

# SHIRON 試論

Essays in English Language and Literature

## CONTENTS

Royalism and Feminism :

- Aphra Behn's Dilemma in the Two Parts of *The Rover*  
 ..... Wataru Fukushi 1
- MacNeice, Munich and Self-Sufficiency  
 ..... Peter Robinson 15
- 『波』, ルイス, 太平洋  
 “I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone”  
 (*The Waves*, Louis, and the Pacific: “I am half in love with the typewriter and  
 the telephone”)  
 ..... 大田 信良 35  
 (Nobuyoshi Ota)
- 出来事の記述を逃れて  
 Julian Barnes の *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* (1989)  
 の主題  
 (The Escape from Descriptive Bondage: A Theme of Julian Barnes's *A History  
 of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* (1989) )  
 ..... 正宗 聡 57  
 (Satoshi Masamune)

March 2002

No. 40

SHIRON 40 試論 第40集

2002

# *SHIRON*

**Essays in English Language and Literature**

## **EDITORS**

EIICHI HARA

TAKASHI NAKAMURA

PETER ROBINSON

MITSUKO SUZUKI

**No. 40**

March 2002

Department of English Literature

Tohoku University

Sendai, Japan

# SHIRON

Essays in English Language and Literature No.40

ISSN: 0387-7590

Department of English Literature, Graduate School of Arts and Letters

TOHOKU UNIVERSITY

Kawauchi, Aoba-ku, Sendai 980-8576 Japan

Phone : 022-217-5961

<http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp>

# 試論 第40集 目次

(平成14年3月)

## CONTENTS

Synopses .....	iv
Royalism and Feminism :	
Aphra Behn's Dilemma in the Two Parts of <i>The Rover</i> ..... Wataru Fukushi	1
MacNeice, Munich and Self-Sufficiency ..... Peter Robinson	15
『波』, ルイス, 太平洋 “I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone” ..... 大田 信良	35
出来事の記述を逃れて Julian Barnes の <i>A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters</i> (1989) の主題 ..... 正宗 聡	57
研究会会則 .....	72
投稿規定 .....	73
編集後記 .....	74

## Synopses

### Royalism and Feminism: Aphra Behn's Dilemma in the Two Parts of *The Rover*

WATARU FUKUSHI  
Page 1

One of the common characteristics of Behn's *The Rover* and *The Second Part of The Rover* is that both contain two major motifs which are fundamentally at odds with each other. One is presenting feminism, or describing sympathetically female characters who freely choose their way of life; the other is representing libertinism, or creating a rake hero. The latter has been a controversial matter, as critics have discussed *The Rover* usually from a gender-centered point of view, criticizing, in the main, the misogynistic aspect of libertinism. However, taking account of the fact that Behn was a resolute supporter of the royalist cause, it is significant to consider not only the condition of female characters but also the discourse of the time associating rakish manners with royalism.

In this paper, I attempt to outline a part of Behn's central concerns expressed in her dramas by examining the conflicts between these two incompatible motifs, paying attention to the association of libertinism and royalism. Willmore the libertine is generally described as an attractive royalist hero in *The Rover*, but his rakish behavior is often relativized by other characters. In the process of such relativizations, some friction between libertinism and women's free will is foregrounded. Also in *The Second Part of The Rover*, a similar but differently rendered situation of confrontation is discussed. Under the oppressive circumstances for the royalists in the middle of the Exclusion Crisis, Behn dedicated this play to the Duke of York. Willmore's rakish manner is presented in a strengthened way so that royalism appears to be stressed at the expense of feminism; however, the achievement of woman's free choice is underlined at last as La Nuچه conquers Willmore in their battle of love. A brief investigation of *The Roundheads* is taken to confirm our conclusion that Behn's dilemma in reconciling her feminism and libertinism so as not to undermine her royalism is at the heart of her dramaturgy.

MacNeice, Munich and  
Self-Sufficiency

PETER ROBINSON

Page 15

In *Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay*, Louis MacNeice makes ‘a plea for impure poetry’, which is ‘conditioned by the poet’s life and the world around him.’ A poet is also to be a community’s ‘conscience, its critical faculty, its generous instinct.’ The Munich crisis of September 1938 was an occasion upon which both conscience and criticism were engaged. The political analyses of the immediate moment and the retrospect of the following three months helped shape the character of MacNeice’s *Autumn Journal* as an object and a reading experience. The poet’s desire for an impure poetry conditioned by circumstances is qualified by his sense that the way circumstance interacts with a poem is mediated by ‘the question of Form’. A poet’s technique then becomes a negotiation with context in which both dependence and independence are exercised. These issues are informed by MacNeice’s debate with Aristotle in *Autumn Journal* about the desire to be ‘spiritually self-supporting’ or to recognise that ‘other people are always / Organic to the self’ a debate whose terms reverberate both for questions in the poet’s private life, and for the policy of appeasement adopted in the face of Hitler’s territorial ambitions. An aim of this essay is to consider how, when MacNeice writes that ‘the sensible man must keep his aesthetic / And his moral standards apart’, the lines calculatedly travesty the poet’s manifest beliefs about ethics and art, beliefs demonstrated in the formal ordering of the poem — ones which, nevertheless, MacNeice has ‘refused to abstract from their context.’ My chapter on *Autumn Journal* and Munich looks at the relationship between the individual poet and a dramatic public event to underline how, by means of its formal and thematic procedures, a poem can play a role in its times — delineating by implication, as I do, ways in which poems obviously cannot undo the damage done by the various politicians’ errors of judgement in late September 1938.

*The Waves, Louis, and  
the Pacific:  
“I am half in love with  
the typewriter and  
the telephone”*

NOBUYOSHI OTA  
*Page 35*

This paper is concerned with the figure of Louis, an outsider with an Australian accent in *The Waves*. I argue that this text should be reinterpreted from the viewpoint of the Pacific, paying critical attention to the contradictory relations between Bernard, a national artist who attempts to write the absolute book about life, and Louis, an anti-artist of global media technology who is “half in love with the typewriter and the telephone.” To put it differently, the representations of writing or *écriture*, not those of a writer, in Woolf’s modernist text, implicitly refer to a more global context of postcolonialism operating beyond the merely political situation of British imperialism.

Analysing the ending of the novel, Hidekatsu Nojima argues that Woolf’s modernist quest for *kindaiteki jiga* (an authentic self) eventually produces the loss of the subject. Jane Marcus argues that the meaning of *The Waves* is ideologically determined by British imperialism, especially its colonial relationship with India. Nojima’s ethical interpretation seems to be completely opposed to Marcus’ political interpretation, yet the two readings are similar in their concern with the problems of subject, presuming that the fundamental conflict in the text lies in the relations between Bernard’s art and Nature or Percival and native people in India. Indeed, Marcus asserts that Woolf’s radical politics is definitely expressed in Bernard’s final ride against death, that is, the struggle of the white male subject against the racial or sexual Other. Furthermore, these interpretations seem to be confirmed by the figure of the yellow men migrating around the world in the monologue of Louis: ‘the tramp of dark men and yellow men migrating east, west, north and south; the eternal procession, women going with attache cases down the Strand.’ It is not difficult to relate the image of migration or the cultural others to the political themes of feminism and anti-imperialism in Woolf’s text. However, as Patric McGee points out, Marcus gives too much credit to Bernard and overlooks the deconstructive structure of the text; Woolf’s use of framings subverts the intentional authority of its own author-function, leaving the meaning of *The Waves* undecidable. My own proposition is that, while both Nojima and Marcus recognise the disintegration of the British Empire and its subject, their readings respectively fail to examine the possibility of ideological reconstruction of a new



subjectivity in British imperialism. To put it in the terms of recent postcolonial theory, their interpretations, in fact, disavow the racial difference between the self and the Other. Since the multiplicities of migrating people are contained in the name of Louis, my reading focuses on the various figurations of this multinational businessman, or, more properly, the representations of writing and media technology. Without privileging the images of a female writer, I suggest that the fundamental political issue of Woolf's text lies, not in the colonial relationship between Britain and India, but in the global situation of the Pacific to which Louis's commercial transaction with China symptomatically alludes.

The Escape from  
Descriptive Bondage:  
A Theme of  
Julian Barnes's  
*A History of the World  
in 10 1/2 Chapters* (1989)

SATOSHI MASAMUNE  
Page 57

This paper tries to prove that Julian Barnes's *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* sheds a new light on a problem of postmodern metafiction—that of the “ref-erent.”

One problematic of this novel is that descriptions of events are determined by the authorities in a given community, and subsequently work as facts or beliefs among its members, effacing alternative perspectives. This seemingly oppressive system is supported by the members of the community. As it is impossible to gain access to an event once it has passed, they have no means of proving whether a certain description of it is true or not, and thus, willingly or reluctantly, must rely on someone else to give them the ‘true’ description. In this sense authoritative descriptions of events are socially necessary. On the other hand, they have a negative aspect: the members of the community will lose the freedom to make their own descriptions of events.

The distinction made by J. L. Austin between constative and performative utterances is denied by himself; he states that all utterances are performative ones. A description of a historical event needs an authoritative person to claim it as true. Each such claim can be positioned at a certain point in time and place; their performative power is limited. However, if the same claim is repeated by non-authorities, what is claimed can come to function as a belief or a fact.

Barnes tries to point out that even claims augmented through repetition by non-authorities will cease to be effective in the long run, as he shows the temporal chemical changes suffered by the materials

underlying those claims. This idea might make people who are not inclined to affirm pre-determined beliefs or facts feel released from descriptive bondage, although it might lead them to a sort of nihilism.

