Beyond Brushtalk

Sino-Japanese Literary Exchange in the Interwar Period

Christopher T. Keaveney

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

ISBN 978-962-209-928-9

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Secure On-line Ordering
http://www.hkupress.org

Printed and bound by Lammar Offset Printing Ltd., Hong Kong, China

Hong Kong University Press is honoured that Xu Bing, whose art explores the complex themes of language across cultures, has written the Press's name in his Square Word Calligraphy. This signals our commitment to cross-cultural thinking and the distinctive nature of our English-language books published in China.

"At first glance, Square Word Calligraphy appears to be nothing more unusual than Chinese characters, but in fact it is a new way of rendering English words in the format of a square so they resemble Chinese characters. Chinese viewers expect to be able to read Square word Calligraphy but cannot. Western viewers, however are surprised to find they can read it. Delight erupts when meaning is unexpectedly revealed."

— Britta Erickson, *The Art of Xu Bing*

Contents

Introduction

The interwar period (1919–1937) was, in a number of significant ways, the nadir of Sino-Japanese relations. The idealistic façade of Jazz Age abandon and "Taishō Democracy" of the twenties masked the systematic expansion of militarism in Japan that ultimately would threaten stability on the continent and stymie efforts at cultural interaction among Chinese and Japanese intellectuals. In China, the various manifestations of Japanese aggression and imperialism met with waves of stiff and increasingly well orchestrated resistance that led first to invasion by the Japanese and then to war in 1937.

Given the severity of the political relations between the two nations it is ironic and surprising that there should have been such frequent and salubrious interactions between Chinese and Japanese writers during this period. The positive exchange that emerged between writers from the two literary communities proved to be an ultimately futile challenge to the Japanese militarist juggernaut. Nevertheless, it was an admirable and noteworthy essay at cultural bridge building between China and Japan where political and diplomatic measures had failed. For the first time in the long history of relations between these two East Asian neighbors, the cultural touchstone for both nations was no longer China and traditional Confucian values, but the West, and this in turn created increased opportunities for writers to interact in more equitable, less culturally bound ways than ever before, as both communities of writers sought to fashion a new modern literature based on Western models.

This is the story of attempts on the part of writers from the two literary communities to overcome formidable historical, cultural, ideological and political obstacles in order to engage in dialogues emphasizing literary cooperation and mutuality. It is a story, or rather a series of stories, that was destined to end in failure, crushed beneath the moraine of inevitable forces. Nevertheless, it is a tale worth telling insofar as it provides an example of positive interaction between two countries whose modern history of relations has been marred all too often

by miscommunication, dogmatic adherence to ideological posturing and outright conflict.

The Golden Age of Sino-Japanese Literary Exchange

The "interwar period," as defined in this study, lasted from the May Fourth Movement in China, which came about in the wake of the Versailles Treaty in 1919, to the formal declaration of war on China by Japan in 1937. A number of the writers who would eventually go on to become pivotal figures in modern Chinese letters studied in Japan and embarked on their literary careers while in Japan during the May Fourth period. The period under consideration in this study ends, tragically, with the breakdown in communications between the literary communities that was the result of Japanese imperialism of the 1930s. The writers examined in this book include a number of the most celebrated authors of the era from both China and Japan. Ultimately, although this study examines relations involving famous writers such as Lu Xun and Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, the figure who emerges as the unsung hero of Sino-Japanese literary relations was a little-known bookstore owner named Uchiyama Kanzō, whose bookstore in Shanghai became the hub of relations between writers in the two communities during the interwar period.

The stories told here revolve around communication — face-to-face communication — and attempts at cultural understanding. For the first time in the long history of cultural relations between the two nations, intellectuals and artists attempted to transcend traditional biases and conventional assumptions about the other in order to communicate via a new Western aesthetic vocabulary. To the degree that historical rigidity and political exigencies allowed, they attempted to meet as equals and to communicate as modern artists who shared common aesthetic aspirations. In order to accomplish this goal they first had to go beyond the limitations inherent in the traditionally esteemed mode of cultural communication, written classical Chinese, and to literally lay their brushes aside and communicate directly to effectively confront a new array of cultural issues. In so doing, they were able to go beyond "brushtalk" in order to achieve a true meeting of the minds.

Brushtalk: Traditional Cultural Communications in East Asia

Traditionally, the ink brush had served as the chief tool of literary expression in East Asia and was valued as one of the "four treasures" of the scholar. Furthermore, written literary Chinese was the medium for intercultural exchange among intellectuals throughout East Asia. "Brushtalk" (Chinese, *bitan;* Japanese,

hitsudan) was the vehicle through which ideas, both profound and mundane, were exchanged during the Chinese dynastic period among Chinese of different regions and between Chinese and visitors from their tributary and neighbor states including Koguryo, Paekche and Silla on the Korean Peninsula, Vietnam, and Japan.

Brushtalk refers specifically to the practice of communication in East Asia among literate individuals, incapable of speaking one another's language, by means of written classical Chinese. In actual practice, of course, it need not be classical Chinese. A simple exchange of written Chinese characters would often suffice to convey a point or to make an inquiry. All educated people in East Asia in premodern times possessed the ability to read and write in classical Chinese. As Joshua Fogel suggests, one should not underestimate the power of written Chinese characters and of the ink brush itself as a flexible tool for asking questions, exchanging ideas and proffering formal greetings.[1] This is a phenomenon that has its origins in the earliest exchanges among literate individuals in the Sinitic world. Even today, one can see this scenario played out regularly in East Asia in which, for example, Japanese visiting China are able to ask the whereabouts of a particular kind of store or site of cultural interest, or to identify themselves by means of a name card, all without having to speak a word.[2]

Such modes of communication have their roots in very early cross-linguistic encounters in East Asia. Chinese records suggest that the first Japanese visited China as early as the second century BCE.[3] Although the Japanese of the period were as yet preliterate and could not avail themselves of this mode of communication, one can conjecture that the Chinese themselves of the Han Dynasty (206 BCE–220 CE), hailing from different regions with radically different spoken dialects, employed classical Chinese as a mode of communication when none in the party could speak the dialect of the party with whom they were conversing.[4]

The phenomenon of brushtalk was already fairly well established by the fourth century when Paekche, the dominant power on the Korean Peninsula in that period, began to send embassies to the Chinese court. Chinese historical sources, for instance, speak about formal interactions between successive Chinese courts and the Korean kingdom of Paekche, when Paekche was an independent power on the peninsula between the late fourth and mid-seventh centuries in the common era.[5] Paekche's period of ascendancy coincided with the Six Dynasties period (222–589 CE) in China, thus Paekche embassies to China presented tribute and exchanged classical Chinese poems with a number of different dynastic regimes.[6]

Paekche presents an example of the model of a tributary state in terms of its relations with the Chinese dynasties with which it interacted. For a tributary state, such as Paekche, presentation of tribute and poetry to the dynastic court

was the cost of recognition by the ruling emperor. In exchange for tributary gifts, Paekche leaders received grandiose titles that both confirmed their right to rule and increased their prestige back home and in the eyes of the Chinese court.[7]

The model of Paekche's interactions with China was well known to the early Japanese. Paekche envoys regularly visited both China and Japan, and Paekche provided the Japanese court with the concepts and teachers needed to introduce an advanced civilization based on the Chinese dynastic model.[8] The Japanese, for their part, traveled to Paekche at the same time that they were beginning to send envoys to China. The journey from Japan to Paekche and onward to China was a long and dangerous one for Japanese of the era. An account of one such trip made in 659 and recorded in the *Nihon shoki* (Chronicles of Japan, 720) describes how the two ships making the journey were blown off course and separated, with one ending up in present-day Jiangsu Province and the other in Zhejiang. After reuniting at Yuyao, it took the party two months before reaching the capital near Luoyang.[9] Japanese records also recount trips made from Japan to Paekche in 608, 615, and 654.[10]

In such visits to their civilized neighbors, the Japanese, still in the nascent stages of court culture, were learning the fundamental structures and conventions of Sinitic court culture along with Chinese linguistic skills from Paekche and from the Sui and Tang courts. Through interactions with neighboring states the Japanese acquired the requisite skills to communicate in an acceptable manner during formal court visits, including the ability to communicate via classical Chinese.

The Tang court, anxious to foster appropriate communications skills among its neighbors, established academies in which scholars from tributary and neighboring states could acquire the skills necessary to interact in appropriate ways. One such institution was the Zhongwenguan, a Confucian academy established by Emperor Taizang (627–50) in the Tang capital of Chang'an in order to educate students from China's neighboring states. Korean and Japanese monks studied at the academy, and although little information survives about specific aspects of the academy's curriculum or pedagogical methods, for example the language(s) of instruction, the fact remains that many foreign students received their education there. Jonathan Best suggests that the academy educated as many as 8000 students during its existence in the Tang Dynasty.[11]

Although Japan was never officially a tributary state of China, it was nevertheless clearly within the cultural orbit of China and was in close contact with the Chinese court during the Nara period (710–794) and the former part of the Heian Period (794–1185). Actually, the first official Japanese visit to China took place at the end of China's Sui Dynasty in the year 600. The Japanese court dispatched the mission in 600 to the Sui court, and this served to establish a tradition of court sanctioned visits that would continue for the next two centuries.[12] These

envoys to the Sui and Tang courts and to the courts of Paekche and Silla, served as the principal channel for study and trade in China and bolstered Japan's status as a civilized member of the East Asian community.[13] These official embassies to the Tang capital of Chang'an known in Japanese as *kentōshi,* allowed Japan to remain abreast of political developments and intellectual currents in China. The Japanese court eventually would dispatch a total of six such embassies to the Sui court and fifteen to the Tang Court, with the last, a huge mission including over six hundred men and various forms of tribute, coming in 801.[14] Emperor Kammu died in 806 and with his death ended the dependence on Tang dynasty cultural models.

Written classical Chinese served as the true language of exchange between the Japanese visitors and their Chinese hosts. Thus, the ability to read and write *kanbun* and the ability to write a passable Chinese poem, *kanshi,* were considered indispensable skills for the Heian courtier. The ability to read and write classical Chinese poetry required a certain mastery of Chinese prosody and of the conventions of Six Dynasties and Tang Dynasty poetry. Nevertheless, most of the *kanshi* written by Heian courtiers were public and formal and undistinguished.[15] The composition of poetry in Chinese remained, then, something of a parlor trick for Japanese aristocrats and its currency among Heian courtiers did not imply any real proficiency in the Chinese language, and presumably few in the Heian court could actually communicate in spoken Chinese.

There were notable exceptions to this fact, and there were among intellectuals of the Heian period some who possessed genuine proficiency in the Chinese language. Of these, the two best known are the monk Kūkai and the courtier Sugawara no Michizane. Kūkai, also known as Kōbō Daishi (774–835), is one of the truly remarkable figures in Japanese cultural history and holds a legendary status in Japan. Kūkai is counted among the *sanpitsu,* the three great calligraphers in Japanese history along with Tachibana no Hayanari and Emperor Saga. Kūkai is also credited with having developed the *kana* syllabaries which, along with the *kanji* (Chinese characters), comprise the modern Japanese writing system. The total veracity of Kūkai's achievements notwithstanding, his introduction of Shingon Buddhism to Japan and his overall influence on Buddhism in Japan are undeniable. Well documented also was Kūkai's ability in Chinese.

Kūkai and Saichō (767–822), who established the Tendai (Chinese, Tiantai) sect of Buddhism in Japan, participated in the mission from the Heian court to the Tang Court that lasted in total from 801 to 806. This final mission to the Tang court ultimately encountered some problems, as had earlier missions, due to Japan's refusal to adopt an attitude of subordination befitting tributary states.[16] The men who participated in this and other missions to the Tang court were chosen either on the basis of birth or significant scholarly achievement.[17] Kūkai, whose scholarship and spiritual aspirations were beyond reproach, was also a

valuable member of the mission due to his facility with written Chinese. Saichō, who was traveling to China in order to study in greater depth Tendai, brought along a disciple proficient in Chinese in order to facilitate communications with his hosts. However, there is no mention of Kūkai having such an intermediary, suggesting his ability to communicate sufficiently well in spoken Chinese.[18]

The importance of brushtalk in these intercultural exchanges, and Kūkai's ability to communicate skillfully via this medium, is suggested by a brief anecdote from the 801 mission to China. One of the ships containing nearly half of the emissaries was blown off course and ended up in the small southern port city of Fuzhou. The local officials, unaware of the arrival of the mission, and skeptical of its true objectives, were reluctant to allow the emissaries to continue en-route to Chang'an, until Kūkai composed an elegant appeal describing the goals of the mission in mellifluous Chinese prose, which convinced the authorities to allow the mission to continue on to its destination.[19]

Kūkai spent time in various places in China and studied for a year and one month in the capital of Chang'an. After leaving Chang'an, Kūkai traveled to Yuezhou before returning to Japan via the entry port of Dazaifu in October of 806. It is a testimony to his cultural importance in Japan and to the recognition of his stature as a cultural bridge between the two countries that even today there is a memorial to Kūkai in the city of Xi'an.[20]

An even more significant figure in terms of the discussion of brushtalk and the use of Chinese by Japanese intellectuals of the Heian period is Sugawara no Michizane (845–903). Michizane is often posited as an exemplar of true understanding of the Chinese literary tradition and one of the few eminent Japanese of any period to master the complexities of Chinese prosody. In fact, Michizane's grandfather, Kiyokimi, had been an eminent Sinologist in the Heian court prior to Michizane's time. Kiyokimi visited the Tang court as a member of the 801 mission along with Kūkai, and his use of the contemporary colloquial Chinese term *bufen,* in a surviving *kanbun* attributed to him, is often raised as proof of his facility with spoken Chinese.[21] Among teachers active during Michizane's day also, there is mention of a teacher by the name of Wang Tu, who was apparently an immigrant from China living among a community of Chinese near the capital of Heiankyō (present day Kyoto). He was apparently among those who taught Chinese at a local imperial institution, suggesting that Michizane had the opportunity to study spoken Chinese along with his exposure to the most recent developments in Chinese prosody.[22]

Michizane was recognized as a master of both *kanshi* and *kanbun* among Heian courtiers, but in fact all Heian courtiers were expected to have a certain level of conversance with the Chinese canon. Heian period courtiers were comfortable with the poetic forms of the Six Dynasty Period and were increasingly familiar and comfortable with the Tang dynasty poetic forms and conventions,

including the five and seven character *jueju* form which rose to prominence in the Tang Dynasty. Nevertheless, no poet of the age was as comfortable and adept at producing *kanshi* as Michizane. Even when convention did not demand the composition of Chinese poetry, Michizane often chose that mode of literary expression. For example, on a twelve-day journey to Japan's southern provinces undertaken in 898 Michizane produced *kanshi* while his companions composed poems in the representative Japanese *waka* form.[23]

The court recognized Michizane's genius for *kanbun* and *kanshi* and exploited his skills in those areas in cultural interactions with dignitaries from neighboring countries. For example, Michizane was among a group who welcomed a visiting delegation from the kingdom of Parhae who visited in 883. Parhae flourished northeast of the Tang border and was comprised of leaders who had fled from Koguryo in 696.[24] The welcoming of the visitors from Parhae began with an exchange of Chinese poems between Michizane and the other Japanese hosts and the dignitaries from Parhae. Only when Chinese poetry had been exchanged could formal negotiations begin.[25] Depending on the availability of interpreters, it can easily be imagined that both parties might be compelled to depend on the writing brush as the sole means of conducting negotiations.

