa shogun out of fear of European influence in the Philippines and elsewhere.
140 Tsuno, 36–7. Tsuno also mentions Shōyō's commitment to "outdoor drama" (pageants).
141 Ibid., 147.
142 Moriya Sasaburō, *Nihon ni okeru Sheikusupia* (Tokyo: Yasshio Shuppan, 1986), 143.
143 The Naturalists eschewed "unnatural" theatricality (Tsuno, 31).
144 Moriya, 124.
145 Natsume Kinnosuke, *Sōseki zenshū*, vol. 16 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2019, facsimile ed.), 27.
146 Leo Tolstoy, *Tolstoy on Shakespeare: A Critical Essay on Shakespeare*, trans. Vladimir Tchertkoff (1906; Glasgow: Good Press, 2022), 14.
147 Ibid., 32.
148 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Torusutoi tai Shēkusupiya" (1907), in *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei*, vol. 2, ed. Sasaki Takashi (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Centre, 1997), 239.
149 Ibid., 243.
150 Kang Jungki, "Shō," in *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 179–80.
151 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Iwayuru atarashii onna" (1912), in *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 8 (1977), 211–372. See Kang Jungki, "Iwayuru atarashii onna," in *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 38.
152 George Orwell, "Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool" (1947), in *George Orwell: Selected Essays*, ed. Stefan Collini (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 273. Orwell pinpoints Shakespeare's likely appeal to Shōyō with his view that "Shakespeare was not a philosopher or a scientist, but he did have curiosity, he loved the surface of the earth

and the process of life – which, it should be repealed, is *not* the same thing as wanting to have a good time and stay alive as long as possible" (ibid.).

153 "Chikamatsu tai Shēkusupia tai Ipusen," 798–9 (Matsumoto Ryōzō, 228).
154 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 166.
155 Richard G. Moulton, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Thinker* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1907), 49. Moulton was English, born in 1849 into a distinguished Methodist family, and appointed professor of English literature at the University of Chicago in 1892.
156 Ibid., 167.
157 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori" (1928), in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 5 (1977), 50.
158 Sadoya, 44.
159 Matsumoto Shinko, "Botsurisō to Edwādo Dauden," *Tsubouchi Shōyō Kenkyū Shiryō* 9 (1980): 1–12.
160 Dowden, 35.
161 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Soko shirazu no mizuumi" (1891), in *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* (1969), 282.
162 Dowden was elected president of the English Goethe Society in 1888.
163 Dowden, 6.
164 Ibid.
165 Tsubouchi Shōyō, "Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite" (1928), in *Shōyō senshū*, supp. vol. 5 (1977), 267.
166 Edward Dowden, *Shakespere* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1877), 47–56.
167 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 161–2.
168 Dowden (1875), 42.
169 Ibid., 46.
170 Ibid., 44.
171 Ibid., 46.
172 Ibid., 62.
173 Ibid.
174 Ibid.
175 The urban *gesaku* novels of Tanehiko, who died in 1842, remained popular until well into the Meiji era. His name is mentioned eight times in *Shōsetsu shinzui* as a stereotype of late Edo fiction that Shōyō urged his contemporaries to avoid. The novels of Kōyō, who died in 1903 at the age of thirty-five, are comparable to Thackeray rather than to Henry Fielding (or George Eliot) (Sadoya, 20).
176 "Waga kuni no shigeki," 291.
177 Ibid., 288.
178 Satō Isao, "Hishō bungaku," in *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 305. Possnett was also influenced by Spencer's Social Darwinism.
179 Hutcheson M. Possnett, *Comparative Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1886), 325.
180 Ibid., 362.
181 Ibid., 366.
182 Ibid., 357–8.
183 Henry R. Woudhuysen, ed., *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare* (London: Penguin Books, 1989), 122. Norinaga's aesthetic of *mono no aware* asserts that the particular glimpses the universal through the force of feeling, but he was writing mainly about classical *waka* poetry.
184 Possnett, 12.
185 Daniel Gallimore, "Of Ponds, Lakes, and the Sea: Shōyō, Shakespeare, and Romanticism," in *British Romanticism in Asia: The Reception, Translation, and Transformation of Romantic Literature in East Asia and India*, ed. Alex Watson and Laurence Williams (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 273–92.