Barnes focuses on a specific performative utterance, "I love you," in the half-chapter of the novel. The characteristic of this utterance is to promise. If true love has been sworn, the utterer is expected to keep to it thereafter. The person in love, Barnes seems to suggest, can enjoy his feelings with no constraint as long as he can defer confessing his love to the beloved. Solipsistic as it may sound, that state might suggest another way of escaping from descriptive bondage, and might, perhaps, be the entrance to the realm of private language. Thus, the dichotomy between authoritative descriptions and personal ones might be transformed into the dichotomy between ordinary and private language.

## Royalism and Feminism: Aphra Behn's Dilemma in the Two Parts of *The Rover*

Wataru Fukushi

Aphra Behn began her literary career in 1670 with a tragicomedy called *The Forc'd Marriage*. The title is symbolic enough to show her principal matter of concern; for, in her dramas, Behn constantly presented female characters who try to marry the man of their choice, escaping from the partner decided by their parents. It is noteworthy that Behn often portrays sympathetically such female characters in difficulties, characters like Erminia in *The Forc'd Marriage*, Cloris in *The Amorous Prince*, and Florinda in *The Rover*. The forced marriage is presented as a matter of vital importance which drives the plot in *The Rover*. The nuptials of the virtuous heroine Florinda and her constant lover Belville constitute a characteristic case in which a woman makes a satisfactory choice of her own. Viewed from Florinda's side, the marriage at the denouement is significant because it produces a happy ending. Certainly one of the primal concerns in Behn's dramas, fully worked-out in *The Rover*, is to describe women who freely choose their way of life: in other words, to present feminism—pity for, vindication of, and sympathy for women in trouble.<sup>1</sup>

Representing libertinism was another main theme for Behn. She described various libertines in her works, always giving them two ambivalent features: they are attractive, but tyrannical. For example, in her second play, *The Amorous Prince*, published in 1671, Behn created the rakish Frederick, loved by the chaste Cloris. He is attractive, at least for Cloris, but so licentious as to attempt the seduction of women merely to satisfy his desires. His wildness is so marked that he even has it in mind to rape another maid. Frederick's tyrannical violence is, however, finally neutralized so that a happy ending for the woman is emphasized—his charm, not his wildness, being underlined.

The characteristics of the libertine Willmore in *The Rover* are not very different from those of Frederick: he is also attractive and wild. Yet, one significant difference is that his rakish manner is never

reformed. This makes the marriage of Willmore and Hellena complicated. It is not merely described as the satisfactory result of a woman's free choice, although Hellena does wish it, but also as an acceptable union for the libertine. Since it happens without Willmore's reformation, he might well threaten his wife's future happiness after the marriage. Hellena must want Willmore to be faithful in their matrimony for her reputation, but it is not at all certain that he will be constant to her—because Willmore is not simply an attractive character but preserves both charm and wildness.

The two couples juxtaposed at the end of *The Rover* suggest that two incompatible modes coexist in the play: one is the consummation of true love, or the fulfilling of a woman's free choice, represented in the marriage of Belville and Florinda, and the other is the survival of libertinism in that of Willmore and Hellena. These two modes are fundamentally drawn out in separate directions so that their coexistence generates a tension emerging from several conflicts between Willmore and the others.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the causes of that tension. A first and necessary step will be to compare *The Rover* with *The Second Part of The Rover*; for these two plays share a similar tension though it is revealed in different ways. Secondly, it will be important to consider not only the representation of female characters, as many critics have done,<sup>2</sup> but also the difficulty of representing rakes, a difficulty with which Behn will have struggled. Examining only a misogynistic aspect to libertinism might lead us to miss another side: its association with the royalists. As Susan Owen has shown, there were certain discourses which related party politics with sexual politics around the period of the Exclusion Crisis.<sup>3</sup> Considering that Behn was a resolute supporter of the royalist cause throughout her life, Owen's suggestion should not be neglected.<sup>4</sup> We should therefore historicize the rakish manners represented in *The Rover* and *The Second Part of The Rover* in interpreting them: while libertinism was regarded as an abominable form of behavior for some women, it was related to an image of the royalist. Feminism and libertinism are fundamentally at odds; but Behn needed to reconcile them somehow in order not to undermine her royalism.

## I

First, we need to take a short view of the historical and political context around the time *The Rover* was written and its significance for

Behn. It is well known that the revelation of the Popish Plot in the autumn of 1678 provoked a “four-year roller-coaster of political crisis”<sup>5</sup> known as the Exclusion Crisis. The political confrontation between the King and parliament which involved the royalists and the opposition was so furious that it was widely feared civil war would break out again. It cannot be overstated that the revelation of the Popish Plot was a crucial turning point in the party politics of the period; however, this political confrontation did not suddenly explode in 1678. There had been continuous struggles between the two sides since the Restoration.<sup>6</sup> As is recorded in many satirical poems,<sup>7</sup> the antagonism was apparent even from the early 1670s; in addition, the association of libertinism and the royalists was also evident from an early phase of the confrontation. It might be confirmed through the staging of *The Libertine* by Thomas Shadwell in 1675. Shadwell, who was an advocate of the Earl of Shaftesbury and the parliamentarians during the Crisis, bitterly satirized the rakish style in a play where libertines are described as demonic villains and finally sent to Hell. According to Janet Todd, contemporary audiences certainly saw the play as direct criticism of the royalists.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, it must have been difficult for Behn (who stood by the King and his supporters) to represent a rake as an abominable rogue after the staging of *The Libertine*. She would not have wanted to be regarded as an anti-royalist in describing a libertine as a villain or by making him reform and repent his behavior.

Willmore in *The Rover* is generally depicted as an attractive royalist hero. He is a wandering mercenary soldier who travels with the “Prince” (1.2.61)<sup>9</sup> and is hired by the Spanish navy: that is, he is a typical cavalier of the Interregnum period in which this drama is set. A number of royalist aristocrats—such as Thomas Killigrew, author of *Thomaso*, the source for the two parts of *The Rover*—were exiled from England with Charles and earned their living as mercenary soldiers during the Commonwealth. Considering that people tended to draw a parallel between the Interregnum and the 1670s,<sup>10</sup> Willmore may be thought a royalist not of the 1640s but of the Restoration. His gay and courageous humour would be received as charms characteristic of the current royalist by the audience of that time.

Willmore’s merry character is presented as soon as he makes his first appearance on the stage: “my business ashore was only to enjoy myself a little this Carnival” (1.2.63–4). With a sexual implication that he will “enjoy” the loose and festive space of the “Carnival”, he

declares he has an inclination to mirth. Willmore's gallantry is described sufficiently in the scene where he quarrels with his company on the question of whether he should enter Angellica's lodgings or not. Frederick's speech shows well the common uneasiness about the bawdy house: "death Man, she'll Murder thee [Willmore]" (2.1.258). It was often the case with prostitutes that they hired bullies in order to defend themselves; therefore, they were considered to bear equivocal features—sexual allurement and potential violence which might deprive the customer of his life. What is tested at the gate of Angellica's house is masculinity in two senses: conquering women and confronting violence. Willmore asserts his when he replies: "Oh! fear me not, shall I not venture where a Beauty calls? a lovely Charming Beauty! for fear of danger!" (2.1.259–60)

Willmore's sexual attractiveness is most fully shown during the scene in which he seduces Angellica. His conquest of Angellica should satisfy vicariously the male audience's desire:

ANGELLICA. The low esteem you have of me, perhaps  
 May bring my heart again:  
 For I have pride, that yet surmounts my Love.  
 WILLMORE. Throw off this Pride, this Enemy to Bliss,  
 And shew the Pow'r of Love: 'tis with those Arms  
 I can be only vanquisht, made a Slave.  
 ANGELLICA. Is all my mighty expectation vanisht?  
 —No, I will not hear thee talk—thou hast a Charm  
 In every word that draws my heart away.  
 And all the Thousand Trophies I design'd  
 Thou hast undone—[. . .]. (2.1.391–401)

It is notable that Willmore has enough insight to perceive that her pride is the last obstacle to his courtship. As Angellica has stated that "No Matter, I'm not displeas'd with their [male characters'] rallying; their wonder feeds my vanity, and he that wishes but to buy, gives me more Pride, than he that gives my Price, can make my pleasure" (2.1.115–7), pride is essential for her individuality as a whore; however, torn between pride and love, she is now in a dilemma. It represents the triumph of libertinism that Willmore succeeds in undermining Angellica's fundamental quality and leading her into bed. His success is based on a misogyny which assumes male predominance over the female and regards a woman as merely an object for the fulfilling of a man's desire—that is to say, as an exchangeable commodity. Willmore's conquest of Angellica is the moment when a

libertine possesses a woman as an object (and what is more, for free). Angellica is commodified not only as a character—as the portraits hung on her abode signify<sup>11</sup>—but also as a physical object, the actress's body on stage being an alluring object for male spectators. This is, therefore, a gratifying performance vicariously satisfying the male audience's desire. The male audience can gaze at Angellica who is about to submit to Willmore with whom they can identify, fulfilling their visual pleasure.<sup>12</sup> At this point, Willmore, the royalist libertine, is at the high point of his attractiveness.

However, Willmore's heroic charm decreases from this moment on. We soon discover Willmore's success in not only conquering Angellica but also receiving some money from her in the scene where he boasts his accomplishment to his company (3.1.87–118). Being in rapture about his triumph over Angellica, Willmore reveals his frivolity: “pox of Poverty it makes a Man a slave, makes Wit and Honour sneak . . .” (3.1.112–3). This attitude, though jokily sneering at poverty, makes a satirical contrast with his courting rhetoric which criticized Angellica for her mercenary vice: “Yes, I am poor — but I'm a Gentleman, / And one that Scornes this baseness which you practice” (2.1.320–1). It reveals that his heroic speech condemning Angellica was no more than a strategy. In addition, when Willmore curses poverty, his speech, curiously enough, shows a resemblance the foppish Blunt's lines: “I thank my Stars, I had more Grace than to forfeit my Estate by Cavaliering” (1.2.46–7). Blunt's preference of “Estate” to “Cavaliering”—to play and to be a cavalier—well testifies that he is a typical country squire. His foppish character is mocked in several scenes, sometimes by Willmore and Belvile; nevertheless, Willmore's desire for wealth do reveal a similarity with Blunt after the former's conquest of Angellica.