One of the great tragedies of cultural exchange between Japan and China is the fact that Sugawara no Michizane, Sinophile and cultural bridge between Japan and China, never had the opportunity to visit the country the culture of which he so exquisitely interpreted to his generation. Michizane had been appointed chief ambassador for a large-scale mission that was to take place in 894. However, the instability in China due to the An Lushan Rebellion led Michizane to suggest that the mission be cancelled, and that aborted mission turned out to be the last chance for Michizane to visit China. The infamous exile which marked his final years spelled not only the end of Michizane's influence at court, it also effectively led to the abandonment of such official Japanese court missions to China and a virtual break of official contact between China and Japan that would last for nearly five centuries.[26]

Thereafter, interaction between Japan and China became sporadic and did not adhere necessarily to the formal trappings of cultural exchange that had developed during the Tang Dynasty. The Ashikaga shogunate sent representatives to the Ming Court in the fourteenth century, and the abiding interest in *kanshi* can be seen in the phenomenon of Five Mountain *(gozan)* Chinese language poetry that flourished among Zen Buddhist monks in Japan during the Medieval period.

Certainly, even with the cession of formal relations between Japan and China, Japanese writers and scholars remained keenly interested in cultural developments on the continent as can be witnessed, for example, in the influence of the Neo-Confucian thought of Wang Yangming on Tokugawa thought.[27] The trappings

of traditional cultural interactions and the central importance attached to the writing brush remained as well. During the Tokugawa period (1603–1868) when the shogunate officials received visiting envoys from the Yi (Choson) Court in Korea, they were received in the traditional manner and Chinese poetry was exchanged. Such practices at a time when Japan effectively had cut itself off from the rest of the world, including the Chinese court, suggests the persistence of classical Chinese and of brushtalk as the ultimate medium and mediator of cultural exchange in East Asia.[28]

During the same period that modern Japanese writers were journeying to China and writing about their experiences there with increasing frequency, *kangakusha* or "scholars of Chinese learning," particularly in the realms of history and culture, were also venturing to China and producing accounts of their visits. These visits by *kangakusha* and the body of writing that resulted from their visits provides an intriguing corollary to the parallel body of writing by members of the *bundan* (literary community).[29]

The visits of *kangakusha* to China actually preceded those of Japanese writers and can be traced to the visit of the Senzaimaru mission in 1862. Such *kangakusha* as Takasugi Shinsaku (1839–1867) and Hibino Teruhiro (1838–1912) were included in the mission by the shogunate because of their broad knowledge of traditional Chinese culture and history and because of their facility in communicating with the Chinese they encountered via the brush in the form of *hitsudan*. Their role in the mission and their subsequent responses to the realities of the China they encountered in Shanghai often differed in radical fashion from those of the merchants and government officials who accompanied them on the journey.[30]

Although the Senzaimaru mission included *kangakusha,* who produced accounts of their visit upon their return to Japan, the real genre of *kangakusha* accounts of visits to China developed in the decades that followed in the works of several of the most renowned *kangakusha* of the Meiji period. Visits by Takezoe Shin'ichirō (1842–1917) in 1876, Oka Senjin (1832–1913) in 1884 and Naitō Konan (1866–1934) in 1899 provided Japanese readers with nuanced and informed perspectives on contemporary China in the context of a thoroughgoing knowledge of traditional Chinese culture and society.

Some of these accounts, such as Oka Senjin's *Kankō Kiyū* (Trip Report, 1884) expressed despair at the contrast between the robust splendor of traditional China and the squalor he encountered during his visit to China. Other accounts, however, offer a contrasting viewpoint. In Naitō Konan's *Enzan sosui* (Mountains of North China and the Rivers of South China) Naitō wrote openly about the problems gripping contemporary China, but never despaired of China's ability to return to its former position of glory.[31]

One of the most fascinating and weighty pieces of writing produced by *kangakusha* in the wake of an extended stay in China was written by Uno Tetsuto (1875–1974) in 1907 entitled *Shina bunmei ki* (A Record of Civilization in China). The work describes Uno's eighteen months of study in Beijing in 1906–07. An intriguing and comprehensive description of China which extends to nearly four hundred pages, *Shina bunmei ki* recounts in painstaking detail the various phenomena that Uno observed including people, places, festivals and sites of cultural interest. One important quality of the work, which it held in common with other accounts of China by *kangakusha,* was Uno's dogged attempts to consciously root out those elements of tradition that still existed in some fashion.[32] The most symbolically important manifestation was Uno's visit to Mount Tai. Mount Tai, China's most sacred mountain, was the destination of a pilgrimage by Confucius, 2500 years earlier, and by following in the footsteps of the master, Uno had "returned, figuratively, to the fount of civilization itself."[33]

Kangakusha continued to visit China in the first half of the twentieth century, and their accounts provide a corollary to the body of writing by Japanese writers. In some ways, the two bodies of writing validate and challenge one another in such themes as the attempt to use traditional culture as a touchstone for contemporary China. For *kangakusha,* the brush and brushtalk provided the immediate means of exchange and cross cultural and literary exchange with the host. Unlike many of the Japanese writers treated in this text, the *kangakusha* possessed a facility with classical Chinese unrivaled in Japan. These scholars thus felt no great need to go beyond brushtalk; brushtalk remained an apposite and effective means of communication with Chinese hosts.

Bridge Building: Factors Contributing to the Ease of Interaction between Chinese and Japanese Writers in the Interwar Period

A variety of factors contributed to the ease with which Japanese and Chinese writers were able to meet and interact in the interwar period. Among the most significant issues that contributed to effective interaction between the two literary communities was the opportunity for a number of bright, promising young Chinese students to study abroad in Japan. This happily coincided with increased opportunities for Japanese writers to visit China, and many important Japanese writers of the period did, in fact, avail themselves of this opportunity. Moreover, for a variety of reasons, some of which will be touched upon here, Chinese writers were interested in Japanese intellectual and cultural currents and were even more interested in keeping abreast of Western intellectual trends and reading Western literary works in Japanese translations. As a consequence of this, maintaining the Japanese language proficiency achieved while studying in Japan was of critical importance to many Chinese writers.

The phenomenon of Chinese students returning from years of study in Japan to embark on careers as writers is part of the larger phenomenon of Chinese studying abroad in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Of the significant writers of the May Fourth period, it has been suggested that nearly half of them had some overseas study experience either before they started their careers as writers, or soon after they had begun writing.[34] Although the majority went to study when they were between the ages of twenty and thirty, presumably already having committed themselves to their craft, nearly a quarter of May Fourth writers who studied abroad went when they were under the age of twenty.[35] Significantly, many of the latter cohort went to Japan, and among them are some of the most influential literary and intellectual figures of that generation including, Lu Xun (1881–1936), Tian Han (1898–1979) and Guo Moruo (1892–1978).

In fact, of the Chinese who studied abroad in the period under discussion, the overwhelming majority did so in Japan. Of the writers of the May Fourth Era, 66 studied in Japan as opposed to 32 in France, 30 in the United States and only 19 in England.[36] Of course the reasons why the decision was made to study in a certain country, often by the provincial government officials who sponsored the student, were complex. The decision to study in Japan was primarily an economic one, bolstered by cultural and linguistic affinities, which were presumed to facilitate the process of acculturation on the part of the students.

For the few fortunate enough to be chosen to participate in study abroad, there were innumerable benefits, including direct contact with artists and intellectuals in the host country, which influenced their individual decisions to write. These encounters in turn parlayed into the development and organization of China's new literature. The benefit of living abroad for these young writers included a direct engagement with foreign literature and literary theory, an openness to new ideas and influences, a willingness to question and criticize authority, and a worldliness and sophistication borne of the experience of negotiating in a foreign society and culture.[37]

Nevertheless, there were certain aspects of the experience abroad for those who studied in Japan that were unique to Japan and which are germane to this study. While in Japan, the students' encounter with contemporary Japanese literature affected their conceptualization of literary organizations in terms of the structure of both specific literary coteries and also of the social status and obligations of writers as a class. Moreover, because of their proximity to Japan, many students were able to later revisit Japan in order to keep abreast of recent literary and intellectual developments. It is, however, in terms of language that the experience in Japan most profoundly influenced those who returned to China and became writers. The Japanese language primarily influenced Chinese literary style as May Fourth writers sought to create a new vernacular literary language.[38] The ability to speak and read Japanese also proved to be of paramount importance

to these young writers. Not only did it allow them to pursue studies in Japan and to read contemporary Japanese literature, it also gave them access to the substantial and increasing body of Western literature in Japanese translation which in turn profoundly affected the speed with which Chinese writers were able to hasten the development of China's own modern literature.[39]

Given the number of May Fourth era writers who had lived and studied in Japan in the late Meiji and Taishō periods it is not surprising that the Japanese writers who they openly admired and whose works they sought to translate should correspond to those who enjoyed a strong reputation in Japan. However, it is a source of some interest that some of the most acclaimed writers in Japan, including naturalist writers such as Tayama Katai (1872–1930) and Shimazaki Tōson (1872–1943) did not receive critical attention in China commensurate to their status in Japan while a less celebrated writer such as Mushanokoji Saneatsu, should have been so highly regarded.

It was Zhou Zuoren and Lu Xun in their translations from contemporary Japanese literature and their critical essays from the teens and early twenties who helped establish tastes in Japanese literature among May Fourth readers. In fact, it was Zhou Zuoren's speech delivered at Beijing University in 1918, "Japanese Literary Developments in the Past Thirty Years" (Riben jin sanshinian xiaoshuo zhi fada), published as an essay in *New Youth* (Xin qingnian) in the following year, that provided the initial introduction to literary currents in contemporary Japan and established a hierarchy of Japanese writers. In this essay and in the essays and translations produced by the Zhou brothers through the early twenties, the Japanese writers who emerge as the most influential figures, including some of those treated in this study, are Natsume Sōseki, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke and Kikuchi Kan from the Shinshichō (New Currents of Thought) School, and Mushanokōji Saneatsu and Arishima Takeo from the White Birch School. Since Mushanokōji, Arishima and Tanizaki are all treated in this study, I will restrict my remarks to the reception of other Japanese writers in the May Fourth literary milieu.

The individualism and humanism of Natsume Sōseki (1867–1916) resonated with May Fourth readers in much the same way as they did with Japanese readers. The influence of Sōseki in the May Fourth literary world came largely filtered through the essays of Zhou Zuoren. The influence of the humanism of Sōseki is particularly apparent in Zhou's humanist manifesto, "Ren de wenxue" (Humane Literature), in which Zhou advocates a realistic literary approach that delineates human experience from an individual's perspective.[40]

Like his brother, Lu Xun too was initially drawn to Sōseki's thought, but, as Zhou Zuoren asserts, "The True Story of Ah Q" and other works of fiction by Lu Xun also clearly reflect the style of Sōseki. Lu Xun appears to have been most attracted to Sōseki's essays and *shōhin,* and he translated several of these pieces

for the Japanese literature volume in the *Shijie wenxue daxi* (Compendium of World Literature) in 1922 including "Yume jūya" (Ten Nights of Dreams) and "Kureegu sensei" (Craig sensei).[41] Both of these pieces are characterized by Sōseki's unmistakable and engaging narrative voice which, despite other difference between the two writers, is a quality that he clearly shares with Lu Xun.[42] Lu Xun's admiration for Sōseki helped to establish in China the same aura of high regard for Sōseki in which the writer was held in Japan.

In a similar way, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke garnered critical and popular attention in May Fourth China comparable to that which he received in Japan. Lu Xun translated Akutagawa's story "Hana" (The Nose) in *Chenbao fukan* (The Morning News Supplement) between May 11 and June 14, 1921. In the appendix that accompanied his translation Lu Xun stated that what appealed to him about this and other stories by Akutagawa was his artful recasting in contemporary terms of historical material in which a thoroughly modern, realistic style brought the historical moment to life.[43]

Starting with "The Nose," Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren translated several stories by Akutagawa in the twenties. Due to their endorsement of Akutagawa and the sensation caused by his suicide, Akutagawa enjoyed an exalted status among Chinese readers in the interwar period.[44] Moreover, to a greater degree than other Japanese writers from the prewar era, Akutagawa's appeal continued in China long after the war, and he appeared as the subject of a number of critical essays in the 1980s and 1990s.