186 This comment (Tsubouchi Shikō, 127) was surely in jest since Shōyō can hardly be considered to belong to the New Romantic school of his rival Mori Ōgai, but there is a serious point that Shōyō may have been making about the permeability of generic styles.
187 Moulton, 40.
188 Ibid., 244.
189 See Ishimaru Hisashi, "Shōsetsu sanpa," in *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 182.
190 Michael C. Brownstein, "Tsubouchi Shōyō on Chikamatsu and Drama," in *Currents in Japanese Culture: Translations and Transformations*, ed. Amy Vladeck (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 286.
191 Moulton, 50.
192 Ibid., 46.
193 Jean-Jacques Tschudin, "Danjūrō's *Katsureki-Geki* (Realistic Theatre) and the Meiji 'Theatre Reform' Movement," *Japan Forum* 11, no. 1 (1999): 83.
194 The library's purchase of Shakespeare editions dates from 1876 (Kawato Michiaki, *Meiji no Sheikusupia* (Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 2004), 251–2).
195 "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen," 163.
196 Toyoda Minoru, *Shakespeare in Japan: An Historical Survey* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940), 136.
197 Kenneth Deighton, ed., *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1891), xxiv.
198 Edward Dowden, ed., *The Tragedy of Hamlet* (London: Methuen & Co., 1899), xxvi.
199 "Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori," 224–9.
200 Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson, eds., *The Tempest* (1921; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), lvii.
201 Ibid., 6.
202 Ibid., lviii–lix.
203 Ibid., lix–lx. Shōyō does not include this part in *Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori*.
204 "Temupesuto," 60.
205 Indra A. Levy, *Sirens of the Western Shore: The Westernesque Femme Fatale, Translation, and Vernacular Style in Modern Japanese Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 39.
206 Ibid., 30.
207 "Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite," 267–8. On the Japanese dictionaries, see Note 92 in Chapter 3.
208 Nakamura, 68.
209 Moriya, 52–3.
210 Quoted in Massimiliano Tomasi, *Rhetoric in Modern Japan: Western Influences on the Development of Narrative and Oratorical Style* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004), 128.
211 Saitō Mino, "Morita Shiken," in *Nihon no honyakuron – ansorojī to kaidai*, ed. Yanabu Akira, Naganuma Mikako, and Mizuno Akira (Tokyo: Hōsei University Press, 2010), 89. Shiken's strategy was more consciously focused on the target audience than what had come before.
212 "Nihon de enzuru *Hamuretto*," 196.
213 Ibid., 200.
214 Kisaka Motoi, "Gendai ōbunmyaku no hirogari", *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to Kyōzai no Kenkyū* 32, no. 4 (1987): 124–8; Akira Mizuno, "Stylistic Norms in the Early Meiji Period: From Chinese Influences to European Influences," in *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*, ed. Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi (London: Continuum, 2012), 96.
215 Atsuko Ueda, "Sounds, Scripts, and Styles: *Kanbun Kundokutai* and the National Language Reforms of 1880s Japan," in *Translation in Modern Japan*, ed. Indra Levy (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 147.

216 Satō Isao, *Tsubouchi Shōyō ni okeru Doraiden juyō no kenkyū – tōyō to seiyō ni okeru hikaku bungaku no genten* (Tokyo: Hokuseidō Shoten, 1981).
217 Tsubouchi Yūzō, *Eishibun hyōshaku* (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1902), 137–9.
218 Keith Walker, ed., *John Dryden: The Major Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 549.
219 Alfredo Michel Modenessi, "'Dost Dialogue with Thy Shadow?': Translating Shakespeare and Stage Business," *Shakespeare Studies* 46 (2018): 71.