Hellena takes the initiative against Willmore in the battle of love between them, so that he appears to be beaten in marrying her; however, their nuptials are not described as a simple victory for Hellena. Marriage seems the most detestable thing for a libertine like Willmore, for, officially, it required husband and wife to be constant to each other in order to maintain their reputations. Seen from this viewpoint, the marriage of Willmore and Hellena does seem a defeat for Willmore; however, we should not overlook Willmore's shifty statement: “Well, I see we are both upon our Guards, and I see there's no way to conquer good Nature but by yielding,—here—give me thy hand—one kiss and I am thine;—” (5.1.435–7). The equivocality of their marriage is well

revealed in this paradoxical speech: Willmore accepts a “yielding” to Hellena because it is the only way to “conquer” her. In part, marriage is a triumph for Hellena because she can manage to contain Willmore within the system of matrimony; on the other hand, it is, in part, a desirable result for Willmore because he can possess both Hellena’s body and fortune: “Ha! my Gipsie worth Two Hundred Thousand Crowns!—oh how I long to be with her—pox, I knew she was of Quality” (4.1.271–2). For Willmore, marriage with Hellena suggests not a termination of his rakish career, but a chance to gain the property which will solve his financial predicament. Moreover, when Willmore tells Hellena his name is “*Robert the Constant*” (5.1.456), his claim of constancy only sounds jokey. He has never been faithful, as he deceived Angellica, and his curious titling himself as “*the Constant*” conversely convinces us that he will never be so after the wedding. The marriage of Hellena and Willmore does not simply mean Hellena’s victory because she cannot reform his rakishness and Willmore profits financially by it.

Libertinism is not necessarily presented as a very attractive mode; however, the nuptials of Willmore and Hellena do not completely subvert it. More significantly there are always viewpoints which relativize Willmore’s libertinism, and these generate the tension within the play. One of those viewpoints is conspicuous in the scene where Blunt is ‘discovered’:

Oh Lord!

I am got out at last, and (which is a Miracle) without a Clue—and now to Damning and Cursing!—but if that wou’d ease me, where shall I begin? with my Fortune, my self, or the Quean that couzen’d me—what a Dog was I to believe in Woman? oh Coxcomb!—Ignorant conceited Coxcomb! [. . . ] but as I was in my right Wits, to be thus cheated, confirms it I am a dull believing *English Country Fop*—[. . . ]. (3.2.87–99)

This scene simultaneously suggests two different effects. One is derived from the fact that Blunt’s soliloquy is presented in a discovery scene, which is intended to increase the visual effect.<sup>13</sup> Playwrights of the period use this type of scene to present some shocking sight—of terrible torture, of an assignation in a grove, or of a voluptuous bed chamber—in order to hold the audience’s attention. In this case its use is parodic to make fun of Blunt, because the discovery of his miserable figure is rather more laughable than shocking. His appearance on stage in dirty underwear makes a great contrast with the usual use of the dis-



covery scene in which an actress is presented in an erotic, loose dress. In fact, Blunt's miserable appearance and speech functions to emphasize the difference between him and the royalist aristocrats. However, we need to note that he is described as a member of Willmore's company throughout the play. While he has characteristics which differ from those of the royalists, he continues to be "one of us" (1.2.66) for the royalists: this leads us to the second effect of this scene. That is, the audience's mockery of Blunt can be turned on to Willmore because of their resemblance. Blunt's identification with a "Dog" in this scene reminds us that Willmore also described himself as a "Melancholy Dog" (3.1.133). Moreover, they have in common so vile a humour as to call Florinda a whore and to attempt to rape her—Willmore regards that as just a "pure Accident" (3.2.142) to conquer a beauty, while Blunt, who is abused by the prostitute Lucetta, considers that a chance to "be reveng'd on one Whore for the sins of another" (4.1.614–5). On the one hand, the difference between Blunt and Willmore is certainly discovered and mocked; on the other, their similarity is also suggested so that we may wonder how far that difference does function to denigrate Blunt alone. What is discovered and mocked is, explicitly, Blunt's ridiculousness; however, it can also be, implicitly, Willmore's frivolous character.

The next point is made through Belvile, the other royalist aristocrat. He is put into a similar situation to that of Willmore—his estate confiscated and in exile—and is always friendly to him, but there is one clear difference between them concerning the sexual norm. Belvile never accepts Willmore's rakish manners, and condemns them when his beloved Florinda is exposed to their threat. Belvile's fury against Willmore who has proposed to rape Florinda reveals not only his faithful love but also the fact that Willmore's libertinism is challenged by another mode of love. While Willmore regards Florinda as an "Errant Harlot" (3.2.216), an exchangeable commodity, Belvile distinguishes her from other women and feels "Reverence" (3.2.219) for her. His constant love leads to the consummation of Florinda's own choice. The happy ending in the marriage between Belvile and Florinda suggests both that libertinism is not the only style valued in this play and that the mode of true love relativizes Willmore's manners.

In the scene where Angellica threatens him with a pistol, Willmore's rakishness is highlighted and relativized:

ANGELLICA. Yes, Traitor,

Does not thy guilty blood run shivering through thy Veins?  
 Hast thou no horreur at this sight, that tells thee,  
 Thou hast not long to boast thy shameful Conquest?  
 WILLMORE. Faith, no Child, my blood keeps its old Ebbs and  
 Flows still, and that usual heat too, that cou'd oblige thee with  
 a kindness, had I but opportunity. (5.1.202–8)

It is notable that Willmore will not reform his rakish manner even in this emergency. However, it is more significant to realize that his libertinism is literally threatened. Angellica's claim is based on her love for Willmore—just like Florinda's for Belvile. While Willmore regarded her as only an exchangeable commodity, Angellica looked on him as a true lover: "But I have given him my Eternal rest, / My whole repose, my future joys, my Heart! / My Virgin heart *Moretta*; Oh 'tis gone!" (4.1.232–4) Thus, she has good reason to condemn Willmore's "shameful Conquest", for her "Virgin heart" was outraged by the faithless libertine. Like Florinda who regards forced marriages for fortune as "ill Customes" (1.1.60), Angellica reveals her need for true love when she argues that marriage for fortune is "the same Mercenary Crime" (2.1.357) as prostitution. Angellica leaves the stage with her virgin heart neglected; however, she produces the critical moment when libertinism is drastically relativized. Although her violent conduct in holding a pistol to his head ruins her chance of success, the mode of true love will not fade out but be incarnate in the Florinda and Belvile pairing. Angellica's pistol threatening and relativizing Willmore's rakishness reveals the place where the tension arises—between the woman's desire and the desire of the libertine.

## II

*The Second Part of The Rover* is said to have been performed some time before 18 January 1681, when Parliament was dissolved. Around that time, the opposition had so much the upper hand that the Exclusion of James was believed to be inevitable. Behn, in such a situation, dedicated this play to the Duke of York. This was a highly political act, declaring her support for the royal brothers; in addition, the play itself contains many more political references than its previous part. It would seem that the rakish style and royalism would be stressed at the expense of feminism; however, it is not the fulfillment of the rake's desire but the achievement of a woman's free choice that is foregrounded. The tension, which was generated in the juxtaposition of the

two incompatible modes in *The Rover*, is presented in a different manner in the Willmore and La Nuche pairing. Behn describes libertinism as a central concept under the necessity of supporting the royalist in hard times, but she can not entirely dismiss her other primal concern, feminism.

*The Second Part* presents libertinism in a strengthened way, dispelling some elements which relativized the rake Willmore in the previous part. The first point is the disappearance of the faithful couple. That Belvile and Florinda are “left [. . .] in health at St. *Germans*” (1.1.81)<sup>14</sup> is symbolic, for the mode of constant love embodied by the two lovers does not develop at all in this part. Ariadne, who is forced to marry Beaumont, differs from Florinda (who faithfully pursued her sole lover) but is much nearer to Hellena: “I hate your dull temperate Lover, ’tis such a husbandly quality! like *Beaumont’s* addresses to me, whom neither joy nor anger puts in motion” (2.1.393–5). She regards her fiancé, Beaumont, as the “formal Matrimonial Fop” (2.1.416) and in vain pursues Willmore. Similarly, Beaumont does not share the constant humour with Belvile: “[. . .] a Husband that will deal thee some Love is better than one who can give thee none” (2.1.449–50). While he makes thus an unfaithful and plausible excuse for Ariadne, he chases, also in vain, the “charming Beauty, fair *La Nuche*” (2.1.413). They eventually marry, but that does not challenge libertinism as the constancy of Belvile and Florinda had done. Secondly, another fetter for the rakish mode vanishes: Willmore’s wife, Hellena. When Willmore reports Hellena’s death in a sea storm—it is an irony because she asked him “Can you storm?” (*The Rover*, 1.2.161) in order to know if he loves her or not—on their way to Madrid, it is noted in the stage direction that he should tell it “*With a Sham sadness*” (1.1.124). As Beaumont remarks, “Marriage has not tam’d you” (1.1.122); Willmore is not reformed, or rather, his rakishness and misogyny are much more conspicuous than in the previous part.