While his appeal was ultimately not as enduring as Akutagawa's, during the interwar period fellow Shinshichō writer Kikuchi Kan (1888–1948) also enjoyed a strong reputation among May Fourth readers. While in Japan, prior to the formation of the Creation Society, Yu Dafu read and admired Kikuchi Kan and apparently intended to produce a literary magazine modeled on *Shinshichō* (New Currents), the literary organ of the coterie group of the same name.[45] Interestingly, Yu Dafu and the other Creationists, who read Japanese literary magazines as students in Japan, had developed their own tastes in contemporary Japanese literature independent of the influence of Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren prior to their return to China in 1921 and 1922.[46] As he had with Akutagawa, Lu Xun translated two of Kikuchi Kan's stories in the early twenties: "Miura Uemon no saigo" (The End of Miura Uemon) and "Adauchi kinshirei" (A Proscription on Revenge). Lu Xun stated that what he admired about Kikuchi Kan was that he was less consciously aesthetic than Akutagawa and that Kikuchi possessed a genius for portraying the complexities of the human condition.[47] Kikuchi's reputation in China was further enhanced by the introduction to his plays by Tian Han and Ouyang Yuqian and other young Chinese dramatists who were drawn to the social realism of Kikuchi's plays.

Ironically, Japanese linguistic ability ultimately offered a further benefit for these writers. The high level of Japanese linguistic proficiency that these writers were able to attain while students in Japan allowed them to go beyond the traditional brushtalk to communicate directly with Japanese writers who flocked to China in increasing numbers in the Taishō and early Shōwa periods. Accounts by Japanese writers as diverse as Tanizaki Jun'ichirō (1886–1965) and Ibuse Masuji (1898–1993) comment on the remarkably high levels of Japanese linguistic ability of these Chinese writers, even years after their return to China.

The phenomenon of Chinese writers of the May Fourth period who had studied in Japan and possessed not only a familiarity with Japanese literature and intellectual currents, but also strong Japanese proficiency was accompanied by increased opportunities for Japanese writers to visit China. Travel to China on the part of the Japanese had actually recommenced in 1862, five years before the fall of the Tokugawa shogunate. Following the Senzaimaru mission to China which, in the manner of the traditional *kentōshi,* included Japanese officials and eminent Sinologists, an increasing number of Japanese writers and thinkers traveled to China in the late Meiji period.[48] The number of Japanese writers who visited China increased even more dramatically in the Taishō period (1912–1926) and through 1936, the first decade of the Shōwa period (1926–1989).

Japanese writers who traveled to China in this period visited for a variety of reasons. Japan's influence in China had widened, and Japanese had easy entry into such ports as Shanghai and Ningbo. Shanghai in the first half of the twentieth century was one of the world's truly cosmopolitan cities, the fifth largest city in the world and a metropolis "shrouded in glamour and mystery."[49] Part of the attraction of Shanghai was its diversity, and it attracted ambitious, adventurous people from around the world. The International Settlement, which was home to large foreign populations, represented for visiting Japanese the illusion of visiting the West.

However, Japanese were also anxious to visit the China of tradition, which they envisioned as a place with which they had strong cultural affinities. Japanese writers, in their description of various sites they visited during this era were likely to speak of it in terms of a common cultural homeland, and the places they were naturally drawn to were places with which they were already familiar through their conversance with traditional Chinese culture and literature. Japanese writers spoke of *kanji bunka,* the culture of Chinese characters, which ostensibly linked all men of letters in East Asia. Japanese writers professed to possess an intuitive knowledge of China which came via the written Chinese characters themselves and which emboldened them to adopt the role of apologists for China to their readers back in Japan.[50]

There were other, internal factors that made travel to China possible and desirable for Japanese writers. These writers were sometimes dispatched to China

and had their passage paid by organizations and institutions that wished to enlist the aid of well-known writers to develop some image of China. For instance, newspapers would sometimes send writers to China as special literary correspondents. One celebrated example of this was Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, who visited China from late March to early July of 1921. He was sent by the *Osaka Mainichi Shinbun* in order to visit famous sites in China and to write a series of articles on the cultural life of contemporary China.[51]

The South Manchurian Railway (SMR) Company was another organization which made it possible for writers to visit China from the late Meiji period into the Shōwa period, as something of a public relations strategy. The most celebrated of these literary visitors who came via the offices of SMR was Natsume Sōseki (1867–1916). Sōseki visited China in 1909 at the invitation of Nakamura Zeko (1867–1927), the president of SMR.[52] Although the company paid for Sōseki's visit and presumably hoped that he would say flattering things about their efforts in China, they had no control over what he actually wrote.[53] In fact, one of the striking features of the body of writing by Japanese writers who visited China in the early twentieth century was the startling range of responses that the experience of travel in China elicited among them, which ran the gamut from unbridled adulation to outright disgust, and often featured a little of the two.

One final impetus for travel to China on the part of Japanese writers in the first half of the twentieth century was the increasing vigilance of authorities and the skewed reportage of China in the media. Writers traveled abroad in order to see the realities of contemporary China with their own eyes and to offer their readers an alternative perspective, one that differed from that provided by official channels, one that often consciously hearkened back to the traditional relationship between the two countries and was designed to elicit a sympathy for China sadly lacking in that militarist era. Intellectuals in the Taishō period perceived themselves as leaders in the "rising trend of individual consciousness and spoke increasingly of the social function of *zaya gakuha,* independent artists and intellectuals."[54] The Taishō Democracy movement, in fact, urged universal suffrage, and the end of censorship and social equality for all.[55] The phenomenon of Japanese writers visiting China is profitably seen, in one sense, as an attempt to foster greater autonomy on the part of the writers from authority.

Furthermore, the phenomenon of Japanese writers visiting China was accompanied by several academic efforts to learn more about contemporary China and to go, by means of Chinese language education, beyond the limitations and stiff formality of traditional brush talk encounters in order to engage contemporary China. One such example of this was the Tōa Dōbun Shoin (East Asian Common Culture Academy) in Shanghai which educated Japanese youth in Chinese language, including the spoken Chinese, and culture.[56] The purpose of the academy, established by the parent institution Tōa Dōbunkai in Tokyo (1898–

1945), was to train young Japanese for business and government service. More than five thousand students received training at the institute between 1900 and 1945.[57] Some of the graduates of Tōa Dōbun Shoin became academics, others went into business and banking. Moreover, the school maintained a strong connection with the military, and many graduates ended up serving in Manchuria.[58] What is critical to this study is that at the time when the study of vernacular Chinese was seen as "crazy" and Chinese language education in Japan still emphasized written classical Chinese, there were isolated academic attempts in Japan also to go beyond the limitations of brushtalk.[59]

The various factors described in this section converged in the interwar period (1919–1937) to create an environment of relations between China and Japan in which writers were able to meet and to exchange ideas directly, sometimes employing the time-tested practices associated with the tradition of brushtalk interaction, but often eschewing them in order to develop a new, modern idiom of cultural exchange and to create a climate in which writers from both Japan and China could interact above of the political imbroglio in the development of their respective vernacular literatures.

In the Name of Progress: The Sordid Realities of Sino-Japanese Political Relations in the Interwar Period

The attempts at cultural bridging by Japanese and Chinese writers described in this study were enacted against a backdrop of increasing tension and impending conflict between the two countries. These efforts at direct communication between writers from the two literary communities can only be interpreted as vain and ultimately futile attempts to avoid and transcend the various obstacles that lay between writers from the two countries. For a short period, corresponding to the first half of the period covered in this study, roughly from 1919 to 1929, writers were able to sidestep these larger issues in their dealings with one another, clinging to the safe haven of a shared aesthetic vision, whether an art-for-art's sake aesthetic or a socialist realism based on European models. Ultimately, however, this flouting of political realities became less and less tenable with the increasing tensions of the 1930s.

Sino-Japanese relations during the interwar period have been characterized as a "many layered cake, impossible to eat all at once."[60] To be certain, relations between the two countries during this period were enormously complex, with the cultural relations described in this study representing but one facet of a network of interrelations that also included political and diplomatic relations, economic and social relations, most of which were marred by increasingly severe pressures that were constantly threatening the fragile balance that allowed for

dialogue between members of the two literary communities. Writers in both communities attempted to justify their efforts by resorting to a time-honored argument, appealing to affinities between the two countries. Likewise, propagandists in Japan sought to legitimize their imperialist activities in East Asia by drawing upon cultural affinities, racial similarities and geographical proximity to underscore an assumed sense of closeness. Both literati and propagandists couched these appeals by resorting finally to written characters as the source of closeness as manifested in the term *dōbun dōshu* (common script, common race).[61]

The history of political and diplomatic relations between the two countries in the interwar period is a litany of missteps, betrayals and diplomatic failures as the two countries moved inexorably toward open conflict. One commentator describes the "psychological warfare" waged by both Japan and China between 1905 and 1945 in regard to relations with the other in order to sway opinion both at home and in the other nation.[62] This propaganda often took the form of an appeal to pan-Asian doctrine. That writers too should have appropriated this rhetoric, which had a certain appeal as an antidote to the hegemony of Western values, should not be surprising.

Sino-Japanese relations in the interwar period have their roots in the late nineteenth century in the aftermath of China's humiliating defeat at the hands of the Japanese in the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95). This defeat, in conjunction with unflattering reports about China sent back by an increasing number of Japanese visitors to China resulted in a dramatic change in the Japanese conceptualization of China. Whereas China had traditionally been held in awe by the Japanese, who referred to their giant neighbor as a "sleeping lion," in the modern period "Shina," itself a culturally weighted designation, was portrayed as the home to a backward race of people unable to modernize whom the Japanese came to refer to derisively as *chankoro* (pig-tailed fellows).[63]

In August of 1914 Japan launched an invasion force against the German forces in China and captured Qingdao on November 7 of the same year. The infamous "Twenty-one Demands" presented to Yuan Shikai on January 18, 1915 brought Sino-Japanese relations to a new low.[64] Among Japan's demands of China were unprecedented privileges in Manchuria and the transfer of control of the resource-rich and culturally important Shandong Peninsula.[65] When Yuan Shikai (1859–1916) caved in to the Japanese demands, the response among the Chinese populace was both immediate and widespread. A great number of Chinese students returned from studies in Japan and become involved in anti-Japanese activities, which included a boycott of Japanese goods and nationwide demonstrations.[66]

When the Terauchi Masatake (1852–1919) cabinet came to power in Japan in 1916 there was an attempt to improve relations with China and to alleviate

some of the tensions caused by the Twenty-one Demands. Toward that end, Prime Minister Terauchi provided political loans to the Chinese government.[67] However, the loans themselves were resented in certain quarters in China, and with the appointment of the more conservative and less accommodating Hara Kei (1856–1921) cabinet in 1918 the loans were eventually discontinued.

Tensions again rose to the boiling point in the wake of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 when at the plenum the lease of Germany in the Shandong Peninsula was awarded to Japan rather than being returned to China despite the urging of the Chinese delegates in attendence.[68] This action again resulted in Chinese boycotts of Japanese goods and massive demonstrations in China's major cities and also served as the catalyst for the New Culture Movement, which in turn led to the rise of the May Fourth Movement which produced the writers who are the focus of this study. It was not until the Shandong Treaty of February 4, 1922 that the former German leased territory, which included the Jinan-Qingdao Railway and other assets were formally restored to China.[69] While this action served to temporarily relax tensions between China and Japan, the mistrust of Japan by the Chinese and the schism that had emerged between the two countries remained unchanged.

The cabinet of Shidehara Kijūrō (1872–1951) from 1924–1927 saw genuine attempts to cultivate more benign policies toward China and to relax some of the seething tensions between the two countries. There were several endeavors during Shidehara's administration to create a policy of "Friendship and Co-operation" with the various warlord cliques in an increasingly unstable China.[70] Although it can be argued that in fact economic considerations drove Japan's more beneficent policies in China, there is no doubt that Shidehara's diplomatic principles of co-existence and co-prosperity (kyōson kyōei-shugi) created some small measure of goodwill between the two countries. It is not surprising then that this four-year period corresponds to the high point of relations between the two literary communities. It was during these years that most of the writers addressed in this study became acquainted, and several of the Japanese writers considered in this study visited China.

The relative euphoria of the period, however, was short-lived. With the coming to power of General Tanaka Giichi (1866–1949), head of the Seiyūkai opposition party, in 1927 relations once again began to sour. Anti-Japanese demonstrations occurred once again, and when Prime Minister Tanaka sent 2000 Japanese troops in to quell the unrest in Shandong in May of 1927, tensions were further exacerbated. The Eastern Conference (Tōhō kaigi) convened by Tanaka between June and July of 1927 failed to bridge the gap between Chinese nationalist aspirations and Japanese continental expansionism.[71] Under these circumstances it was difficult for writers to meet and avoid the realities of tensions between the two countries.

Further deterioration of relations between the two countries can be inferred from the increasing frequency of "events" and "incidents" which were indications of Japan's return to wholesale intervention on the continent. These include, for instance, the Mukden Incident of September 18, 1931 in which a train traveling from Beijing to Mukden was attacked by the Japanese Guandong Army.[72] The Manchurian Crisis, which this incident precipitated, marked an important turning point in Sino-Japanese relations. The Guandong Army secured the main arteries in central and southern Manchuria, effectively taking control of all of Manchuria. Zhang Xueliang (1901–2001), the Chinese military leader in Manchuria, withdrew from Manchuria and appealed to the League of Nations. The league was unable to resolve the crisis, and Japan, emboldened by the apparent acquiescence of the international community, recognized the puppet state of Manchuguo (Japanese, Manshūkoku), effectively rendering constructive relations between the two nations impossible.[73]

Japanese intervention in the greater Shanghai area in 1932, which resulted in the lopsided Sino-Japanese Treaty of May 1932 and Japan's decision to withdraw from the League of Nations in 1933, effectively meant that international mediation in Sino-Japanese affairs was no longer possible.[74] These direct military actions and diplomatic maneuverings were accompanied by rhetoric on the Japanese side designed to consolidate Japanese legitimacy on the continent. Prime Minister Konoe Fumimaro's (1891–1945) designation of a New Order in East Asia and the concept of Japan's leadership in the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere (Daitōa kyōeiken) were intended to be seen as the justification for Japanese military maneuverings in China.[75] By the time war was officially declared in 1937, all relations between the two countries, including the personal relations between the writers described in this study, effectively had come to an end.