References

Brownstein, Michael C. "Tsubouchi Shōyō on Chikamatsu and Drama." In *Currents in Japanese Culture: Translations and Transformations*, edited by Amy Vladeck, 279–89. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.
Clements, Rebekah. *A Cultural History of Translation in Early Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Deighton, Kenneth, ed. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1891.
Dowden, Edward. *Shakespeare*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1877.
———. *Shakspere: A Critical Study of His Mind and Art*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1875.
———, ed. *The Tragedy of Hamlet*. London: Methuen & Co., 1899.
Eliot, Thomas S. "Seneca in Elizabethan Translation." In *Selected Essays: 1917–1932*, 65–106. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950.
Emmert, Richard and Alan Cummings. "Introduction, 'Viewing the Autumn Foliage'." In *Kabuki Plays on Stage: Restoration and Reform, 1872–1905*, edited by James R. Brandon and Samuel L. Leiter, 304–8. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003, https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824845919.
Ernst, Earle. *The Kabuki Theatre*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1974, https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824846060.
Fukuda Kiyoto and Kobayashi Yoshihito. *Tsubouchi Shōyō*. Tokyo: Shimizu Shoin, 1969.
Gallimore, Daniel. "Of Ponds, Lakes, and the Sea: Shōyō, Shakespeare, and Romanticism." In *British Romanticism in Asia: The Reception, Translation, and Transformation of Romantic Literature in East Asia and India*, edited by Alex Watson and Laurence Williams, 273–92. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3001-8_11.
Gerstle, C. Andrew. "Introduction to Chikamatsu." In *Early Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology, 1600–1900*, edited by Shirane Haruo, 233–42. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.
Honma Hisao. *Tsubouchi Shōyō – hito to sono geijutsu* [Tsubouchi Shōyō, the Person and His Art]. Tokyo: Shōhakusha, 1959.
Inagaki Tatsurō, ed. *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* [Works of Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969.
Inouye, Charles Shiro. "Promoting Virtue and Punishing Vice: Tarantino's *Kill Bill* and the Return of Bakumatsu Aesthetics." *Post Script: Essays in Film and the Humanities* 28, no. 2 (Spring 2009): 92–100.
Ishida Tadahiko. *Tsubouchi Shōyō kenkyū* [Theories of Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Fukuoka: Kyushu University Press, 1988.
Ishimaru Hisashi. "'Shōsetsu sanpa'" ["Three Types of Novel"]. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 182.
Jameson, Anna. *Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical, and Historical*. London: Saunders and Otley, 1832.
Kang Jungki. "Iwayuru atarashii onna" [The So-Called New Woman]. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 38.
———. "Shō" [George Bernard Shaw]. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1985), 179–80.

Karlin, Jason. *Gender and Nation in Meiji Japan: Modernity, Loss, and the Doing of History*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014, https://doi.org/10.21313/hawaii/9780824838263.001.0001.

Kawatake Shigetoshi and Yanagida Izumi. *Tsubouchi Shōyō*. 1939. Reprint, Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1988.

Kawato Michiaki. *Meiji no Sheikusupia* [Shakespeare's Reception in the Meiji Era]. Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 2004.

Keene, Donald. *World Within Walls: Japanese Literature of the Pre-Modern Era, 1600–1867*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Kisaka Motoi. "Gendai ōbunmyaku no hirogari" [The Extent of Modern European-Influenced Style]. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to Kyōzai no Kenkyū* 32, no. 14 (November 1987): 124–8.

Lee Yeounsuk. *The Ideology of* Kokugo*: Nationalizing Language in Modern Japan*. translated by Maki Hirano Hubbard. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010. Originally published as *"Kokugo" to iu shisō*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996, https://doi.org/10.21313/hawaii/9780824833053.001.0001.

Levy, Indra A. *Sirens of the Western Shore: The Westernesque Femme Fatale, Translation, and Vernacular Style in Modern Japanese Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010, https://doi.org/10.7312/levy13786.

Marceau, Lawrence E. "Cultural Developments in Tokugawa Japan." In *A Companion to Japanese History*, edited by William M. Tsutsui, 117–35. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2007, https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470751398.ch8.

Matsumoto Ryōzō, trans. and ed. *"History and Characteristics of Kabuki: The Japanese Classical Drama" by Shōyō Tsubouchi and Jirō Yamamoto*. Yokohama: Heiji Yamagata, 1960.

Matsumoto Shinko. "Botsurisō to Edwādo Dauden" [Edward Dowden and "The Hidden Ideals Debate"]. *Tsubouchi Shōyō Kenkyū Shiryō* 9 (March 1980): 1–12.

Mizuno Akira. "Stylistic Norms in the Early Meiji Period: From Chinese Influences to European Influences." In *Translation and Translation Studies in the Japanese Context*, edited by Nana Sato-Rossberg and Judy Wakabayashi, 92–114. London: Continuum, 2012.

Modenessi, Alfredo Michel. "'Dost Dialogue With Thy Shadow?': Translating Shakespeare and Stage Business." *Shakespeare Studies* 46 (2018): 70–83.

Moriya Sasaburō. *Nihon ni okeru Sheikusupia* [Shakespeare in Japan]. Tokyo: Yasshio Shuppan, 1986.

Motoori Norinaga. "Love and Poetry." In *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, vol. 2, translated and edited by Tsunoda Ryūsaku, Wm. Theodore de Bary, and Donald Keene, 30–5. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. Originally published in *Iso no kami no sasamegoto* (1763).