Libertinism moves to the center when Willmore becomes literally the central character trying to control both the main plot of his love affair with La Nuche and the sub plot of mocking the foppish characters, Blunt and Fetherfool. Willmore disguises himself as a mountebank and performs a mock-fortune-telling in order to attract La Nuche: “I must confess you’re ruin’d if you yield, and yet not all your Pride, not all your Vows, your Wit, your Resolution or your Cunning, can hinder him from Conquering absolutely . . .” (3.1.210–2). Unfortunately for him, La Nuche replies “No,—I will controul my Stars and

Inclinations” (3.1.214). On the contrary, it sounds ironically at last when he is captured by La Nuche in spite of his intention to court Ariadne. Yet he does try to establish an order so that the dramatic world will fit his desires. Willmore also voluntarily involves himself in the mocking plot: “I must have my share of this jest, and for divers and sundry reasons thereunto belonging, must be this very Mountibank expected” (1.1.230–2). While Willmore was not involved in the mocking of Blunt in *The Rover*, he states that “the Rogues [Blunt and Fetherfool] must be couzen’d” (1.1.116). He manages the sub plot as a mountebank in order to satisfy his desire for “mirth” (1.1.116).

Since Willmore takes part in the sub plot, it is apparent that the structuring of conflict between royalism and the opposition stresses the former. In addition to Willmore’s voluntary participation in the mocking of Blunt and Fetherfool, his motive for it is also worth noting: “these two politick Asses must be couzen’d” (1.1.242–3). Though the word “politick” is used here to mean ‘prudent’ (of course an irony), it should not be missed that it connotes that other meaning, ‘political’. Willmore’s antagonistic attitude toward Blunt and Fetherfool contains an aspect of political rivalry, which is also confirmed in the speech and action of the other side:

BLUNT. The Devil’s in’t if this will not redeem my reputation with the Captain, and give him to understand that all the wit does not lye in the Family of the *Willmore*’s, but that this noddle of mine can be fruitful too upon occasion.

FETHERFOOL. Ay, and Lord how we’l domineer, *Ned*, hah—over *Willmore* and the rest of the Renegado Officers, when we have married these Lady Monsters, hah, *Ned*!

(1.1.218–24)

It is significant that both Blunt and Fetherfool are willing to challenge Willmore, for it provides a vivid contrast with Blunt in the previous part. While, despite their differences in humour, he was a docile friend of Willmore throughout *The Rover*, here Blunt contrives to outwit Willmore by marrying the “Lady Monsters”. As the word “Renegado” signifies, their position is based on a different faith or, more practically, a different political side from Willmore and the other royalists. In addition, the fact that their intriguing to marry the “Lady Monsters” is kept from the company of royalists confirms that they bear the mark of the Whigs: to “doat in secret” (2.1.57) was related to Whiggish hypocrisy.<sup>15</sup> The mocking of Blunt and Fetherfool—managed by the royalist Willmore—is, therefore, equivalent to satirizing the Whigs.

The most extraordinary figures in this play, the “Lady Monsters”, also function in emphasizing the triumph of the royalist. They are, in the first place, the very representation of the Other—they are rich, Jewish, come from Mexico, and are deformed—and to some extent subvert the supposed male dominance over the dramatic world. The monsters can partly defy the male desire to treat them as commodities: they outwit and overwhelm Blunt and Fetherfool who merely think of them as the source of fortune both in their speech and their physical peculiarity—especially the “Heroical and Masculine” (3.1.76) body of the Giant. However, the similar desire of the other side, the royalists Shift and Hunt, to gain the fortune of the monsters does not suffer from their resistance: “The Gyant [. . .] is in love with me [Shift], the Dwarf with Ensign *Hunt*, and as we may manage matters it may prove lucky” (1.1.191–2). Luckily, the two royalists are able to “manage matters” and to marry the monsters. Although they consider marriage as only a means of gaining property, just like Blunt and Fetherfool, their mercenary desire is not focalized.

Libertinism and royalism are accentuated because the play lacks factors opposing them and viewpoints to reveal their defects. It seems that the theme of the woman’s choice is disregarded in this play; however, one critical point emerges when Willmore the libertine at last fails to complete his final aim—to conquer the woman he desires:

LA NUCHE. And you it seems mistook me for this Lady [Ariadne]; [. . .] now I am yours, and o’re the habitable World will follow you, and live and starve by turns as fortune pleases.  
 WILLMORE. Nay, by this light, Child, I knew when once thou’dst try’d me, thou’dst ne’r part with me—give me thy hand, no poverty shall part us. [. . .] now here’s a bargain made without the formal foppery of Marriage. (5.1.501–9)

The fact that Willmore “mistook” his partner when he led her to bed is meaningful. Unlike the Willmore in *The Rover*, he can not satisfy his desire in this play; on the contrary, it is La Nuche who attains her aim as she declares “[. . .] I will not lose the glory on’t” (5.1.494). Although Willmore is trying to control the dramatic world and is on the whole successful, he fails to triumph in this critical point for a gallant. In other words, it is not the desire of the libertine but the attainment of woman’s will that is eventually brought into focus. La Nuche’s triumph over Willmore is crucial in that it fractures the libertine-centered order in the play, and, more importantly, that it generates a tension between the two irreconcilables: the libertine’s desire and the woman’s

free will.

Yet, it is also important to draw attention to the plot that makes La Nuche's victory ambiguous. Though Willmore accepts her, he avoids "the formal foppery of Marriage" which will fetter him, at least outwardly, in the legal sanction of constancy—which he had suffered in *The Rover*. As he states "You [Beaumont and Ariadne] have a hankering after Marriage still, but I am for Love and Gallantry" (5.1.610–1), the evasion of marriage enables Willmore to vow to maintain his libertinism. In addition, considering that Willmore disguises himself as a mountebank and accomplishes the mocking of Blunt and Fetherfool soon after he is defeated by La Nuche, there is a drive in the plot structure that tries to reaffirm the libertine-centered (therefore royalist-centered) dramatic world—which was constructed by putting Willmore in the central position, but which was qualified by La Nuche. This play shows the woman's triumph over a libertine, but—because of this very triumph—there are several contrivances to obscure it.

### III

Finally, let us look at *The Roundheads or, The Good Old Cause* which was produced in December 1681 when the fury of the Popish Plot was coming to a favorable conclusion for the royalists. This play is a highly political one among Behn's dramas and is apparently filled with devices to fortify royalism. It seems that the female characters are debased for the purpose of stressing the nobility of the male royalists; however, Behn's feminism is not completely sidelined though it is mostly concealed and revealed only in oblique points.

In the first place, *The Roundheads* contains some characteristics of the Tory propaganda:

Is there such god-like Vertue in your Sex?  
 Or rather, in your Party.  
 Curse on the Lies and Cheats of Conventicles,  
 That taught me first to think Heroicks Divels,  
 Blood-thirsty, lewd, tyrannick Savage Monsters.  
 —But I believe 'em Angels all, if all like *Loveless*.  
 What heavenly thing then must the Master be,  
 Whose Servants are Divine? (5.1.379–86)<sup>16</sup>

The allusion to "the Master", or the King, as a divine thing is the key point in Lady Lambert's speech. It confirms the hierarchical structuring which puts the royalist at the top—the master should be a "heav-

only thing”—by providing a foundation to heighten royalism from the side of the opposition, the wife of the parliamentarians’ leader.

It appears that a vain woman changes her mind when enlightened by the nobility of a royalist; however, a similar tension seen in the two parts of *The Rover* is implied here. The love sworn by the protagonist which moves Lady Lambert seems to be a constant one; yet the name of the protagonist is, oddly, ‘Loveless’, a typical libertine. Though Loveless does not seem to be love-less or a misogynist, his courting of Lady Lambert is shamelessly adulterous and his name casts a rakish tone over his character. Similarly, Lady Lambert could be a ‘lamb’ to be devoured by the rake pretending to be a constant lover.<sup>17</sup> While the woman’s choice and male desire appear compatible here, it is implied in their names that there still exists a similar tension between royalism and feminism in this overtly political play.

It must have been a hard task for Behn to represent a rake in the two parts of *The Rover*. Libertinism and feminism are essentially incompatible; however, Behn could not make Willmore reform his behavior as she did Frederick in *The Amorous Prince*, because to represent a libertine’s reformation had come to imply an anti-royalist predilection by the time *The Rover* was written. It is, therefore, the result of a negotiation under the pressure of an urgent political crisis between Behn’s feminism and royalism—which was closely associated with the rakish style—that generates the tension shown in the two parts of *The Rover*. As can also be seen in Behn’s highly political drama, *The Roundheads*, her dilemma in presenting feminism and libertinism is thus at the heart of Aphra Behn’s dramaturgy.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I do not intend to suggest that Aphra Behn shares the modern concept of ‘feminism’, or that there was a ‘feminism’ in the seventeenth century. However, we can find compassionate lines in Behn’s works, which can be called feminism in the most fundamental sense.

<sup>2</sup> Elin Diamond, for instance, has argued the close relationship between a libertine’s action and the principle of the patriarchal rule. See Diamond, “*Gestus* and Signature in Aphra Behn’s *The Rover*,” *ELH* 56 (1989): 519–41.

<sup>3</sup> See Susan Owen, *Restoration Theatre and Crisis* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996), 157–60. I owe a good deal to Owen’s work in composing my essay.

<sup>4</sup> For Behn’s royalism, see Janet Todd, *The Secret Life of Aphra Behn* (1996: London: Pandora, 2000), 5–6.

<sup>5</sup> Owen, *Crisis*, 1.

<sup>6</sup> See Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987), 62.

<sup>7</sup> For example, see George deForest Lord, et al. eds., *Poems on Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660–1714*, 7 vols. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963), 1, 179–84, 213–9. Hereafter abbreviated as *POAS*.

<sup>8</sup> See Todd, *The Secret Life*, 213–4.

<sup>9</sup> Aphra Behn, *The Rover. Or, The Banish't Cavaliers. The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd, 7 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1996), 5, 445–521. All references are to this edition. The numbers of act, scene, and line are given in parenthesis.

<sup>10</sup> See Owen, *Crisis*, 35–6.