Writers in both China and Japan in the 1930s were faced with a staggering array of impediments to continued interactions with their colleagues in the other literary community. In Japan, increasingly vigilant censorship and pressure from the authorities made intercourse with Chinese writers virtually impossible. Although travel to China continued, it was more and more difficult for Japanese writers to have unmediated contact with their Chinese colleagues.

Ultimately, Japanese writers were faced with several choices, all unsavory. They could oppose the government's militaristic stance and rightist agenda and use their writing as a tool for political criticism. Few writers chose the path of conscience, and those who did were faced with harassment by the police, imprisonment, or even death, as in the well-known case of the proletarian writer Kobayashi Takiji (1903–1933), murdered while under incarceration. Among the other options available to Japanese writers during the 1930s were collaboration with the authorities, or silence. Writers who were associated either with "pure literature" or with the proletarian movement and had been critical of the militarist

government were forced to recant and perform *tenkō,* a "conversion" from their apolitical or socialist stance to one of service to the imperialist goals of the state. A number of writers reluctantly trod that path. Other writers, including some contained in this study, who had been apolitical and had clung to an art-for-art's-sake position prior to the 1930s, did an about-face and became, in some cases, enthusiastically supportive of state policy and actively contributed to the dissemination of imperialist propaganda. Still other writers chose to withdraw and remain silent in the face of the atrocities that Japan was committing abroad. Even this seemingly passive option was a difficult one fraught with peril in the face of mounting pressure from the authorities upon artists to support their efforts and to contribute to the propaganda machine. The Japanese writers included in this study reflect the full range of choices.

In China the range of options was much more limited. A few writers aligned themselves with the Guomindang, though the majority aligned themselves with the Chinese Communist Party. Moreover, the majority of Chinese writers included in this study were associated with the League of Leftist Writers, which was formed in 1930. The mission of the league was to support the goals of the Chinese Communist Party through cultural activities and via the literary works themselves. The result was the pursuit of a variety of literature, which would reflect the goals of the party. Many of the members of both the Creation Society and Sun Society were party members, and the movement was well-organized and disciplined, with many of the members of the league active in the Cultural Party Branch in Shanghai.[76] In the late twenties and early thirties literature was seen by the Chinese Communist Party as one of the few areas where the party could assert influence, and writers were charged with the duty of fashioning literary works that reflected the principles of Western realism.[77] The term *shehuizhuyi xianshizhuyi* (Socialist Realism) was adopted from the Soviet Union in 1932 to describe the aspirations of writers to create a proletarian literature which would reflect the unpleasant realities of contemporary Chinese society. Though, as one commentator suggests, "As heirs of the May Fourth literary revolution all left-wing writers claimed to be realists, but they could not agree as to what realism meant."[78] In fact, in actual practice, the Proletarian Movement in Chinese literature was more rhetorical than real. When one looks at the most important Chinese literary works of the 1930s such as Mao Dun's *Ziye* (Midnight, 1933), Ba Jin's *Jia* (Home, 1933), and Ye Shengtao's *Ni Huangzhi* (1929), they all are about the bourgeoisie and cannot properly be called proletarian literature.[79]

Many of the figures included in this study made substantial efforts to avoid and overcome the manifold obstacles that hampered positive interaction between the two literary communities in the 1930s, but ultimately all were forced to submit. Increasingly, during the interwar period in both China and Japan, any interactions with writers in the other literary community were seen as

collaboration with the enemy, and writers were forced to abandon their hopes for positive communications with their counterparts in the other literary community and either turn to the task of supporting their state or turn inward away from the horrors that threatened their very existence.

Ian Nish, in writing about relations between China and Japan during this period, adroitly assesses the realities that lay beneath the ideological posturing:

> Few, if any, periods of sustained friendship can be detected. … However much Japanese thought — and spoke — in terms of co-existence and co-prosperity, it is not evident that China thought in similar terms or reciprocated. There was always some degree of illusion or self-deception in the more benign policies which some Japanese tried to apply to China.[80]

The relations between Chinese and Japanese writers described in this book represent the exception in terms of Sino-Japanese relations during the interwar period. The writers under discussion earnestly sought, at least initially, to put aside ideological differences and endeavored to rise above the fray of political posturing in order to communicate directly and to cooperate in the creation of a common modern East Asian aesthetic vocabulary. Although all writers were forced to abandon this undertaking, many did so only reluctantly, when it became clear that to cling to hopes of the resumption of positive cultural relations was an endeavor fraught with danger. Yu Dafu's death at the hands of Japanese authorities in 1945 was the result in part of his facility with the Japanese language and the close ties he retained with influential Japanese despite his abhorrence of Japanese policies. Yu Dafu was the ultimate victim of this period of failed relations although, as I hope to demonstrate, writers in both communities suffered while trying to sustain relations with colleagues across the political divide.

Beyond Brushtalk: Writer to Writer in the Interwar Period

This work examines Chinese and Japanese literary relations during the interwar period from a variety of perspectives. Among those are direct encounters between writers from the two communities, including relations cultivated during those turbulent years. Also included are considerations of intriguing parallels between writers from the two literary worlds and analyses of important dimensions of writers' oeuvre informed by their experience with the other literary community. Nevertheless, neither is this an exhaustive study of the complex web of cultural relations between the two countries nor will it suggest that the ties between the two literary worlds were organized or officially sanctioned by either country. Finally, it must be admitted that these informal relations between two small cohorts of writers had no effect on slowing the juggernaut of Japanese imperialism

in China. Nevertheless, the relationships themselves were sincere and affected the lives and works of all of the writers involved.

Chapter 1 introduces the key figure in literary exchange during the interwar period, Uchiyama Kanzō (1885–1959), and describes how his bookstore served as the unofficial hub for interactions between Chinese and Japanese writers. Moreover, it describes Uchiyama's relationship with Lu Xun, China's most important modern writer and a writer much admired by contemporaries in Japan. The chapter further describes how the relationship between these two men, which hearkened back to the tradition of literati friendships in pre-modern East Asia was tested in the fires of political intrigue and scrutiny by the authorities and was strengthened in the process. Without exception, every writer treated in this study was in some way indebted to the efforts of Uchiyama Kanzō at cultural bridging.

Unlike Chapter 1, which focuses on a specific literary relationship involving two writers, Chapter 2 examines the impact of travel to China on one Japanese writer. Tanizaki Jun'ichirō traveled to China on several occasions, and his interactions with Chinese writers and his encounters with specific places of cultural import informed his literary output at a time that he was gradually turning from the fascination with the West that informed his early works to a return to Eastern aesthetics. The pieces resulting from the first visit fall neatly into the *kikōbun* (travel diary) and *nikki* (literary diary) varieties and are representative examples of a body of such work penned by Japanese writers in the modern period based on their travels, both domestic and overseas. On the other hand, the most significant work produced following Tanizaki's second visit, in its frank description of the Chinese literary community and of specific Chinese writers with whom Tanizaki became acquainted, constitutes a valuable record of cultural exchange between the Chinese and Japanese literary communities during the twenties. The final section of this chapter examines Tanizaki's perspective on the significance of his encounters with those Chinese writers from the vantage point of the War period.

Chapter 3 describes the impact of Japan's White Birch School (Shirakabaha) on the contemporary Chinese literary world. The White Birch School was one of the best organized and ideologically focused of the Taishō period coteries. The idealism and humanism they espoused had an immediate impact on Chinese writers. The brothers, Zhou Zuoren (1885–1967) and Lu Xun, translated and championed the works of various of the School's members, although the writers to whom each of the brothers was attracted too reflect some fundamental aesthetic and ideological differences between the two men.

These differences are even more apparent when contrasting each brother's reaction to Mushanokōji Saneatsu's (1885–1976) New Village movement in aesthetic communal living, a movement derided by Lu Xun, but championed by

Zhou Zuoren, which had an impact on Chinese intellectuals as diverse as Zhou Zuoren, Chen Duxiu (1879–1942) and Mao Zedong (1893–1976). Chapter 4 examines the impact of the New Village experiment on May Fourth intellectuals and gauges the level of interest in the Village among writers and revolutionaries and conjectures on the reasons that enthusiasm for the possibilities of such an experiment quickly cooled in May Fourth China.

Chapter 5 considers the impact of travel experiences in China on the writer, Hayashi Fumiko (1903–1951). Moreover, the chapter considers the reception of Hayashi's work by members of the League of Leftist writers, who were in the early thirties searching for literary representations of the new emancipated women. Parallels between Hayashi's most important early work *Diary of a Vagabond* and Ding Ling's classic early work, *Miss Sophie's Diary* also offer an interesting dimension for discussion of literary relations. Both works, which represent the "new woman" struggling for recognition in a society clinging to traditional values, were welcomed by leftist writers in China. The dramatic turns in the careers of both writers in the 1930s demonstrates the rift that had emerged between the two literary communities and serves as a fitting metaphor for the collapse of relations between Chinese and Japanese writers.

Chapter 6 examines the complex relationship of the Chinese writer Yu Dafu (1896–1945) and the Japanese writer Satō Haruo (1892–1964). The relationship between these two writers, which was initially one of mutual respect and admiration before deteriorating into betrayal and animosity, seems to most fully manifest the unfulfilled hopes of this period. The two writers were familiar with one another's works even before they met, and Yu's story "Sinking" exhibits a debt to Satō's signature work *Rural Melancholy.* The relationship between these two texts, which will also be addressed in this chapter, demonstrates the closeness of aesthetic goals of the two literary communities during the interwar period.

Finally, Chapter 7 will catalogue the choices that each of the writers made in the face of the tensions in the late thirties that led to outright war. The paths that writers trod in the late 1930s, ranging from political activism and collaboration to silence and withdrawal into the relative safety of aesthetics and political disengagement, correspond to the exigencies of that turbulent age. Writers, who had initiated in the 1920s a period of intercommunity dialogue in which they were able to transcend the stiff propriety and cultural orthodoxy of the writing brush in order to communicate directly as artists with similar aesthetic goals, were forced to abandon their efforts. The dream had failed. Nevertheless, for a brief space of time, during a terrible period of enmity between the two nations, Chinese and Japanese writers succeeded in carving out a charmed space in which they could negotiate questions of modernity, the creation of a new literature, and the role of the writer in the new society.

Notes

Introduction

1. Joshua Fogel, "Japanese Literary Travelers in Prewar China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 49: 2 (1989), 578.
2. It must be admitted that increasingly in East Asia, as elsewhere, spoken English is serving the intercessory function formerly served by written classical Chinese. Nevertheless, I witnessed my wife, who is Japanese and cannot speak Chinese, communicate via written characters at the market and elsewhere when we were living in Wenzhou, China.
3. Robert Borgen, "The Japanese Mission to China, 801–806," *Monumenta Nipponica* 37: 1 (Spring 1982), 1.
4. This type of communication within China was widespread until the advent of compulsory education made standard Chinese, *putonghua,* nearly universal.
5. Jonathan W. Best, "Diplomatic and Cultural Contacts between Paekche and China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42: 2 (December 1982), 444.
6. Ibid., 449.
7. In the Six Dynasties period, this granting of titles was essentially a symbolic act, and there were ultimately few responsibilities incumbent upon either side. Ibid., 449.
8. Ibid., 448.
9. Ibid., 451.
10. Ibid., 451.
11. Ibid., 468.
12. Robert Borgen, *Sugawara no Michizane and the Early Heian Court* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994), 6.
13. Ibid., 6.
14. Ibid., 227.
15. Ibid., 19.
16. Ibid., 2.
17. Borgen, "The Japanese Mission to China," 2.
18. Ibid., 4.
19. Ibid., 11.
20. The memorial to Kūkai in Xian is located at the Qinglongsi Temple southeast of the old city walls. The memorial jointly commemorates the contributions of Kūkai and

his master, the Chinese monk Huiguo. Interestingly, though it is a relatively modest temple by the grand standards of Xian, and rarely visited by most tourists, it is considered a must-see for Japanese visitors to the city.

21. Borgen, *Sugawara no Michizane,* 34.
22. Ibid., 97.
23. Ibid., 260.
24. The degree of Parhae's desire to be recognized by Japan can be gauged by the fact that they sent no fewer than thirty-three separate missions to Japan. See Borgen, *Sugawara no Michizane,* 227.
25. Ibid., 335.
26. Ibid., 6.
27. Interestingly and ironically, given his fate, Sugawara no Michizane's name became the rallying cry in the Tokugawa period for elements in the intellectual world concerned with asserting the importance of Chinese thought in determining Japanese social and cultural values. Consequently, the motto *wagon kansai* (Japanese spirit, Chinese learning) was incorrectly attributed to Michizane. Ibid., 6.
28. Ibid., 253.
29. It is not the goal of this study to examine this complex body of writing by *kangakusha.* Joshua Fogel has mined that field intensively, and those interested in this phenomenon should start by reading Dr. Fogel's *The Cultural Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Essays on the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1995).
30. Ibid., 93. The *kangakusha* employed brushtalk in the traditional manner of exchanging official greetings as prescribed by Sinitic protocol. However, they also used the brush to communicate in more mundane ways as well, such as transactions in the marketplace. Joshua Fogel provides some examples of such exchanges in *The Cultural Dimension,* such as the exchange involving Hibino Teruhiro on page 81.
31. Ibid., 103.
32. Ibid., 105.
33. Ibid., 196.
34. Zheng Chun, *Liuxue beijing yu Zhongguo xiandai wenxue* (The Background of Overseas Study and Modern Chinese Literature) (Jinan: Shandong jiaoyu chubanshe, 2002), 32.
35. Ibid., 32.
36. Ibid., 33.
37. Ibid., 5.
38. For more about the question of the influence of Japanese on modern Chinese literary style, see Edward Gunn, *Rewriting Chinese: Style and Innovation in Twentieth-Century Chinese Prose* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991).
39. For example, there were a great number of works in Japanese translation and original Japanese works available in Uchiyama Kanzō's bookstore in Shanghai at which Lu Xun and Tian Han, among others, regularly purchased books. See Wang Huoying, "Neishan Wanzao" [Uchiyama Kanzō] in *Lu Xun zawen cidian* (Lu Xun Miscellanea Dictionary) (Shandong: Shandong Xinhua shudian, 1986), 486. Moreover, these writers and other intellectuals also became conversant with Western political theory, including Marxist ideology, through Japanese translations. Sylvia Chan, "Realism or Socialist Realism? The 'Proletarian' Episode in Modern Chinese Literature, 1927–1932," *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs,* no. 9 (January 1983), 63.