Moulton, Richard G. *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Thinker*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1907.

Nakamura Kan. *Tsubouchi Shōyō ron – kindai Nihon no monogatari kūkan* [Tsubouchi Shōyō and the Space of Modern Japanese Narrative]. Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1986.

Natsume Kinnosuke. *Sōseki zenshū* [Collected Works of Natsume Sōseki], vol. 16. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2019, facsimile edition.

Nishiyama Matsunosuke. *Edo Culture: Daily Life and Diversions in Urban Japan, 1600–1868*. translated and edited by Gerald Groemer. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997, https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824862299.

Orwell, George. "Lear, Tolstoy and the Fool." 1947. In *George Orwell: Selected Essays*, edited by Stefan Collini, 260–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Poch, Daniel. *Licentious Fictions and the Nineteenth-Century Japanese Novel*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019, https://doi.org/10.7312/poch19370.

Possnett, Hutcheson M. *Comparative Literature*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1886.

Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur, and John Dover Wilson, eds. *The New Shakespeare: The Tempest*. 1921. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Reider, Noriko T. *Tales of the Supernatural in Early Modern Japan: Kaidan, Akinari, Ugetsu Monogatari*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

Sadoya Shigenobu. *Tsubouchi Shōyō – dentōshugisha no kōzu* [Tsubouchi Shōyō: The Making of a Traditionalist]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1983.
Saeki Junko. "From *Iro* (Eros) to *Ai=Love*: The Case of Tsubouchi Shōyō." In *Translation in Modern Japan*, translated and edited by Indra Levy, 73–101. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2016, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315084602-5.
Saitō Mino. "Morita Shiken." In *Nihon no honyaku ron: ansorojī to kaidai* [An Anthology of Japanese Translation Studies], edited by Yanabu Akira, Naganuma Mikako, and Mizuno Akira, 89–90. Tokyo: Hōsei University Press, 2010.
Satō Isao. "Hishō bungaku" [Comparative Literature]. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* (1986), 305.
———. *Tsubouchi Shōyō ni okeru Doraiden juyō no kenkyū – tōyō to seiyō ni okeru hikaku bungaku no genten* [Shōyō and Dryden: A Focus for Literary Comparison between East and West]. Tokyo: Hokuseidō Shoten, 1981.
Shōyō Kyōkai, ed. *Shōyō senshū* [Selected Works of Tsubouchi Shōyō], 17 vols. (1927–8; reprinted with 5 supplementary volumes). Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1977–8.
———, ed. *Tsubouchi Shōyō jiten* [Dictionary of Tsubouchi Shōyō Studies]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1986.
Suzuki Sadami. *The Concept of Literature in Japan*. translated by Royall Tyler. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2006. Originally published as *Nihon no "bungaku" gainen*. Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 1998.
Thornbury, Barbara E. *Sukeroku's Double Identity: The Dramatic Structure of Edo Kabuki*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, 1982.
Tolstoy, Leo. *Tolstoy on Shakespeare: A Critical Essay on Shakespeare*. 1906. translated by Vladimir Tchertkoff. Glasgow: Good Press, 2022.
Tomasi, Massimiliano. *Rhetoric in Modern Japan: Western Influences on the Development of Narrative and Oratorical Style*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004, https://doi.org/10.1515/9780824840570.
Torigoe Bunzō, ed. *Chikamatsu Monzaemon shū* [Works of Chikamatsu Monzaemon], vol. 2. Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1975.
Toyoda Minoru. *Shakespeare in Japan: An Historical Survey*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1940.
Tschudin, Jean-Jacques. "Danjūrō's *Katsureki-Geki* (Realistic Theatre) and the Meiji 'Theatre Reform' Movement." *Japan Forum* 11, no. 1 (1999): 83–94, https://doi.org/10.1080/09555809908721623.
Tsubouchi Shikō. *Tsubouchi Shōyō kenkyū* [Studies in Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1953.
Tsubouchi Shōyō, trans. "Antonī to Kureopatora" [Antony and Cleopatra]. 1915. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 5, 1–213, 1977.
———. "Azusa miko" [The Catalpa Bow Shaman]. 1891. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 8, 143–82, 1977.
———. "Chikamatsu tai Shēkusupia tai Ipusen" [Chikamatsu as Compared with Shakespeare and Ibsen]. 1909. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 10, 769–813. translated by Matsumoto Ryōzō in Matsumoto Ryōzō, 207–39, 1977.
———, trans. "Henrī yonsei dainibu" [King Henry IV, Part 2]. 1919. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 477–659, 1977.
———. "Honan ni tsukite" [On Adaptation]. 1885. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 2, 717–8, 1977.
———, trans. "Ishaku hōshaku" [Measure for Measure]. 1918. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 5, 215–393, 1977.
———, trans. *Ishaku hōshaku* [Measure for Measure]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1933.
———. "Iwayuru atarashii onna" [The So-Called "New Woman"]. 1912. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 8, 211–372, 1977.
———, trans. "Jajauma narashi" [The Taming of the Shrew]. 1920. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 661–824, 1977.
———. "Jibun no honyaku ni tsuite" [About My Shakespeare Translations]. 1928. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 5, 254–77, 1977.