<sup>11</sup> The significance of the pictures of Angellica has been widely argued. See Janet Todd, *The Sign of Angellica: Women, Writing and Fiction, 1660–1800* (New York: Columbia UP, 1989), 1–2, Nancy Copeland, “‘Once a whore and ever’? Whore and Virgin in *The Rover* and Its Antecedents,” *Restoration* 16 (1992): 20–7, 23–4, Diamond, “*Gestus* and Signature”, 534–7, and Julie Nash, “‘The sight on’t would beget a warm desire’: Visual Pleasure in Aphra Behn’s *The Rover*,” *Restoration* 18 (1994): 77–87, 78–80.

<sup>12</sup> For the concept of visual pleasure, see Laura Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” *Visual and Other Pleasures* (London: Macmillan, 1989), 14–26. See also Nash, “The sight on’t”, 77–87.

<sup>13</sup> For the ‘discovery scene’, see Peter Holland, *The Ornament of Action: Text and Performance in Restoration Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979), 36–42.

<sup>14</sup> Aphra Behn, *The Second Part of The Rover. The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd, 7 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1996), 6, 223–98. All references are to this edition. The numbers of act, scene, and line are given in parenthesis.

<sup>15</sup> Satirizing the Whigs as lecherous was a typical royalist device for criticizing their inconstant hypocritical character; the Whigs often attacked the libertinism prevalent at court as a source for the social decay in public morals. For the Whigs’ attack, see Harris, *London Crowds*, 80. For exemplary royalistic satire of the hypocritical Whigs, see *POAS*, 2, 103–6.

<sup>16</sup> Aphra Behn, *The Roundheads or, The Good Old Cause. The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd, 7 vols. (London: William Pickering, 1996), 6, 357–424.

<sup>17</sup> In John Tatham’s *The Rump*, the source of *The Roundheads*, the names of some characters taken from real lords of the Rump Parliament were slightly altered in the first edition: for example, Lambert as Bertlam. Behn’s application of the second edition—Lambert as Lambert—has, it seems to me, some meaning other than the fact that she simply no longer needed to worry about the danger of representing the real parliamentarians.



## MacNeice, Munich and Self-Sufficiency

Peter Robinson

In *Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay*, Louis MacNeice makes ‘a plea for impure poetry’, which is ‘conditioned by the poet’s life and the world around him.’ A poet is also to be a community’s ‘conscience, its critical faculty, its generous instinct.’<sup>1</sup> The Munich crisis of September 1938 was an occasion upon which both conscience and criticism were engaged. The political analyses of the immediate moment and the retrospect of the following three months helped shape the character of MacNeice’s *Autumn Journal* as an object and a reading experience. The poet’s desire for an impure poetry conditioned by circumstances is qualified by his sense that the way circumstance interacts with a poem is mediated by ‘the question of Form’.<sup>2</sup> A poet’s technique then becomes a negotiation with context in which both dependence and independence are exercised. These issues are informed by MacNeice’s debate with Aristotle in *Autumn Journal* about the desire to be ‘spiritually self-supporting’ or to recognise that ‘other people are always / Organic to the self’, a debate whose terms reverberate both for questions in the poet’s private life, and for the policy of appeasement adopted in the face of Hitler’s territorial ambitions.

An aim of this essay is to consider how, when MacNeice writes that ‘the sensible man must keep his aesthetic / And his moral standards apart’,<sup>3</sup> the lines calculatedly travesty the poet’s manifest beliefs about ethics and art, beliefs demonstrated in the formal ordering of the poem — ones which, nevertheless, MacNeice has ‘refused to abstract from their context.’<sup>4</sup> At the close of *Modern Poetry* MacNeice, writing in early 1938, imagined that

When the crisis comes, poetry may for a time be degraded or even silenced, but it will reappear, as one of the chief embodiments of human dignity, when people once more have time for play and criticism.<sup>5</sup>

Yet, in the event, poetry was neither silenced nor degraded, and it did not need to wait until people had ‘time for play and criticism’ — itself

a phrase which faintly and haplessly degrades the place poetry can and does have in life, whether there is a crisis going on or not. So my chapter on *Autumn Journal* and Munich looks at the relationship between the individual poet and a dramatic public event to underline how, by means of its formal and thematic procedures, a poem can play a role in its times — delineating by implication, as I do, ways in which poems obviously cannot undo the damage done by the various politicians' errors of judgement in late September 1938.

## 1

On 27 May 1992, the British Prime Minister John Major signed a document formally nullifying the Munich Agreement. Neville Chamberlain had put his signature to the original document at 2 a.m. on 30 September 1938. First rumours of a Czech putsch had begun on 21 May of the same year, when the Czech army, in response to well-founded rumours of German aggression had partially mobilized. Resulting diplomatic pressure had obliged Hitler, much to his annoyance, to postpone his plans. In August, the month *Autumn Journal* begins, Lord Runciman visited the Sudetenlands to pressurize the Czech government into appeasing German interests there. On 15 September Neville Chamberlain flew to Berchtesgaden. He met Hitler again on 22-3 September at Godesberg, where Hitler presented what amounted to an ultimatum, the Godesberg Memorandum. On the 25th, the British Cabinet decided it could not accept the terms of this memorandum, nor urge them on the Czech Government. On the 26th, preparations for war began, and Chamberlain sent via Sir Horace Wilson a personal letter to Hitler. At 10.30 p.m. on 27 September, Hitler directed a reply to Chamberlain asking him to judge if he could 'bring the Government in Prague to reason at the very last hour'.<sup>6</sup>

On 28 September, 'Black Wednesday', the day war seemed inevitable, the British Fleet was mobilized. Further diplomatic efforts involving British appeals to Mussolini<sup>7</sup> and ambassadorial visits to Hitler from France, Britain, and Italy, produced the suggestion of a conference. Thus, on 29-30 September came about the historic Munich Pact, which effectively acceded to Hitler's Godesberg Memorandum, with its 1 October deadline for the secession of the Sudetenlands. It also produced Chamberlain's scrap of paper, a private agreement between himself and Hitler, which promised 'Peace for our time'. Alan Bullock sardonically observes that after the agreement was

reached ‘the two dictators left to the British and French the odious task of communicating to the Czechs the terms for the partition of their country.’<sup>8</sup> On 1 October, German troops marched into the Sudetenlands. The Czechs went down, ‘and without fighting’ (117)<sup>9</sup>, in MacNeice’s words.

‘No case of this kind can be judged apart from its circumstances’, Winston Churchill wrote, and ‘The facts may be unknown at the time, and estimates of them must be largely guesswork’.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, Chamberlain had himself explained that ‘we must adjust our foreign policy to our circumstances’,<sup>11</sup> meaning that our straitened finances justified appeasement. It came to light at the Nuremburg Trials, however, that while Chamberlain assumed that Hitler’s final territorial demand in Europe was that involving the Sudeten Germans, the ‘objective in Hitler’s mind was, from the first, the destruction of the Czechoslovak State’.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, the German readiness for war may have been overestimated: ‘Some of his generals were so convinced that it would not be possible to carry out a successful invasion . . . that they were apparently ready to overthrow Hitler’.<sup>13</sup> According to Churchill’s highly partisan account, this plot was postponed when Chamberlain flew to Berchtesgaden on 15 September, and abandoned when the Munich Pact seemed to prove that Hitler’s bluff had succeeded. That there was a plot appears beyond doubt. John Wheeler Bennet, however, in his detailed version, notes that this theory for the plotters’ failure to act, which was ‘circulated by interested parties, does not hold water for a moment.’<sup>14</sup>

Wheeler-Bennett does, nevertheless, note that ‘it was manifestly evident that conditions for such an enterprise were vastly less favourable after the signing of the Munich Agreement.’<sup>15</sup> Immediate events quickly proved Chamberlain wrong about peace for our time. When, on 2 November, Ribbentrop and Ciano dictated the new Czech-Hungarian frontier, the other two signatories of the Munich Pact were not invited. On 15 March 1939, two weeks after MacNeice had composed the head note to *Autumn Journal*, Hitler annexed the remaining parts of Czechoslovakia. Two days later in a speech at Birmingham, the British Prime Minister abandoned appeasement. The Czech leader in London, Thomas Masaryk, had pointed to the gamble taken by Chamberlain at Munich by agreeing to allow Hitler to absorb the Sudetenlands: ‘If you have sacrificed my nation to preserve the peace of the world, I will be the first to applaud you; but if not, gentlemen, God help your souls.’ Haile Selassie more wryly observed: ‘I hear

you have the support of the British government. You have my profound sympathy.’<sup>16</sup>

In *Fellow Travellers of the Right*, Richard Griffiths suggests that ‘The immediate aftermath of the Munich agreement was, for most people, either disgust or relief.’<sup>17</sup> On the back of a postcard showing a photograph entitled ‘The Pilgrim of Peace / Bravo! Mr. Chamberlain’, Ludwig Wittgenstein wrote with evident disgust: ‘In case you want an Emetic, there it is.’<sup>18</sup> Christopher Isherwood admitted to a secret relief: ‘What do I care for the Czechs? What does it matter if we are traitors? A war has been postponed — and a war postponed is a war which may never happen.’<sup>19</sup> William Empson, who explained later that ‘the point is to join up the crisis-feeling to what can be felt all the time in normal life’, had written ‘Courage Means Running’ in 1936. Many years later he felt obliged to alter his final verse’s ‘wise patience’ to ‘flat patience’ in the light of the shame that had descended upon the entire policy of appeasement after Munich:

As the flat patience of England is a gaze  
Over the drop, and ‘high’ policy means clinging;  
There is not much else that we dare to praise.