40. Fang Changan, "Xingcheng, diaozheng yu zhibian: Zhou Zuoren 'Ren de wenxue' guanyu Riben wenxue de guanxi" (Form, Control, and Transformation: Perspectives on the Relationship of Zhou Zuoren's "Humane Literature" to Japanese Literature), *Literary Review,* 3 (2004), 95.
41. Wang Cheng, "Xiamu shushi wenxue zai Zhongguo de fanyi yu yinxing" (Lu Xun's Literature in Chinese Translation and Its Influence), *Fanyi Luntan,* 25.
42. One might conjecture that "Craig Sensei" appealed to Lu Xun on a personal level as well, as presenting a respected teacher figure, a mentor not unlike Fujino sensei, the teacher who had exerted a powerful influence on Lu Xun during his medical studies in Sendai. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, it was at Uchiyama's shop that Lu Xun purchased Sōseki's collected works. See Fuji Shōzō, "Lu Xun xinmuzhongde Xiamu Shushi (Natsume Sōseki in the Mind's Eye of Lu Xun), trans. by Ma Diji. *Lu Xun Studies Monthly,* vol. 2 (1991), 37.
43. Qin Gang, "Xiandai Zhongguo wentan dui Jiechuan Longzhijie de yijie yu zhishou," *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan,* 2 (2004), 248.
44. Liu Chenying. "Jiechuan Longzhijie zai Zhongguo" (Akutagawa Ryūnosuke in China), *Taidu xuekan* 3: 19 (2003), 2.
45. Inaba Shōzō, *Iku Tappu: sono seishun to shi* (Yu Dafu: His Youth and Poetry) (Tokyo: Tōhō senshu, 1982), 199.
46. The Creationists' tastes in modern Japanese literature, in fact, do not diverge very much from those of Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren. See Xu Zidong, *Yu Dafu xinlun* (New Essays About Lu Xun) (Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe, 1984), 219.
47. Liu Boqing, "Lu Xun yi Riben xinsichaofa zuojia" (Lu Xun and Authors of the New Currents School), *Jilin Daxue shehui kexue xuebao,* 1 (1984), 51.
48. For more about the mission of the Senzaimaru to China and its significance in modern Sino-Japanese relations, see the chapter entitled "The Voyage of the *Senzaimaru* to Shanghai: Early Sino-Japanese Contacts in the Modern Era" in Joshua Fogel's book, *The Cultural Dimensions of Sino-Japanese Relations*, 79–94.
49. Leo Ou-Fan Lee, *Shanghai Modern: The Flowering of a New Urban Culture in China, 1930–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 4.
50. Joshua Fogel, "Japanese Literary Travelers," 579. See also Ogata Sadako, "Japanese Attitude Toward China," *Asian Survey* 5: 8 (August 1965), 391.
51. Fogel, "Japanese Literary Travelers," 585.
52. Ibid., 580.
53. Ibid., 580.
54. Susan Hamilton Nolte, "Individualism in Taishō Japan," *The Journal of Asian Studies,* 43: 4 (August 1984), 669.
55. Ibid., 677.
56. Also known by its Japanese name, Dongya tongwen shuyuan. Douglas R. Reynolds, "Chinese Area Studies in Prewar Japan: Japan's Tōa Dōbun Shoin in Shanghai, 1900–1945," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45: 5 (November 1986), 945.
57. Ibid., 946.
58. Ibid., 950.
59. Ibid., 950.
60. Ian Nish, "An Overview of Relations between China and Japan, 1895–1945," *China Quarterly* 124 (December 1990), 601.
61. Ogata, "Japanese Attitude," 391.

62. Nish, "An Overview," 601.
63. Ogata, 390. For more about the background and significance of the term "Shina" see Joshua Fogel's essay, "The Sino-Japanese Controversy over *Shina* as a Toponym for China," in *The Cultural Dimensions of Sino-Japanese Relations,* 66–76.
64. Nish, "An Overview," 607.
65. Sydney Gifford, *Japan Among the Powers, 1890–1990* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994), 50–51.
66. Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 494.
67. Nish, "An Overview," 609.
68. Ibid., 609–610.
69. Ibid., 610.
70. Ibid., 612.
71. Ibid., 613.
72. Ibid., 614.
73. Ibid., 616.
74. Ibid., 618.
75. Ibid., 619.
76. Sylvia Chen, "Realism or Socialist Realism?" 59.
77. Ibid., 62.
78. Ibid., 57.
79. Ibid., 65.
80. Nish, "An Overview," 622.

Chapter 1

1. It is difficult to assess the degree to which the influence of the Sinologist grandfather was to affect the direction that Uchiyama Kanzō's life was to take. Ozawa Masamoto, *Uchiyama Kanzōden* (Tokyo: Banchō shoten, 1972), 17.
2. Yoshida Hiroji, *Lu Xun no tomo: Uchiyama Kanzō no shōzō* (Lu Xun's Friend: A Portrait of Uchiyama Kanzō) (Tokyo: Shinkyō shuppansha, 1994), 54.
3. Ibid., 56.
4. Ibid., 59.
5. Ibid., 63.
6. Ibid., 64.
7. Ibid., 65.
8. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 30.
9. Makino Toraji, who would later hold several important administrative posts at prestigious Dōshisha University in Kyoto, was the favored disciple of the founder of Dōshisha, Nishima Jō. See Yoshida, *Lu Xun no tomo,* 65.
10. In later reminiscences, Uchiyama describes how upon deciding to fully embrace his newfound religion, he threw away the elegant ivory cigarette case which was the unofficial symbol of the merchant class in the Kansai region. Ibid., 65.
11. Ibid., 70.
12. Ibid., 73.
13. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 63.
14. Yoshida, *Lu Xun no tomo,* 76.
15. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 42.

16. Ibid., 46. Hankou stood at the point where the Han River merges with the Yangtze. Hankou was later combined with the smaller cities of Hanyang and Wuchang to comprise the present city of Wuhan. At the time of Uchiyama's visit, there were five foreign concessions in Hankou.
17. Ibid., 46.
18. Yoshida, *Lu Xun no tomo,* 80.
19. Ibid., 83.
20. Ibid., 87.
21. Ibid., 87.
22. Customers included Chinese, Japanese and Koreans. The Uchiyamas continued this policy in their new shop and the practice soon spread to other Japanese businesses in Shanghai. According to later reminiscences by Uchiyama Kanzō the only customers who occasionally took advantage of the good will of the Uchiyamas were Japanese businessmen. See Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 75.
23. Yoshida, *Lu Xun no tomo,* 88.
24. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 76.
25. Ibid., 95.
26. Ibid., 96
27. Shih Shu-mei, *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917–1937* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 141.
28. Ibid., 141.
29. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 124.
30. Harriet Sergeant, *Shanghai: Collision Point of Cultures 1918–1939* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1990), 237.
31. Ibid., 241.
32. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 84.
33. Yu Dafu, for example, studied in Japan from 1913 to 1922, Guo Moruo from 1913 to 1921, Zhang Ziping from 1912 to 1921, and Cheng Fangwu from 1910 to 1921. For more about the experiences of the Creation Society's members in Japan, see Chapter 1 of my book, *The Subversive Self in Modern Chinese Literature* (New York: Palgrave), 2004.
34. Uchiyama Kanzō, *Kakōroku* (A Record at Age Sixty) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1981), 175.
35. Ibid., 193.
36. Ibid., 194.
37. Ibid., 167.
38. Ibid., 172.
39. Ibid., 172.
40. Wang Zili (ed.), *Yu Dafu wenji* (Yu Dafu's Writings), vol. 9 (Hong Kong: Joint Publishing, 1984), 401.
41. Ibid., 467.
42. Lu Xun, *Lu Xun shuxin ji* (Lu Xun's Collected Correspondences), vol. 2 (Beijing: renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1976), 1084.
43. Ibid., 1092.
44. Joshua Fogel, "Japanese Literary Travelers in Prewar China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 49: 2 (1989), 575–602.
45. Itō Toramaru (ed.), *Iku Tappu shiryō hoben* (A Companion of Yu Dafu Materials), vol. 2 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku bunken sentaa, 1975), 201.

46. Ibid., 202.
47. One result of Lu Xun's move to Shanghai and this new era of productivity was the publication of a collection of translations of Japanese literature in 1929 called *Bixia yuecong* (Translations Beneath the Wall). See Yamada Keizō, *Rojin no sekai* (Lu Xun's World) (Tokyo: Oshū shoten, 1977), 215.
48. Uchiyama would later say that the anniversary of that meeting was the anniversary that he most cherished. Uchiyama Kanzō, *Kakōroku,* 156.
49. Sergeant, *Shanghai,* 235.
50. Ibid., 242.
51. Ibid., 240.
52. Ibid., 240.
53. Ibid., 239.
54. Yoshida, *Lu Xun no tomo,* 88.
55. Ibid., 117.
56. Ibid., 117.
57. Ibid., 118.
58. Sergeant, *Shanghai,* 238.
59. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 115.
60. The workshops themselves lasted two hours each day with the enthusiastic participation of young students, the majority of whom were from the Shanghai School of Art. Ibid., 115.
61. Ibid., 116.
62. W. J. F. Jenner, "Lu Xun's Last Days and After," *China Quarterly* 91 (September 1982), 428.
63. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzōden,* 125.
64. Ibid., 125.
65. Lu Xun contributed a foreword for this collection in which he praised Uchiyama's contributions to understanding between the two nations. Ibid., 124.
66. Uchiyama Kanzō, *Shanhai mango* (Random Talk in Shanghai) (Tokyo: Kaizōsha, 1941), 2.
67. Ibid., 318.
68. Uchiyama, *Kakōroku,* 157.
69. Barak Kushner, *The Thought War: Japanese Imperial Propaganda* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2006), 15.
70. Yoshida, *Ro Jin no tomo,* 219.
71. Joshua Fogel, " 'Shanghai-Japan': The Japanese Residents' Association of Shanghai," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 59: 4 (November 2000), 942.
72. Ibid., 928.
73. Ibid., 249.

Chapter 2

1. Earl Miner, *Japanese Poetic Diaries* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1969), 8.
2. Ibid., 12.
3. The irony of the *kikōbun* form is the expectation that it at once be an intensely personal response to a place but also evocative of the site's cultural and historical associations. See Earl Miner et al., *The Princeton Companion to Classical Japanese Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 283.

4. Joshua Fogel, *The Cultural Dimensions of Sino-Japanese Relations* (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1995), 85.
5. Joshua Fogel, *The Literature of Travel in the Rediscovery of Japan, 1862–1945* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996), 33.
6. Sakaki Atsuko, "Japanese Perceptions of China: The Sinophilic Fiction of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 59: 1 (1999): 193.
7. Fogel, *The Literature of Travel,* 82.
8. Tanizaki's infatuation with the West was beginning to cool, and his ardor for Eastern traditions beginning to grow, just at the time of his first visit to China in 1918. See Ken Ito, *Visions of Desire: Tanazaki's Fictional Worlds* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), 105–132.
9. Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Shina shumi to iu koto" (This Taste for Things Chinese), *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshō* (Collected Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō), vol. 6 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969), 121. Unless otherwise noted, this and all of the translations in this study are mine.
10. For more about this body of fiction by Tanizaki, see Sakaki's article, "Japanese Perceptions of China."
11. The concept of "pilgrimage" in Tanizaki's writings, first to an imagined West and later in regard to his return to the East, are an important facet of his travel essays and fiction. For more about this phenomenon see Tsuruta Kin'ya, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's Pilgrimage and Return," *Comparative Literature Studies* 37: 2 (2000): 239–255.
12. Tanizaki, "Soshū kikō" (A Record of a Journey to Suzhou), *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū* (Collected Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō), vol. 6 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969), 223.
13. Sakaki, *Japanese Perceptions of China,* 201.
14. In the writings following Tanizaki's first trip to China he tends to exoticize China and the Chinese as he had the West in earlier writings. This objectification of the people and places he encounters is a quality on which a number of scholars comment. In fact, Atsuko Sakaki refers to the narrators in Tanizaki's fictional works from China as "Orientalists." Ibid., 201.
15. Ibid., 222.
16. Tanizaki, "Rozan nikki" (Lushan Diary), *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū* (Collected Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō), vol. 7 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969), 468.
17. Ibid., 470.
18. One feature of both the *nikki* and the *kikō,* which they share with other traditional prose forms such as the *monogatari* (tale literature) is the inclusion of poetry at moments involving an emotional encounter with the site's cultural significance. See Miner et al., *The Princeton Companion,* 292.
19. Miyauchi Junko, *Ikyō ōkan* (Travels to Foreign Lands) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1991), 84.
20. Tanizaki, "Shanhai kōyūki" (A Record of a Friendly Exchange in Shanghai), *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū* (Collected Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō), vol. 10 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969), 563.
21. Tanizaki's second visit to China coincided with his increasing fascination with the Kansai region, and his visit served to strengthen associations he had begun to make between the Kansai region as the cradle of traditional Japanese culture and China as the source of traditional Eastern culture. See Ken Ito, *Visions of Desire,* 111.
22. Interestingly, although Tanizaki met virtually all of China's important young writers during this visit, he was unable to meet Lu Xun, the writer he desired most to meet. See Fogel, *Japanese Literary Travelers,* 590.