———. "Kaioku mandan" [Recollections]. 1925–6. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 12, 341–72, 1977.
———. *Kansai no senjōteki higeki* [Sensational Tragedies of Kansai]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1933.
———, trans. *Makubesu* [Macbeth]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1935.
———. "'*Makubesu* hyōshaku' no shogen" [Preface to a Commentary on *Macbeth*]. 1891. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 3, 161–9, 1978.
———, trans. "*Manatsu no yo no yume*" [A Midsummer Night's Dream]. 1915. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 171–304.
———. "Nihon de enzuru *Hamuretto*" [Performing *Hamlet* in Japan]. 1907. In *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei* [Research Materials on the Reception of Shakespeare in Japan], vol. 2, edited by Sasaki Takashi, 196–202. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Centre, 1997.
———. "Shēkusupiya atto randamu" [Shakespeare at Random]. 1931. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 5, 279–373, 1978.
———. "Shēkusupiya kenkyū shiori" [A Companion to Shakespeare Studies]. 1928. In *Shōyō senshū*, supplementary vol. 5, 1–277, 1977.
———. "Shōsetsu shinzui" [The Essence of the Novel]. 1885–6. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū* (1969), 3–58. translated by Nanette Twine, *Occasional Papers* 11 (Department of Japanese, University of Queensland, 1981), electronic edition, accessed 23 October 2023, http://archive.nyu.edu/html.2451/14945/shoyo.htm.
———. "Soko shirazu no mizuumi" [The Bottomless Lake]. 1891. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū*, 279–82, 1969.
———, trans. *Taitasu Andoronikasu* [Titus Andronicus]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1926.
———, trans. "Temupesuto" [The Tempest]. 1915. In *Shōyō senshū*, vol. 4, 1–169, 1977.
———. "Torusutoi tai Shēkusupiya" [Tolstoy contra Shakespeare]. 1907. In *Sheikusupia kenkyū shiryō shūsei* [Research Materials on the Reception of Shakespeare in Japan], vol. 2, edited by Sasaki Takashi, 238–46. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Centre, 1997.
———. "Waga kuni no shigeki" [Historical Drama of Japan]. 1893–4. In *Tsubouchi Shōyō shū*, 287–315, 1969.
Tsubouchi Yūzō [Shōyō]. *Eishibun hyōshaku* [Introduction to English Poetry]. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1902.
———. "Shakespeare and Chikamatsu." 1916. In *A Book of Homage to Shakespeare*, edited by Israel Gollancz and Gordon McMullan, 543–6. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
Tsuno Kaitarō. *Kokkeina kyojin – Tsubouchi Shōyō no yume* [Comic Giant: The Dream of Tsubouchi Shōyō]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2002.
Ueda Atsuko. *Concealment of Politics, Politics of Concealment: The Production of "Literature" in Meiji Japan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503626898.
———. "Sounds, Scripts, and Styles: *Kanbun Kundokutai* and the National Language Reforms of 1880s Japan." In *Translation in Modern Japan*, edited by Indra Levy, 141–64. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2016, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315084602-9.
Walker, Keith, ed. *John Dryden: The Major Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
Walley, Glynne. "Translator's Introduction." In Kyokutei [Takizawa] Bakin, *Eight Dogs, Or, "Hakkenden": An Ill-Considered Jest*, translated by Glynne Walley, xi–xlv. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University East Asia Program, 2021, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501755194-003.
Woudhuysen, Henry R., ed. *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare*. London: Penguin Books, 1989.
Yano Hōjin. "Tsubouchi Shōyō to bungaku kyōiku" [Tsubouchi Shōyō and Literary Education]. *Tsubouchi Shōyō Kenkyū Shiryō* 1 (September 1969): 1–12.