Christopher Ricks, echoing Empson’s own alignment of the poem with inter-war foreign policy, describes ‘Courage Means Running’ as ‘about what can be said for Munich.’<sup>20</sup> Patrick Kavanagh, in the interests of a felt and vital parochialism, counterposes a local and international border dispute in ‘Epic’, first published in 1951:

I heard the Duffy’s shouting ‘Damn your soul’  
And old McCabe stripped to the waist, seen  
Step the plot defying blue cast-steel —  
‘Here is the march along these iron stones’  
That was the year of the Munich bother. Which  
Was more important?’<sup>21</sup>

While Kavanagh uses the contrast to state a case for his kind of poetry, the thrust of my argument is that there must be similarities of principle involved in both disputes, similarities which MacNeice explores in *Autumn Journal*. One problem with Ricks’s phrase ‘what can be said for Munich’ is that Empson himself did not write his poem with Munich in mind, and, not being inclined to appease Germany at any point, assumed, like MacNeice, that war would come and should be fought. At the time, everyone will have felt what could be said for Munich: we have been spared the endurance of another war. Yet many,

including Empson, will have also understood the cost of what could be said for that piece of paper.

MacNeice appears to have experienced both disgust and relief. He writes in *The Strings are False* of first fear: ‘The terror that seized London during the Munich crisis was that dumb, chattering terror of beasts in a forest fire’; then of relief: ‘Chamberlain signed on the line and we all relapsed’; then, something less sharp than Wittgenstein’s contempt: ‘Newsreels featured the life of Chamberlain — the Man of Peace after 2,000 years.’<sup>22</sup> Yet there is a further complex of feelings in *Autumn Journal*, for out of this slide through fear and relief to an empty disbelief comes a sense of shame and inadequacy.

## 2

The threat of war is insinuated into the opening passage of *Autumn Journal*. Where ‘summer is ending in Hampshire’ there are ‘retired generals and admirals’ —

And the spinster sitting in a deck-chair picking up stitches  
Not raising her eyes to the noise of the ’planes that pass  
Northward from Lee-on-Solent. (101-2)

The retired military men will have seen service in the First World War, and the planes are from a Naval Air Station. At this point the political situation seems a noise off-stage. By section V of the poem, MacNeice is exploring the attempt to deal with the ‘chattering terror’, an attempt to which the poem’s mock-garrulousness acknowledges a complicity that two of its most recent critics have called ‘an immensely winning demonstration of how not to “stop talking”, though all the time behind the talk lurks fear’:<sup>23</sup>

The latest? You mean whether Cobb has bust the record  
Or do you mean the Australians have lost their last ten  
Wickets or do you mean that the autumn fashions —  
*No, we don’t mean anything like that again.*  
No, what we mean is Hodza, Henlein, Hitler,  
The Maginot Line,  
The heavy panic that cramps the lungs and presses  
The collar down the spine. (108-9)

Milan Hodza was a Slovak statesman and Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia from 1935 to just before the Munich Pact. Konrad Henlein was the Sudeten leader, who had visited London on 12 May 1938 to press the claim that his people had been oppressed by the Czech gov-

ernment.<sup>24</sup> The issue of Czechoslovakia is taken up again in section VII, which opens by listing ‘Conferences, adjournments, ultimatums, / Flights in the air, castles in the air, / The autopsy of treaties . . .’ (113) ‘Flights in the air’, with its hint of escape in the offing, almost certainly refers to Chamberlain’s meetings with Hitler in mid-September. There was possible folly even in Chamberlain’s taking to the air. Bullock notes that Hitler’s ‘vanity was gratified by the prospect of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, a man twenty years older than himself, making his first flight at the age of sixty-nine in order to come and plead with him.’<sup>25</sup> The ‘autopsy of treaties’ probably refers to the argument justifying Hitler’s foreign policy as a necessary correction to the Treaty of Versailles.<sup>26</sup>

The passage usually cited in discussions of Munich and MacNeice’s poem is that describing ‘cutting down the trees on Primrose Hill’.<sup>27</sup> Later in the section, though, there is this sequence of lines:

But one — meaning I — is bored, am bored, the issue  
 Involving principle but bound in fact  
 To squander principle in panic and self-deception —  
 Accessories after the act,  
 So that all we foresee is rivers in spate sprouting  
 With drowning hands  
 And men like dead frogs floating till the rivers  
 Lose themselves in the sands. (114)

There is a vertiginous enjambment in this passage, where the phrase ‘Involving principle but bound in fact’ shifts sense, taking from ‘in fact’ its substance as a statement and turning it into a colloquial filler, as if the line end read: bound, in fact, to squander. This shift may be related to Chamberlain’s ‘we must adjust our foreign policy to our circumstances’ and to the encouragement it gave to the French leaders Bonnet and Daladier to abandon their treaty obligations to Czechoslovakia.<sup>28</sup> Any ‘issue / Involving principle’ must be ‘bound in fact’, for an issue is just that: a context of fact in which principles are conflictingly involved. The disturbing of ‘in fact’ by the enjambment works to ruin the balance of this statement, to upset the integrity of the line. The phrase ‘Accessories after the act’ indicates, with its rhyming recall of the judicial phrase ‘after the fact’, that those who wish to appease may be offering as a principle what is, in fact, ‘panic and self-deception’. The poet ambiguously includes himself by writing ‘all we foresee’, but his opening, ‘one — meaning I — is bored, am bored’, offers a guiding viewpoint for the lines. MacNeice hints here at a disjunction

between the versions of the crisis with which he is surrounded and his own view of an 'issue / Involving principle but bound in fact', which will be lost in misconceptions and fear, a fear of 'drowning hands' and 'men like dead frogs'. Boredom and fear: those express MacNeice's being both a part of the crisis and isolated, detached from it by his own views. Such combinations of involvement in a context and distance from it are at the ambivalent heart of MacNeice's *Autumn Journal*.

Yet the mixtures of involvement and detachment are unstable, preventing the poetry from settling into a single view of the crisis. The next eight lines introduce a further response to the public debate:

And we who have been brought up to think of 'Gallant Belgium'  
 As so much blague  
 Are now preparing again to essay good through evil  
 For the sake of Prague;  
 And must, we suppose, become uncritical, vindictive,  
 And must, in order to beat  
 The enemy, model ourselves upon the enemy,  
 A howling radio for our paraclete. (114)

Edna Longley cites this passage to suggest that MacNeice 'makes the poem a warning against the two "musts" in that passage, thus acting as Grigson's "critical moralist".'<sup>29</sup> This is undoubtedly part of the passage's meaning: we must preserve ourselves from irrational hate, even if it is in the interests of saving ourselves and defeating Hitler. The reference to the First World War's 'issue / Involving principle' (Britain declared war in 1914 when Belgian neutrality was violated) carries over into the implicit aversion to becoming 'uncritical, vindictive', for this had also produced the wartime anti-German hysteria and contributed to the dangerously punitive reparation clauses in the Versailles Treaty.

Yet there is another way of reading the passage which, instead of adopting the stance of the detached 'critical moralist', involves itself in the desire for appeasement that may also derive from memories of the Great War and the wish, hardly an evil one, that such things should never happen again. MacNeice's passage may even be responding to Hitler's speech at the Nuremberg Rally on 12 September, or that of 26 September at the Berlin Sportpalast, 'a masterpiece of invective which even he never surpassed.'<sup>30</sup> In it, Hitler contrasted his own war service with the life of President Beněš, and stated that 'there marches a different people from that of 1918.'<sup>31</sup> This aligns the passage with Chamberlain's pacifism, for it assumes that if war comes we will have to model

ourselves on the enemy, as, for instance, in the style of Bomber Harris; we will have to be uncritical and vindictive; we will have to ‘essay good through evil / For the sake of Prague’. Thus, the detachment indicated by the ‘we suppose’ in MacNeice’s lines produces a double significance in the ‘warning against the two “musts”’. One meaning makes these lines, caught up in the context of the Munich crisis, sound as appeals for peace at any price, so as to avoid the need to brutalize ourselves; the other implies that if fight we must, then it is the task of detached intellectuals like MacNeice to preserve us from having to ‘model ourselves upon the enemy’.

It is crucial to *Autumn Journal* that intellectual high-mindedness, that’s to say, in more generous parlance, being a ‘critical moralist’, has to remain in contact with its subject matter, the actual, ordinary conflicts of emotion and desire which people felt at the time. Thus, similarly, in the page on Munich from *The Strings are False*, MacNeice writes of a George Formby show that ‘His pawky Lancashire charm was just what we wanted’,<sup>32</sup> the word ‘pawky’ nevertheless giving an evaluative detachment to the line. The occasion also finds its way into *Autumn Journal*:

And I go to the Birmingham Hippodrome  
 Packed to the roof and primed for laughter  
 And beautifully at home  
 With the ukelele and the comic chestnuts . . . (116)

That phrase ‘beautifully at home’ is a reminder that MacNeice in his isolation also needed to belong. However detached from contexts by his upbringing and education, MacNeice strove to be in context, and that involved accepting that his work would contain the ordinary sensations he shared with those around him.

The conclusion of section VIII coincides with those events in Munich at the end of September:

The crisis is put off and things look better  
 And we feel negotiation is not in vain —  
 Save my skin and damn my conscience.  
 And negotiation wins,  
 If you can call it winning,  
 And here we are — just as before — safe in our skins;  
 Glory to God for Munich.  
 And stocks go up and wrecks  
 Are salvaged and politicians’ reputations  
 Go up like Jack-on-the-Beanstalk; only the Czechs



Go down and without fighting. (117)

The benefit of MacNeice's expansive style lies in its ability to move quickly through a series of inter-related feelings: relief, high hopes, low motives, disgust, bitter mockery, underlying self-interest,<sup>33</sup> and, finally, shame. Richard Griffiths summarised responses to Munich as 'either disgust or relief'; MacNeice combines both of these in the passage where the European leaders sacrifice Beněš and Masaryk's country, and produces from the combination of these feelings the further one of shame. We feel relief, but sense our motives for feeling it are poor, and are then disgusted with ourselves for feeling it, and so feel ashamed. MacNeice's own italicised pronoun in the following lines may contain tonally all these sensations:

*We* are safe though others have crashed the railings  
 Over the river ravine; their wheel-tracks carve the bank  
 But after the event all we can do is argue  
 And count the widening ripples where they sank. (117)

At this point, Munich as such appears to fade from the poem, though in section XII MacNeice evokes a pre-war mood, a recognition, if any were still needed, that war is inevitable despite the agreement: 'People have not recovered from the crisis' (123) and 'Those who are about to die try out their paces.' (124) Yet the atmosphere of Munich seems to hang over the entire poem, as a matter of 'Principle . . . bound in fact'. First, though, there is the by-election.