23. Tanizaki, "Shanhai kōyūki," 589.
24. Ibid., 590.
25. Ibid., 591.
26. Jaroslav Prusek (ed.), *Dictionary of Oriental Literatures,* vol. 1 [East Asia] (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), 87.
27. Uchiyama, *Kakōroku*, 175.
28. Fogel, *Japanese Literary Travelers,* 589.
29. Nozaki Kan, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō and Narrating 'Transcendental China'," *Journal of Modern Literature in Chinese* 7: 2 (December, 2005), 45.
30. These two works of fiction are simply the best known of Tanizaki's stories from the late teens and early twenties set in China. See Atsuko Sakaki, *Japanese Perceptions,* 199–200.
31. Nozaki, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō," 49
32. Sakaki, *Japanese Perceptions of China,* 199.
33. "Shanhai kenbunroku" (A Record of Observations in Shanghai), *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshū* (Collected Works of Tanizaki Jun'ichirō), vol. 22 (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1969), 553.
34. Tsuruta Kin'ya, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō's Pilgrimage and Return," 244.
35. Ibid., 254.
36. Letter reprinted in *Tanizaki Jun'ichirō zenshû,* vol. 24: 245.
37. Sakaki, *Japanese Perceptions of China*, 196.
38. Ito*, Visions of Desire*, 136.
39. Ibid., 136.
40. From Noguchi Takehiko, "Tanizaki Jun'ichirō ron" (Concerning Tanizaki Jun'ichirō) (Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha, 1973), as cited in Ken Ito's *Visions of Desire,* 111.
41. Ibid., 110.
42. This essay was collected, at the end of 1942, in an anthology with earlier essays written after the completion of Tanizaki's first translation of *The Tale of Genji* under the title *Hatsu Mukashi, Kinō Kyō* (Not So Long Ago: Yesterday and Today). See Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era (Fiction)* (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1984), 773.
43. Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Kinō kyō," in Itō Toramaru (ed.), *Tian Han zai Riben* (Tian Han in Japan) (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1997), 180.
44. By emphasizing the importance of this exchange of poems at that gathering and the personal significance of the poem that he had received from Ouyang, Tanizaki is cleverly situating this encounter in the tradition of brushtalk communication and thereby providing the encounter with a time-tested framework.
45. Tanizaki, "Kinō kyō," 183.
46. Ibid., 184.
47. Ibid., 185.
48. Ibid., 185.
49. Ibid., 195.
50. Ibid., 195.
51. Ibid., 197.
52. Ibid., 193.
53. Tanizaki was not always willing to countenance compromise with the authorities. His unwillingness to compromise with *Sasameyuki* (The Makioka Sisters) in order to see it published, is well documented.

54. To a degree achieved by few other Japanese literary travelers of the era, Tanizaki was able in this essay to transcend the "fierce nationalism" of the day and engage Chinese writers in a direct way. Ibid., 599.

Chapter 3

1. "Xiongdi" documents the split between the Zhou brothers and portrays the selfless love of the older brother (Lu Xun) for the younger brother (Zuoren) juxtaposed with the feelings of hostility that emerge in the older brother at night toward his younger brother in the semi-conscious state of half sleep. For a translation of this story see Lu Xun, *Diary of a Madman and Other Stories,* translation by William A Lyell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, 1990), 363–376.
2. Another factor that distinguished the White Birch School from other late Meiji anti-naturalist coteries was its enduring influence. Even though the core of writers and artists associated with the White Birch School departed after only a few years, the school continued to exist in some form throughout the Taishō period (1912–1926), and its influence continued well into the Shōwa period (1926–1989). See Stephen W. Kohl et al., *The White Birch Society (Shirakabaha) of Japanese Literature: Some Sketches and Commentary* (Eugene, OR: Asian Studies Occasional Paper No. 2, 1975), 2.
3. The differences in educational background and values of the Shirakaba writers and the older generation of Japanese writers that includes Soseki and Ōgai can be seen in their respective reaction to the ritual suicide of Admiral Nogi and his wife in the wake of the death of the Meiji Emperor. While the older generation of Japanese writers expressed a general sympathy of this act bordering on reverence, Mushanokōji and other Shirakaba derided the suicide as a senseless waste. See Nakamura Mitsuo, *Nihon no kindai shōsetsu* (Modern Japanese Fiction) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shinsho, 1964), 176.
4. Kohl et al., *The White Birch Society,* 19.
5. *Shirakaba* likewise differed from the journals produced by other contemporary anti-naturalist coteries. The sheer scope of the magazine and the diversity of forms contained therein were atypical, and the inclusion of regular art works and photography was unique. *Shirakaba* was reprinted in its entirety in facsimile edition by Shirakabasha in Tokyo between 1969 and 1972.
6. Wang Jinghou, *Wusi: xinwenxue yu waiguo wenxue* (May Fourth: The New Literature and Foreign Literature) (Sichuan: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 1989), 94.
7. Ibid, 94. The novelist Yu Dafu had become acquainted with Mushanokōji during one of Yu's visits to Japan in the latter part of the 1920s. They exchanged ideas and books as evidenced in the letter from Yu to Satō Haruo dated 1928. See Itō Toramaru (ed.), *Iku Tappu: shiryō hoben* (A Companion of Yu Dafu Materials), vol. 2 (Tokyo Daigaku bunken sentaa, 1975), 205.
8. Although it was Mushanokōji's uncle Kade no Kojisukeko, who introduced his nephew to Tolstoy's work, it was through the writings of the Meiji era author Tokutomi Rōka that Mushanokōji became truly familiar with Tolstoy's thought. See Takeda Torao, *Shirakaba* (Tokyo: Meiji Shoten, 1983), 1.
9. Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 93.
10. Eric Rothstein, "Diversity and Change in Literary Histories," in Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (ed.), *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 117.

11. Nakamura Mitsuo, *Nihon no kindai shōsetsu,* 182.
12. Shiga had planned to visit the mine in order to protest along with others who shared his concerns but was forbidden to do so by his father, who was indebted to the owner of the mine. See Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 459.
13. Zhu Peichu, "Riben minyi yundong de changdaozhe: Liu Zongyue" (The Leader of the Japanese Folk Art Movement: Yanagi Sōetsu), *Art and Design,* 4 (1990): 419.
14. Interestingly, the house the two brothers rented in Nishikata had once belonged to the Japanese literary giant, Natsume Sōseki. See William Lyell, *Lu Xun's Vision of Reality* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 78.
15. Susan Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2000), 3.
16. Ibid., 61.
17. Nishihara Daisuke, "Zhou Zuoren's translations of two Japanese stories," *Hikaku bungaku: Journal of Comparative Literature,* vol. XXXVII (1994): 240.
18. Although the anthology is identified as an anthology of fiction *(xiaoshuo)*, it in fact includes works that are clearly not fiction such as Arishima Takeo's essay, "Chiisaki mono e" (To the Little Ones). See Yamada Keizō, *Rojin no sekai* (Lu Xun's world) (Tokyo: Toshokan shoten, 1977), 205.
19. Ibid., 205.
20. Ibid., 209.
21. Nishihara Daisuke, "Zhou Zuoren's translations," 241.
22. Ibid., 239.
23. As translated by Nishihara Daisuke. Ibid., 238.
24. From Lu Xun's 1931 essay, "Fanyi de tongxin" (The Message of Translation). Translated by Nishihara Daisuke. Ibid., 235.
25. Ibid., 237. The two Akutagawa stories were "Rashōmon" and "Hana" (The Nose).
26. Ibid., 236. Other commentators, such as the Taiwanese scholar Lin Lianxiang, find the Zhou brothers' translations from the Japanese often inaccurate and "extremely clumsy" in general. Ibid., 236.
27. Nakamura Mitsuo, *Nihon no kindai shōsetsu,* 181.
28. Although Mushanokōji's writing might appear to us now as "pompous, naïve, or just plain silly" there is no doubt that he was an immensely popular and influential literary figure in his own day. See Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 42. Nevertheless, although Mushanokōji enjoyed a prominent career as a writer, thinker, painter and social reformer, it is as the spokesman for the ideas of the White Birch School that he is primarily remembered. Ibid., 42.
29. Tellingly, by the time of this translation, Mushanokōji had already pronounced, in typical dramatic fashion, that he had "graduated" from the stifling influence of Tolstoy and would thereafter advocate the thought and writing of the dramatist, Maurice Maeterlinck. See Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 451.
30. Zhou's essay about Mushanokōji's play was entitled "Du Muzhexiaoji qun zuo 'yige qingnian de meng'" (Reading Mushanokōji's "A Certain Young Man's Dream"). See Yamada Keizō, *Rojin no sekai,* 193.
31. Ibid., 193.
32. Ibid., 194.
33. Ibid., 194.
34. Odagiri Susumu (ed.), "Mushanokōji Saneatsu," in *Nihon kindai bungaku daijiten,* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1992), 1442.

35. "Aru seinen no yume" (A Certain Young Man's Dream), in *Mushanokōji Saneatsu zenshū* (Mushanokōji Saneatsu's Collected Works) (Tokyo: Shōgakukan, 1988), 499–607.
36. Ibid., 499.
37. Yamada Keizō, *Rojin no sekai,* 223. All four of the Mushanokōji pieces translated by Lu Xun were concerned with questions of self-expression and sincerity. Ibid., 221.
38. Fujii Shōzō, *Lu Xun bijiao yanjiu* (Lu Xun Comparative Research), trans. Chen Fuqiu (Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe, 1997), 167.
39. Takeda Torao, *Shirakaba gunzō* (A Portrait of Shirakaba) (Tokyo: Meiji Shoten, 1983), 234.
40. Fujii, *Lu Xun bijiao yanjiu,* 167.
41. Ibid., 168.
42. Yamada Keizō, *Rojin no sekai,* 196.
43. Ibid., 197.
44. Although Zhou Zuoren shared these same concerns about the source of this idealistic, pacifist manifesto, he was ultimately more willing to accept this paradox than was his older brother. Ibid., 195.
45. Ibid., 195.
46. Ibid., 198.
47. Ibid., 200.
48. Fujii, *Lu Xun bijiao yanjiu,* 163.
49. Ibid., 174.
50. Yokomatsu Takashi, *Rojin: Minzoku no kyōshi* (Lu Xun: The People's Teacher) (Tokyo: Kawade shobō shinsha, 1986), 133.
51. Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 71.
52. Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West*, 473.
53. Ibid., 473.
54. In an article written after Arishima's death entitled "Haikyōsha toshite no Arishima" (Arishima the Apostate), Uchimura Kanzō admits having seen indications of Arishima's movement away from Christianity as early as 1907 when he visited his former student in Sapporo. See Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 83.
55. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 492.
56. Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 71.
57. Arishima's essay appeared in the January 1918 issue of *Shinchō* (New Tide). Lu Xun apparently read it in October of the following year. See Lu Xun, *Lu Xun lun waiguo wenxue* (Lu Xun Discusses Foreign Literature), edited by Fujian shifan daxue Zhongwenxi (Beijing: Waiguo wenxue chubanshe, 1982), 232.
58. Ibid., 233.
59. Ibid., 234.
60. Yamada, *Rojin no sekai,* 211.
61. Ibid., 211.
62. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 484.
63. Ibid., 475.
64. Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 207.
65. As quoted in Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 215.
66. Ibid., 220.
67. Lu Xun, "Mourning the Dead," in *Diary of a Madman and Other Stories,* trans. William A. Lyell (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1990), 340.

68. Ibid., 340.
69. Yokomatsu, *Rojin: Minzoku no kyōshi,* 144.
70. Ibid., 146.
71. As quoted in Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 4.
72. Ibid., 226.
73. Ibid., 218.
74. Leith Morton, *Divided Self: A Biography of Arishima Takeo* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1988), 199.
75. Ibid., 203–204.
76. Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 218–219.
77. Li Huoren, "Yu Dafu yu sixiaoshuo" (Yu Dafu and the *shishōsetsu*), *Zhongguo xiandai yanjiu* (March 1990): 208.
78. Yokomatsu, *Rojin: Minzoku no kyōshi*, 139.
79. Ibid., 141.
80. Ibid., 141.
81. Ibid., 140.
82. Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 227.
83. Ibid., 228.
84. Ibid., 228.
85. Yokomatsu, *Rojin: Minzoku no kyōshi,* 141.
86. This, however, did not signal the end of the influence of modern Japanese literature on the May Fourth literary community. An anthology of modern Japanese literature issued by Beixin shuju appeared as late as 1929. See Yamada, *Lu Xun no sekai,* 212.

Chapter 4

1. Stephen Kohl et al., *The White Birch School (Shirakabaha) of Japanese Literature: Some Sketches and Commentary.* Occasional Paper No. 2 (Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, 1975), 2.
2. Ibid., 11.
3. Ibid., 11.
4. This essay had an influence on Yu Dafu, one of the leaders of the Creation Society, who expressed similar ideas in an essay from 1927 entitled "Nongmin wenyi de tichang" (Advocating Literature by Peasants). See Li Huoren, "Yu Dafu yu Sixiaoshuo" (Yu Dafu and the *Shishōsetsu*), *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue* (March 1990), 208.
5. Kohl et al, *The White Birch School,* 86. Interestingly, among the ranks of the White Birch School the figure most disengaged from social concerns may have been Satomi Ton, the youngest of the three Arishima brothers. Satomi not only remained opposed to the eldest Arishima brother's stance of the social responsibility of the writer, he was also critical of Mushanokōji's involvement in the New Village Movement. Ibid., 93.
6. Odagiri Susumu (ed.), *Nihon kindai bungaku daijiten* (Dictionary of Modern Japanese Literature) (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1992), 1442. The importance of Tolstoy's spirit in the creation of the village can be seen for example in the custom of celebrating Tolstoy's birthday as a holiday.
7. Included in Mushanokōji Saneatsu, *Jibun aruita michi* (The Road I Have Walked) in *Sakka no jiden* (Autobiographies of Writers) (Tokyo: Nihon tosho sentā, 1994), vol. 7.
8. Odagiri (ed.), *Nihon kindai bungaku daijiten,* 1442.