Robyn Marsack spells out the precise relation of this event to Munich: 'Quinton Hogg, son of the Lord Chancellor and a university contemporary of MacNeice's, was defending the seat specifically on the issue of foreign policy and the Munich Agreement; against him stood A. D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol. Hogg's majority was almost halved but he retained the seat.'<sup>34</sup> In section XIV, MacNeice writes about his involvement in the election, once again emphasising mixed emotions and motives:

And what am I doing it for?  
 Mainly for fun, partly for a half-believed-in  
 Principle, a core  
 Of fact in a pulp of verbiage . . . (128)

Again there is the conjunction of those two words 'Principle' and 'fact'. Yet because MacNeice writes with such honesty about his misgivings, his sense that there are 'only too many who say' that '[“]To

turn the stream of history will take / More than a by-election” (128), because MacNeice is trying to resist the pull of political illusion, again in the light of Munich, he may have been, and may still be, taken to be absenting himself in isolation and detachment. Samuel Hynes, who grants MacNeice’s honesty, sees the poem as an expression of helplessness:

It has no personal momentum, no important decisions are made; the most positive thing that MacNeice does is to work in an Oxford by-election (which his candidate loses). Nor does it propose any positive values, any programme for confronting the future . . . .<sup>35</sup>

I don’t recognise MacNeice’s poem in these opinions, certainly not its ‘principle bound in fact’ or its ‘Principle, a core / Of fact’. *Autumn Journal* summarises the election result as follows:

So Thursday came and Oxford went to the polls  
And made its coward vote and the streets resounded  
To the triumphant cheers of the lost souls —  
The profiteers, the dunderheads, the smarties. (128-9)

Yet MacNeice’s poem states why it is important to take part in the political process, even if you lose, and reserves the right to castigate even the winners if he does not believe in their values. The phrase ‘coward vote’, for instance, comes into sharp relief when read in the light of Hogg’s defence of Chamberlain’s appeasement policy.

In his Clark Lectures of twenty-five years later, MacNeice has forged a false distinction when he notes that ‘the cruder kind of allegory . . . can be used to cover subjects from which the inner life is excluded — such things as General Elections.’<sup>36</sup> The inner life in *Autumn Journal* is not excluded from a by-election, at least, and Hynes accurately answers his own question (‘what have politicians to do with a man’s loneliness?’) when he notes, referring to passages of the poem about MacNeice’s broken marriage: ‘the private loss is an analogue of public loss, and the poet’s helpless misery is an appropriate response to the public situation as well as to the private one.’<sup>37</sup> How odd, and how common, that writers on poetry fail to register the significance of the poem’s mere existence in their comments on the state of mind supposedly revealed by it. By being ‘a way of happening’, the completed poem makes something happen for the poet doing things with words too. Hynes refers to the ‘poet’s helpless misery’, but anyone who as early as 22 November 1938 could outline to T. S. Eliot

at Faber and Faber a clear image of *Autumn Journal* ('A long poem from 2,000 to 3,000 lines written from August to December 1938') would not be someone I would describe as, in any way, 'helpless'.

MacNeice concludes by calling his poem 'a confession of faith' — one in which 'There is a constant interrelation of abstract and concrete'.<sup>38</sup> In poems the confessions of faith are best located in the nature of the poem itself, often counterpointing, and counteracting, the expressions of overt feeling, such as 'helpless misery' or 'boredom', which the poem includes. This is to contradict Samuel Hynes's belief that *Autumn Journal* 'has no alternatives to offer, beyond a vague solidarity of resistance against the common enemy.' It is not true that of MacNeice's past in the poem, each element is treated 'with the ironic knowledge that it is irrelevant to the present crisis.'<sup>39</sup> The achievement of *Autumn Journal* is partly to articulate the interrelated relevance of these things to the experiences of people in crises, while acknowledging the ordinary appearance of irrelevance in relations between one person's life and a public crisis gripping Europe.

### 3

Reviewing Gilbert Murray's translation of *The Seven Against Thebes* on 10 May 1935, MacNeice argued for the preservation of the integrity of the original's verse lines wherever possible: 'I think a translation should start from the Greek, preferably line for line.' A good translator should also be able to 'see what the English looks like just as English.'<sup>40</sup> The integral rhythmic structure of a poetic line is at the heart of MacNeice's poetics. In the whole of *Autumn Journal* there are only fifteen lines which have full stops or question marks syntactically dividing them. MacNeice noted in the letter to T.S. Eliot that *Autumn Journal* 'is written throughout in an elastic kind of quatrain. This form a) gives the whole poem a formal unity but b) saves it from monotony by allowing it a great range of appropriate variations . . .'<sup>41</sup> Yet clearly these variations are ones of line length, enjambment, syntactical extension, and of rhyme confirming syntactic closure or chiming against the movement of the sentence. MacNeice is sparing in his use of the strong medial caesura created by a full-stop. There is a relation between the integrity of verse lines, whether enjambed or end-stopped, and the philosophy of Self and Other in *Autumn Journal*.

Section XVII dramatizes a debate between the virtue in self-coherent autonomy and the virtue in relationship, in interdependence:

And Aristotle was right to posit the Alter Ego  
 But wrong to make it only a halfway house:  
 Who could expect — or want — to be spiritually self-supporting,  
 Eternal self-abuse?  
 Why not admit that other people are always  
 Organic to the self, that a monologue  
 Is the death of language and that a single lion  
 Is less himself, or alive, than a dog and another dog? (135)

MacNeice's deployment of verse lines here dramatizes the issue for him. So, 'Who could expect — or want — to be spiritually self-supporting,' and 'Eternal self-abuse?' are both end stopped, isolated in themselves; while, in the following quatrain, the first three enjambed line-ends point to isolations which they counteract by linking the sense to the following line: 'other people are always / Organic to the self', 'a monologue / Is the death of language', and 'a single lion / Is less himself, or alive, than a dog and another dog'. Still, it must be noted that MacNeice is not advocating a blurring of differences. His enjambements are significant exactly because his sense of lineal rhythm emphasises the lines as units even when they form parts of long syntactic chains:

A point here and a point there: the current  
 Jumps the gap, the ego cannot live  
 Without becoming other for the Other  
 Has got yourself to give. (135)

What MacNeice is dramatizing, then, in the syntax and rhythm of his lines, is a belief in the virtue of autonomy, of lines having their own rhythmic coherence and integrity, but that this virtue is only valuable when brought into relation with other such autonomous entities. MacNeice is appealing for the interrelation of the distinct, as a core value, and the form of *Autumn Journal* is a sustained hymn, not quite to what Peter McDonald calls 'the self being realized in the other, the other in the self',<sup>42</sup> for just as I cannot presume upon another's self-realization in me, so too I can't presume to lodge my self-realization in another. The self and other have to be realizing themselves, each in the context of the relation with the other.

The poem's linear movement, its concern, as indicated not least by the title, in time and the passage of time, an issue again dramatized by the enjambling of longer syntactic units, also contributes to this belief in the value of interrelation, of involvement:

Aristotle was right to think of man-in-action  
 As the essential and really existent man  
 And man means men in action; try and confine your  
 Self to yourself if you can.  
 Nothing is self-sufficient, pleasure implies hunger  
 But hunger implies hope:  
 I cannot lie in this bath for ever, clouding  
 The cooling water with rose geranium soap. (136)

The formal intelligence in such lineation has the ambivalence of an internal debate: he is drawn to the idea of virtue in internal coherence, the self as virtuous insofar as it can separate itself from the contingencies and accidents of circumstance; he is attracted to the soothing detachment and isolation of staying in the bath; but he has experienced how limiting and partial such a virtue would inevitably prove. Thus, 'try and confine your / Self to yourself if you can' is, for MacNeice, an impossible dare. You can't. Nevertheless, this false isolation, something distinct from independence, is an attractive illusion which the poet will acknowledge, even as he recognises that he must, sooner or later, get out of the bath.

An enforced isolation is identified in the next section: 'This England is tight and narrow, teeming with unwanted / Children who are so many, each is alone . . .' (137) and McDonald<sup>43</sup> links the passage in section XVII to the previous section's account of Ireland: 'Ourselves alone! Let the round tower stand aloof / In a world of bursting mortar!' (133) Thus, the remarks in the poem that seem to concern MacNeice's ideas about relations between individuals are also to be understood as comments on nations and foreign affairs. MacNeice was not to be impressed by the Republic's policy during the war, a note which may be detected in his reporting a comment on hearing in Dublin that Chamberlain had declared war: 'A young man in sports clothes said to us: "Eire of course will stay neutral. But I hope the English knock hell out of Hitler."' <sup>44</sup> MacNeice's remarks about translation are again relevant. You must begin with a respect for the integrity of the foreign original ('start from the Greek, preferably line for line'), and you must also appreciate the language of the translation for itself ('what the English looks like just as English'), but the act of translating itself, by which 'Diction and rhythm will . . . differentiate', <sup>45</sup> instances a necessary involvement of one with another, exemplifying McDonald's phrase 'the self being realized in the other', or, perhaps, of one work of art being re-realized in the textures of another language.