9. Leith Morton, *Divided Self: A Biography of Arishima Takeo* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1988), 135.
10. Susan Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Response to Chinese Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 50.
11. Morton, *Divided Self,* 136
12. Ibid., 137. The scholar Otsuyama Kunio maintains that since Arishima misunderstood Mushanokōji's intentions, the latter's reaction was justified. Arishima conceived of efforts of reform in terms of Japan as a whole, while Mushanokōji was purely concerned with the Hyūga project. See Otsuyama Kunio, "Atarashiki Mura no hankyō — Arishima Takeo no hihan o megutte" (Reaction to the New Village — Concerning Arishima Takeo's Criticism) *Bungaku* 42: 12 (1974), 1181–1182.
13. Derived from "Atarashiki Mura ni tsuite no taiwa" (A Dialogue about the New Village), 423.
14. Ibid., 50.
15. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan: Chinese Perspectives, 1895–1945* (Honolulu: Association for Asian Studies and University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 125.
16. Ibid., 3
17. Ibid., 3.
18. Zhou wrote several essays about his visit to the New Village including "Shuo Xincun shenghuo" (Discourse on Life in the New Village). See Qian Lijun, *Zhou Zuoren chuan* (A Biography of Zhou Zuoren) (Beijing: Beijing shiyue wenyi, 1993), 73.
19. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan,* 126.
20. Ernst Wolff, *Chou Tso-jen* (New York: Twayne Pulishers, 1971), 4.
21. It should be pointed out that modern fiction was not Zhou's sole or even primary interest in Japanese literature. His voluminous essays and translations from Japanese literature cover everything from the Edo period novelist Takizawa Bakin (1767–1848) to the modern poet Ishikawa Takuboku (1886–1912). Zhou was particularly attracted to the haiku form, and it is interesting to note that not only did he write an essay about the haiku poet Kobayashi Issa (1763–1827), he also translated a brief play about Issa written by Mushanokōji Saneatsu. See Wolff, 68–69.
22. As quoted in Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan,* 126.
23. Qian, *Zhou Zuoren chuan,* 226.
24. Ibid., 226.
25. Fujii Shōzō, *Lu Xun bijiao yanjiu* (Lu Xun Comparative Research), translated by Chen Futai (Shanghai: Shanghai waiyu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1997), 166.
26. Ibid., 227.
27. Ibid., 231.
28. A few examples of the many essays that Zhou produced in this period about the New Village that might be cited include "Yishu yu shenghuo: Riben de xincun" (Art and Life: Japan's New Village) from 1919 and "Xincun de jingshen" (The Spirit of the New Village) which appeared in the November 23, 1919 issue of the newspaper *Minguo ribao*. See Qian, *Zhou Zuoren chuan,* 232.
29. Wang Jinhou, *Wusi: Xinwenxue yu waiguo wenxue* (May Fourth: New Literature and Foreign Literature) (Sichuan: Sichuan daxue chubanshe, 1989), 93.
30. Ibid., 93.
31. Ibid., 93. Originally appeared in *New Youth* (Xin qingnian), 7: 3 (1919).
32. Ibid., 231.

33. Ibid., 233.
34. Fujii, *Lu Xun bijiao yanjiu,* 165.
35. Ibid., 165.
36. Ibid., 165.
37. Ibid., 233.
38. Ibid., 233.
39. Translated by Ernst Wolff in the appendix of his work *Chou Tso-jen,* 100.

Chapter 5

1. Susanna Fessler, *Wandering Heart: The Work and Method of Hayashi Fumiko* (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1998), 75.
2. There was, in fact, a crackdown on "lumpen writers" in the early 1930s due to their unflattering portrayal of contemporary Japanese society. See Joan E. Ericson, *To Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Women's Literature* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), 63.
3. Kurahara's article originally appeared in the January 1928 issue of *Kaizō*. See Itō Toshihiko, "Kobayashi Takiji to Kurahara Korehito: Sakka to hyōronka no mondai" (December 15, 1990), in http://homepage2.nifty.com/tizu/proletarier, 8.
4. Ibid., 16.
5. Isogai Hideo, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu: Hayashi Fumiko* (Shinchō Japanese Literature Album: Hayashi Fumiko) (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1986), 40.
6. Fessler, *Wandering Heart,* 17.
7. Isogai, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu,* 40.
8. Fessler, *Wandering Heart,* 17.
9. Ibid., 17.
10. Ibid., 17.
11. Isogai, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu,* 45.
12. Ibid., 47.
13. Ibid., 47.
14. Ibid., 47. Yamamoto Sanehiko, the president of Kaizōsha Publishing House, which produced the large circulation journal *Kaizō*, was himself an intriguing figure in terms of Sino-Literary exchange. Not only did he publish the works of many of the Japanese writers of the interwar period treated in this study, he was also acquainted with a number of May Fourth writers as well including Lu Xun and Yu Dafu, whose work he included in *Kaizō.*
15. Fessler, *Wandering Heart,* 18.
16. Isogai, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu,* 47.
17. "Nikki" in *Hayashi Fumiko zenshū* (Collected Works of Hayashi Fumiko), vol. 29 (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1952), 102.
18. Sylvia Chan, "Realism or Socialist Realism: The 'Proletarian' Episode in Modern Chinese Literature, 1927–1932," *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs,* 9 (January 1983): 57.
19. Stephen Ching-Kiu Chan, "The Language of Despair: Ideological Representation of 'New Woman' by May Fourth Writers," in Tani E. Barlow (ed.), *Gender Politics in Modern China: Writing and Feminism* (Durham, NC: Duke University, 1993), 13.
20. Dian Xi and Zhong Xuequn (ed.), *Shiren nüren de Shanghai tan* (Ten Women Writers' Sojourns in Shanghai) (Beijing: New World Press, 2004), 191.

21. Yi-tsi Mei Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction: Ideology and Narrative in Modern Chinese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 19.
22. Ibid., 19.
23. Tani E. Barlow and George J. Bjorge (ed.), *I Myself Am a Woman: Selected Writings of Ding Ling* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1989), 49.
24. Ibid., 55.
25. Dian Xi and Zhong Xuequn (ed.), *Shiren nüren de Shanghai tan,* 193.
26. Ibid., 194.
27. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 82.
28. Ibid., 8.
29. Ibid., 8.
30. Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 63.
31. Isogai, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu,* 36.
32. The term was coined by Karl Marx in his essay from 1850, "The Class Struggle in France." Marx used this pejorative term to criticize sycophantic, non-productive members of society. See Ericson, 63.
33. Fessler, *Wandering Heart,* 56.
34. Isogai, *Shinchō Nihon bungaku arubamu,* 45.
35. Translation by Joan E. Ericson in *To Be a Woman,* 135.
36. In China, the utilization of the diary form as a form of fictional narrative to give expression to modern concerns had been established by the success of the first work of Chinese vernacular fiction, Lu Xun's "Kuangren riji" (Diary of a madman, 1916). For more about the impact of Lu Xun's seminal work see Benjamin I. Schwartz (ed.), *Reflections on the May Fourth Movement: A Symposium* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 6.
37. As Yi-tsi Mei Feuerwerker notes, concerning the effectiveness of the diary form to articulate concerns of modern women writers, far from being a "transparent medium," a window through which to gaze upon the action of the story, the diary is self-reflexive, not just a means for self-investigation by the main characters but itself a subject for investigation. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 50.
38. Certain qualities of Hayashi's diary hearken back to the Heian tradition of women's literary diaries. For instance, the protagonists remain largely anonymous in classical Japanese diaries as they do in Hayashi's fictional diary. See Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 61.
39. Ibid, 60. Likewise, Ding Ling's *Miss Sophie's Diary* has been likened to Shen Fu's *Six Chapters of a Floating Life* in its depiction of the protagonist struggling to find direction in a love triangle in which he has become involved. Barlow and Bjorge (ed.), 49.
40. Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 60.
41. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 46.
42. Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 79. Ironically, Hayashi's work won praise from Nakamura Mitsuo, who praised the work for its objectivity and calculated style, qualities that he identified as decidedly masculine. Ibid., 89.
43. Stephen Ching-Kiu Chan, "The Language of Despair," 30.
44. Lydia Liu, "Invention and Intervention: The Female Tradition in Modern Chinese Literature," in Tani E. Barlow (ed.), *Gender Politics in Modern China: Writing and Feminism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 46.
45. Translated in Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 149.
46. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 19.

47. It is at this point in the narrative that Sophie, suffering from severe tuberculosis, moves into a damp apartment, merely to be closer to her beloved. Translated by Tani E. Barlow, in Barlow and Bjorge (ed.), *I Myself Am a Woman,* 55.
48. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 20.
49. Sharon Hamilton Nolte, "Individualism in Taishō Japan," *Journal of Asian Studies,* 43: 4 (August 1984), 675.
50. Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 104.
51. Ibid., 53.
52. Translated in Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 181.
53. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 43.
54. Barlow (ed.), *Gender Politics in Modern China,* 12.
55. Ibid., 12.
56. Ibid., 14.
57. Translation by Barlow and Bjorge (ed.), *I Myself am a Woman,* 59.
58. Wendy Larson, "The End of 'Funü Wenxue': Women's Literature from 1925 to 1935," in Tani E. Barlow (ed.), *Gender Politics in Modern China: Writing and Feminism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 59.
59. Ibid., 59.
60. Ibid., 67.
61. Ibid., 67.
62. As quoted in Larson, "The End of 'Funü Wenxue'," 67.
63. Ibid., 69.
64. Sylvia Chan, "Realism or Social Realism?" 57.
65. Ibid., 57.
66. Ibid., 59.
67. Ibid., 64.
68. The strength of character that Ding exhibited in dealing with her loss and her subsequent enthusiastic involvement in political activities served to galvanize her popularity so that she became a "star" in the Shanghai scene in the early 1930s. See Dian Xi and Zhang Xuequn, *Shiren nüren de Shanghai tan,* 188.
69. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 52.
70. Ibid., 19.
71. Ibid., 2.
72. Ibid., 2.
73. Fessler, *Wandering Heart,* 37.
74. Ibid., 80.
75. Ibid., 37.
76. Kobayashi Jirō, "Ding Ling zai Riben" (Ding Ling in Japan), in *Ding Ling yanjiu zai waiguo* (Ding Ling Research Abroad) (Hunnan renmin chubanshe, 1985), 365.
77. Ibid., 364.
78. Ibid., 364.
79. Ibid., 365. The same issue of *Nippon Hyōron* included a translated essay by Mao Dun entitled, "Onna sakka Ding Ling" (The Woman Writer Ding Ling), which reintroduced her to Japanese readers.
80. Ibid., 365. Many of these early translations can be credited to the Chūgoku bungaku kenkyūkai (Chinese Literature Research Society), which introduced and translated works of contemporary Chinese literature during and after the war.

81. Wang Cheng, "Riben nüxing wenxue jinru xinshidai" *Dongjing xinwen* (January 13, 1989): 52.
82. Jin Conglin, "Reqing de xianyi: jindai Riben wenxue zai Zhongguo," *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan,* 2 (2001): 46–52.
83. The piece that resulted was entitled "Manmōyūki" (Record of a Voyage to Manchuria and Mongolia). See Joshua A. Fogel, "Japanese Literary Travelers in Prewar China," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies,* 49: 2 (December 1989), 595.
84. Setouchi Harumi, *Tamura Toshiko* (Tokyo: Bungei shunju, 1983), 300.
85. Ibid., 300.
86. Ibid., 324.
87. Ibid., 303.
88. Ibid., 324.
89. Ericson, *To Be a Woman,* 63.
90. Ibid., 63.

Chapter 6

1. Mushanokōji's essay was an introduction to Zhou and included an explanation of his role in disseminating information about contemporary Japanese literary trends to Chinese readers. Mushanokōji Saneatsu, "Shū Sakunin" (Zhou Zuoren), *Nippon Hyōron* (March, 1938).
2. For more about the influence of Japanese literature on Yu Dafu and the relationship between Yu and Satō Haruo. see my book *The Subversive Self in Modern Chinese Literature: The Creation Society's Reinvention of the Japanese Shishōsetsu* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
3. For a comparison of *Rural Melancholy* and "Sinking" see Kurt W Radtke's essay, "Chaos or Coherence," in Adriana Boscaro, Franco Gatti, and Massimo Raveri (ed.), *Rethinking Japan,* vol. 1 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985), 86–101.
4. Ibid., 91.
5. Yu Dafu, "Sinking," in *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue daxi* (Compendium of Modern Chinese Literature), vol. 3 (Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe, 1935), 2013.
6. Edward Fowler, *The Rhetoric of Confession: Shishōsetsu in Early Twentieth Century Japanese Fiction* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), xxvi.
7. Guo Laixun, *Yu Dafu yu Riben de ziwo xiaoshuo* (Yu Dafu and the Japanese "I-Novel"), in Yang Zhouhan (ed.), *Zhongguo bijiaowenxue niankan* (Chinese Comparative Literature Yearly) (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1987), 253.
8. Xu Zidong, *Yu Dafu xinlun* (New Essays about Yu Dafu) (Hangzhou: Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe, 1984), 216.
9. Ibid., 217.
10. Itō Toramaru, "Chuangzaoshe yu Riben wenxue" (The Creation Society and Japanese Literature), trans. Pan Shijingin. *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue* (March 1986), 213.
11. Itō Toramaru, "Zuoteng Chunfu yu Yu Dafu" (Satō Haruo and Yu Dafu), *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue* (February 1993), 208.
12. In 1920, Satō spent four months in Taiwan in which he exchanged poetry with the educator Chen Jingheng who acted as a guide in much the same way as Yu Dafu would eight years later during Satō's visit to Shanghai. Huang Meizi, *Satō Haruo to Taiwan, Chūgoku: "Hoshi" o Megutte* (Satō Haruo and Taiwan and China: Concerning "The Star") (Tsukuba, Japan: Tsukuba University Master's Thesis, 1983).

13. According to Satō Chieko's account, Yu came to greet the Satōs the day they arrived and guided them around on several occasions after that. This information appears in several letters from Satō Chieko to the Yu Dafu scholar Itō Toramaru describing the Satōs' 1927 visit. See Itō Toramaru, *Iku Tappu shiryō hoben* (Edited Materials of Yu Dafu), vol. 2 (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku bunken sentaa, 1975), 199–204.
14. Ibid., 201.
15. At this time Yu, an admirer of Akutagawa, sent a letter of condolence to Akutagawa's family out of deference to Satō Haruo. Ibid., 200.
16. From a letter dating from the third year of the Shōwa period (1928), the year following Satō's visit to China. See Ibid, 204.
17. Itō Toramaru, *Sōzōsha Shiryō* (Creation Society Materials) (Tokyo: Ajia shuppan, 1979), 1.
18. Although many Chinese writers who had experienced Japan as students exhibited a similar ambivalence toward Japan (Guo Moruo and Zhou Zuoren, for instance), no Chinese writer wrote as vehemently against Japanese imperialism, while simultaneously exhibiting genuine affection for Japanese culture as did Yu. Xu Zidong *Yu Dafu de xinlun* (New Essays about Yu Dafu) (Hangzhou: Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe, 1984), 219.
19. Ibid., 221.
20. Satō, "Ajia no ko" (Children of Asia), *Nippon hyōron* (March 1938), 193.
21. Ibid., 393.
22. Hasegawa Izumi, *Kindai bungei zasshi jiten* (Dictionary of Modern Literary Periodicals) (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1965), 2.
23. Yu Dafu, "Riben de wenshi yu changfu" (Japanese Literary Men and Whores), in *Yu Dafu wenji* (Collected Works of Yu Dafu), vol. 8 (Hong Kong: Joint Publishers, 1984), 294.
24. Ibid., 296.

Chapter 7

1. Immanuel C. Y. Hsu. *The Rise of Modern China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 582–583.
2. In fact, 1927–1937 is sometimes referred to as the "Leftist League Decade" due to the prominence of the league in the cultural and political affairs of China in that period. See Shu-mei Shih, *The Lure of the Modern: Writing Modernism in Semicolonial China, 1917–1937* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 238.
3. Sylvia Chan, "Realism or Socialist Realism?: The 'Proletarian' Episode in Modern Chinese Literature, 1927–1932," *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs,* No. 9 (January 1983), 57.
4. Ibid., 59.
5. Ibid., 59.
6. Ibid., 62.
7. And yet, Shanghai was also the home to a number of politically neutral writers as well. Prominent writers such as Ba Jin, Shen Congwen, Lao She and Wen Yiduo, kept their distance from the league and its activities.
8. Ibid., 155.
9. Shu-mei Shih, *The Lure of the Modern,* 234.
10. Bonnie S. McDougall and Kam Louie, *The Literature of China in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 25.

11. Ibid., 25.
12. Ibid., 27.
13. Ibid., 26.
14. Ibid., 27.
15. Yi-tsi Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction: Ideology and Narrative in Modern Chinese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 8.
16. Ibid., 8
17. Yi-tsi Feuerwerker, "The Changing Relationship between Literature and Life," in Merle Goldman (ed.), *Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 284. Twenty years after Hu's death Ding Ling revisited that event in the reminiscence "Yige zhengshi ren ji Hu Yepin" (The Life of an Upright Man, Hu Yepin).
18. Ibid., 287.
19. Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction,* 2.
20. Harriet C. Mills, "Lu Xun: Literature and Revolution — From Mara to Marx," in Merle Goldman (ed.), *Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 214.
21. Ibid., 215. Lu Xun's abiding interest in Communism and the responsibilities of the writer can be seen, for example, in the case of a birthday celebration for Lu Xun in September of 1930, organized by Rou Shi in which Lu Xun used the occasion to lecture those in attendance about the lack of real proletarian writers in China. See Kirk A. Denton, "Lu Xun Biography," Modern Chinese Literature and Culture Resource website, http://mclc.osu.edu/rc/bios/lxbio.htm/.
22. From the essay, "The Revolutionary Literature of the Chinese Proletariat and the Blood of the Pioneers." See David E. Pollard, *The True Story of Lu Xun* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2002), 152.
23. Mills, "Lu Xun: Literature and Revolution," 216.
24. Ibid., 216.
25. Xu Zidong, *Yu Dafu xinlun* (Hangzhou: Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe, 1984), 221.
26. Originally contained in "Zuoyi zuojia lianmeng disici quanti dahui buzhi" (Supplement to the Minutes of the Fourth Convention of the League of Leftist Writers), *Hongqi ribao* (Red Flag Daily), November 22, 1930. In Lydia Liu, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated modernity — China, 1900–1937* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 220.
27. W. J. F. Jenner, "Lu Xun's Last Days and After," *China Quarterly,* no. 91 (September 1982), 424.
28. Ibid., 428.
29. Ibid., 429.
30. Ibid., 428. Lu Xun was so consumed with woodblock print activities in his later years, in fact, that on the day that he died, during a visit with the Japanese leftist scholar Kaji Wataru at Kaji's home, the accomplishments of young Chinese woodblock artists was a main topic of discussion. Lu Xun expressed genuine pride in their accomplishments with the qualification that he wished they were better able to make the faces of their subjects appear more Chinese. Ibid., 426.
31. Ibid., 427.
32. Ibid., 430.
33. Ibid., 430.
34. Originally an essay of Feng's called "Huiyi" (Reminiscences). Ibid., 431.

35. Ibid., 431.
36. "Neishan Wanzao" [Uchiyama Kanzō], in *Lu Xun zawen cidian* (Lu Xun Miscellany Dictionary) (Shandong: Xinhua shudian, 1983), 238.
37. Uchiyama Kanzō, *Kakōroku* (A Record at Age Sixty) (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1981), 134.
38. As quoted in Fujii Shōzō, *Lu Xun hikaku kenkyū* (Lu Xun Comparative Research), trans. Chen Futai (Shanghai: Shanghai waiyu chubanshe, 1997), 171.
39. Ibid., 171.
40. W. J. F. Jenner, "Lu Xun's Last Days," 426.
41. Ibid., 433.
42. Ibid., 433.
43. Ibid., 433.
44. Ibid., 434.
45. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan: Chinese Perspectives, 1895–1945,* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 184.
46. Yoshida Hiroji, *Rojin no tomo: Uchiyama Kanzō no shōzō* (Lu Xun's Friend: A Portrait of Uchiyama Kanzō) (Tokyo: Shinkyō shuppansha, 1994), 189.
47. Ibid., 190.
48. Ibid., 190.
49. Ozawa Masamoto, *Uchiyama Kanzō den* (A Biography of Uchiyama Kanzō) (Tokyo: Banchō shobo, 1972), 156.
50. Ibid., 156.
51. Ibid., 159.
52. Ibid., 221.
53. Ibid., 179. The fact that he was chosen number one among all the candidates suggests the degree to which he was respected among the Japanese community in Shanghai. See Yoshida, *Rojin no tomo,* 248.
54. Ozawa, *Uchiyama Kanzō den,* 179.
55. Yoshida, *Rojin no tomo,* 249.
56. Ibid., 247. Originally in reminiscences by Kojima Toru.
57. Translated and quoted in Ken Ito, *Visions of Desire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 111.
58. The extent of Tanizaki's participation in the war effort was a radio talk on the fall of Singapore in 1942 and several half-hearted patriotic poems. See Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature in the Modern Era: Fiction,* vol. 3 (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984), 774.
59. Ibid., 773.
60. Ito, *Visions of Desire,* 186.
61. Ibid., 186.
62. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 775.
63. Ibid., 773.
64. Ibid., 774.
65. Ibid., 773.
66. Ito, *Visions of Desire,* 190.
67. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 774.
68. Joan Ericson, *Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Women's Literature* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997), 80.
69. Ibid., 80.

70. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 1143.
71. Ericson, *Be a Woman,* 63.
72. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 1143.
73. Ibid., 1143.
74. Ericson, *Be a Woman,* 81.
75. Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 1143.
76. Ibid., 1143.
77. Translated and included in Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West,* 456.
78. Stephen W. Kohl et al., *The White Birch School (Shirakabaha) of the Japanese Literature: Some Sketches and Commentary.* Occasional Paper No. 2 (Eugene: University of Oregon, March, 1975), 52.
79. Ibid., 53.
80. Suekawa Hiroshi (ed.), *Hōritsu* (Laws), in *Shiryō: Sengo nijūnen shi* (Materials: A History of the Twenty Years after the War), vol. III (Tokyo: Nihon hyōronsha, 1966–67), 35.
81. Quoted in Honda Shūgo, *Shirakaba no sakka to sakuhin* (The Authors and Works of the White Birch School), 80. Translated in Kohl et al., *The White Birch School,* 53.
82. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan*, 181.
83. Ibid., 181.
84. Ibid., 186.
85. Ibid., 187.
86. Ibid., 187.
87. Yi-tsi Mei Feuerwerker, *Ding Ling's Fiction: Ideology and Narrative in Modern Chinese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 8.
88. Hua Xianbiao, "Ding Ling," *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue shucang,* vol. I (Beijing: Xinhua shudian, 1987), 4.
89. Kobayashi Tsugio, "Ding Ling zai Riben" (Ding Ling in Japan), in Sun Ruichen and Wang Zhongqing (ed.), *Ding Ling yanjiu zai guowai* (Ding Ling Research Abroad) (Changsha: Hunan Renmin chubanshe, 1985), 365.
90. Ibid., 365.
91. Hua Xianbiao, "Ding Ling," 4.
92. Ibid., 5.
93. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan*, 221.
94. Susan Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Response to Modernity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 4.
95. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan*, 230.
96. Ibid., 230.
97. Ibid., 230.
98. Ibid., 230.
99. Ibid., 231.
100. Ibid., 231.
101. Daruvala, *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Response,* 4.
102. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan*, 231.
103. Ibid., 232.
104. These essays, which appeared in the newspaper *Yongbao* in Tianjin, were included in the column "Yaocaotang suibi" (Essays from the Medicine Hall). Ibid., 232.
105. Ibid., 239.

106. A complete description of the symposium held in Taiwan along with a transcript of selected proceedings is included in Itō Toramaru, *Iku Tappu shiryō hoben,* vol. 2: 218–228.
107. Ibid., 218.
108. Yu, in attempting to demonstrate affinities between the two literary communities, provided the example of Ōda Takeo (1900–79) who had won the Akutagawa Prize for *Jōgai* (Outside the Wall), a novel set in China. Yu admitted that he admired attempts such as these at the creation of truly cross-cultural literature, but feared problems of interpretation, given the linguistic and cultural differences. Ibid., 218.
109. Ibid., 227.
110. It is not clear from the records of these two journeys precisely which Chinese writers Satō visited during these journeys, but in reminiscences he mentions how he hoped to meet specific writers such as Hu Shi and Lu Xun. See Huang Meizi, *Satō Haruo to Taiwan, Chūgoku,* 4.
111. Yu Feng (ed.), *Yu Dafu haiwai wenji* (Anthology of Yu Dafu's Overseas Writings) (Beijing: Sanlian shudian, 1990), 517.
112. Ibid., 518.
113. Ibid., 519.
114. Woon Yoonwah, *Post-Colonial Chinese Literatures in Singapore and Malaysia* (Singapore: Department of Chinese Studies, National University of Singapore and Global Publishing Company, 2002), 85.
115. Ibid., 85.
116. Based on information contained in a letter from Ibuse to Itō Toramaru, which appears in Itō's *Iku Tappu shiryō hoben,* vol. 2: 213.
117. Woon Yoonwah, *Post-Colonial Chinese Literatures,* 89.
118. Ibid., 91.
119. Ibid., 92.
120. Ibid., 93.
121. Ibid., 96.
122. Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941–1945* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 459.
123. The Japanese scholar Suzuki Masao, who interviewed Japanese military officials stationed in Bukit Tinggi at the time of Yu Dafu's death, has established that the Japanese military police executed Yu in order to silence a potentially articulate witness to their crimes. See Woon Yoon Wah, *Post-Colonial Chinese Literatures,* 83.

Epilogue

1. From a poem written by Lu Xun in March 1931 for Katayama Matsumo, Uchiyama Kanzō's sister-in-law, describing rapidly deteriorating conditions in China. See W. J. F. Jenner, *Lu Xun Selected Poems* (Beijing: Foreign Languages Press, 1982), 45 and 133.
2. As quoted in Christopher Bayley and Tim Harper, *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941–1945* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005), 22.
3. Ōe Kenzaburo, "Japan, the Ambiguous, and Myself," in Tore Frängsmyr (ed.), *Le Prix Nobel* (Stockholm: Nobel Foundation Press, 1995).
4. Xing Lingjun, "Cunshang Chunju zai Zhongguo: dangdai Zhongguo wenxue sichao

xiade Cunshang rechushen," (Murakami Haruki in China: The Rage for Murakami in Contemporary Chinese Literary Thought) *Xibei Daxue xuebao* 35: 2 (March 2005), 169.

5. Ibid., 168.
6. Perhaps a better example of recent creative collaboration between artistic communities in China and Japan can be seen in the field of cinema in which there has been regular exchange between Chinese and Japanese filmmakers on a number of projects in the last two decades. One recent example of such collaboration is Zhang Yimou's 2005 film *Riding Alone for Thousands of Miles* starring the distinguished Japanese actor Takakura Ken in a bilingual production set in both countries and comprised of a Japanese and Chinese cast and crew. Both men have publicly described the opportunity to work together as the culmination of long-held dream.
7. Lu Yan, *Re-understanding Japan: Chinese Perspectives, 1895–1945* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002), 253.
8. Fujii Shōzō, *Lu Xun bijiao wenxue* (Lu Xun's Comparative Literature) (Shanghai: Shanghai waiyu jiaoyu chubanshe, 1997), 169. Originally contained in Mushanokōji's open letter to *New Youth* entitled, "A Letter to Chinese Readers I Have Not Yet Met."
9. Tanizaki Jun'ichirō, "Kinō kyō" (Yesterday and Today), in Itō Toramaru (ed.), *Tian Han zai Riben* (Tian Han in Japan). (Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1997), 180.
10. Ibid., 182.

Index

NB: In this index a continuous discussion over two or more pages is indicated by a span of page numbers, e.g. "57–59." *Passim* is used for a cluster of references in close but not continuous sequence.