The relation of these principles to the Munich crisis is not straightforward. MacNeice's views of translation would seem to suggest that the integrity of countries needs to be respected. This indicates a belief that Czechoslovakia should be left to determine her own affairs. The issue is complicated by the problem of ethnic minorities and the Wilsonian principle of self-determination, an idea Hitler was good at exploiting, as at Saarbrücken on 9 October 1938 when he stated that 'inquiries of British politicians concerning the fate of Germans within the frontiers of the Reich — or of others belonging to the Reich are not in place . . . . We would like to give these gentlemen the advice that they should busy themselves with their own affairs and leave us in peace.'<sup>46</sup> The Kristallnacht Pogrom took place just over a month later on 9-10 November, again raising the issue of when persecution of minorities in a country justifies the active involvement of neighbours in their domestic politics. Is it then right to wish to preserve the principle of non-intervention in another nation's affairs by remaining aloof? Does it protect the principle of sovereignty to maintain peace and non-intervention by sacrificing the Sudetenlands? MacNeice's poem is shaped upon the principle, and it seems a direct response to the problems of acting rightly over Czechoslovakia, that the integrity and value of someone's self-sufficiency, a state's independence, can only exist and be maintained by involvement with and from others. Similarly, you respect the identity of a foreign text not by leaving it alone, but by translating it in as accurate and vital a way as possible. Once Hitler has violated the principle of not meddling in the internal affairs of a country, non-intervention cannot protect the principle, for to follow the principle of non-intervention is to sacrifice that very principle, or, as MacNeice puts it, 'the issue / Involving principle' is 'bound in fact / To squander principle in panic and self-deception' (114).

In the letter to Eliot, MacNeice stated that 'There is constant interrelation of abstract and concrete', while in the March 1939 Note to *Autumn Journal*, he announced that 'I have certain beliefs which, I hope, emerge in the course of it but which I have refused to abstract from their context.' (101) One reason why the Munich crisis demanded 'principle . . . bound in fact' and not principle which is 'bound in fact / To squander principle' is that the principles involved only had their specific significance in that context. This interrelation of principle and context is one plank in MacNeice's anti-Platonic stance, so that when 'reading Plato talking about his Forms / To damn the artist touting round his mirror . . .' the poet counters:

. . . no one Tuesday is another and you destroy it  
 If you subtract the difference and relate  
 It merely to the Form of Tuesday. This is Tuesday  
 The 25th of October, 1938. (124)

The interrelation also finds an echo in MacNeice's ideas about poetic form. He notes in *Modern Poetry* that 'My object in writing this essay is partly to show that one and the same poetic activity produces different forms in adaption to circumstances.'<sup>47</sup>

This is not the same as Chamberlain's 'we must adjust our foreign policy to our circumstances'. The difference is that the Prime Minister is explaining appeasement as necessary because we are not in a position to mobilize: our straitened circumstances provide him with an excuse. In MacNeice's remark the circumstances offer a resistance with which the poetic activity, in adapting itself, works to produce a particular formal solution: the circumstances help to generate the effects and qualities of the specific form. The flexibility of the *Autumn Journal's* quatrains, in relation to the Munich crisis, generates literary contexts in which ordinary utterances can express the anxiety and anguish of the moment, while simultaneously discovering a shape that counteracts that 'chattering terror'. MacNeice had lost his dog:<sup>48</sup>

But found the police had got her at St. John's Wood station  
 And fetched her in the rain and went for a cup  
 Of coffee to an all-night shelter and heard a taxi-driver  
 Say 'It turns me up  
 When I see these soldiers in lorries' — rumble of tumbrils  
 Drums in the trees  
 Breaking the eardrums of the ravished dryads —  
 It turns me up; a coffee, please. (113-4)

He also observes in *Modern Poetry* that 'the Poet's first business is *mentioning* things. Whatever musical or other harmonies he may incidentally evoke, the fact will remain that such and such things —and not others —have been mentioned in his poem.' This assertion would be ingenuous about formal contributions to poems if MacNeice did not qualify it with a parenthesis: '(on analysis even this selection [of materials] will be found to come under the question of Form)'.<sup>49</sup> Among the pleasures of *Autumn Journal* is the discovery of an improvised rhythmic ordering and an alternation of rhymed lines and non-rhymed feminine-endings, this discovery occurring often amid the narration of unpromisingly mundane incidents, such as saying 'a coffee, please'

—banal details which in times of crisis have a valuable solidity just because the ordinary transactions of life are themselves under threat.

Such shaping is self-referentially focused upon the beliefs involved at the close of several parts. Section IV, for instance, concludes:

And though I have suffered from your special strength  
 Who never flatter for points nor fake responses  
 I should be proud if I could evolve at length  
 An equal thrust and pattern. (108)

Thrust and pattern in *Autumn Journal* are provided by the variations of paratactic and hypotactic syntax, and the ‘elastic kind of quatrain’. Again, in *Modern Poetry*, MacNeice notes that in the poets of his generation, ‘history is recognised as something having a shape and still alive, something more than a mere accumulation of random and dead facts.’<sup>50</sup> Yet *Autumn Journal*, I think, does not believe in ‘the stream of history’, as MacNeice calls it in the by-election section, not in history’s having a definite course, but in its being shaped, like syntax, by the constrained choices of particular people. If the politicians and leaders are making mad or foolish moves, others may notice, respond, and criticise. This, MacNeice’s poem affirms, is vitally important to all our futures. Thus, the ‘something more’ is what is provided in a poem by the rhythmic and syntactic ordering. In finding such pattern through the shaping of circumstance in poetic form, and the adaptations of such form to the recalcitrant circumstances of mentioned things, MacNeice attributes ‘shape’ and vitality to the days of crisis in which history may seem arbitrarily chaotic, shaped by nothing to which value could be ascribed. At the close of section XVII, the poet associates his creative activity not with the ‘musical or other harmonies he may incidentally evoke’, but with the discovery of meaning and choice, something not incidental to music or harmonies, but the music of the poetry itself:

Still there are still the seeds of energy and choice  
 Still alive even if forbidden, hidden,  
 And while a man has voice  
 He may recover music. (139)

Through such pattern-making, MacNeice is able to signal relations between the political, personal, and philosophical issues of freedom, choice, fulfilment, and responsibility.



## 4

On his way to Spain in December 1938, MacNeice spent Christmas in Paris. As he describes the visit in his autobiography, 'Paris was under snow and very beautiful. We ate and drank a great deal'.<sup>51</sup> In *Autumn Journal* XXII, MacNeice makes of his time there a debate between what he calls in his letter to Eliot 'the sensual man, the philosopher, the would-be good citizen'.<sup>52</sup> The sensual man gets his say, but his headlong tone and catalogue of needs are prefaced by 'So here where tourist values are the only / Values, where we pretend'. Among the things they pretend is:

[']that gossip  
Is the characteristic of art  
And that the sensible man must keep his aesthetic  
And his moral standards apart —' (147)

I think MacNeice's values are travestied here, but the ideas directly expressed are ones which he could contemplate. In 'Letter to W. H. Auden' of 21 October 1937, he states that 'Poetry is related to the sermon and you have your penchant for preaching, but it is more closely related to conversation and you, my dear, if any, are a born gossip'.<sup>53</sup> MacNeice's method is to affirm what a philosopher and would-be good citizen might think, namely that aesthetic and moral standards are neither clearly distinguishable nor ever dissociable, by expressing it as the implied opposite of what the sensual man would prefer to think, which is that if it's beauty you want, forget about morality — as in the jaded jest about translations and women: the more beautiful the more unfaithful.

In 'A Statement' for the *New Verse* 'Commitments' double number of Autumn 1938, MacNeice noted that 'The poet at the moment will tend to be moralist rather than aesthete.' He had prefaced this remark, however, by observing that though 'I have been asked to commit myself about poetry', 'I have committed myself already so much *in* poetry that this seems almost superfluous'.<sup>54</sup> While not an aesthete, the poet as 'critical moralist' is also necessarily committing himself in poetry, his poem 'cannot live by morals alone',<sup>55</sup> and to this end the formal principles of *Autumn Journal* are an aspect of its ethical principles regarding personal relations and foreign affairs. At the end of the poem, we sleep —

On the banks of Rubicon — the die is cast;

There will be time to audit  
 The accounts later, there will be sunlight later  
 And the equation will come out at last. (153)

Here the deferring of the final rhyme to one line later than expected, performs the deferral of auditing accounts, of sunlight, and the equation's coming out. The expressions of the future in these final three lines, whether predictions or hopes, are affirmed by that final rhyme. The rhyme sound comes round, though later than you thought, and the poem's formal equation does come out at last. *Autumn Journal* ends by promising that in nurturing the seeds of 'energy and choice' (139) we can face the future arising from our bungled past.

After citing some criticism of the poem, Edna Longley concludes: 'not every commentator has found *Autumn Journal* psychologically or politically adequate to its task'.<sup>56</sup> MacNeice, himself, lost confidence in the shape that he had made. Fifteen years later, in *Autumn Sequel* (1953), he wrote:

An autumn journal — or journey. The clocks tick  
 Just as they did but that was a slice of life  
 And there is no such thing. (331)

Yet MacNeice is right, 'there is no such thing', and the poet has forgotten what he wrote in *Modern Poetry*. The 'slice' is his selection of material, 'which will be found to come under the question of Form'. What's happening is being done, not by the psychological or political adequacy, but by the relationship between the mentionings of things, in all their various inadequacies, and the formal shaping of these things in and by the poem. MacNeice had written in his letter to T. S. Eliot that he thought *Autumn Journal* his 'best work to date'. Looking back sixty-odd years, I'm inclined not only to agree with him, but to think it his best work.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Louis MacNeice, Preface to *Modern Poetry: A Personal Essay* (Oxford, 1938), no pagination; *Modern Poetry*, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 2.

<sup>3</sup> Louis MacNeice, *Collected Poems* ed. E. R. Dodds (1979), 135 (twice), 147, 101.

<sup>4</sup> MacNeice, *Modern Poetry*, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 205.

<sup>6</sup> Cited in Alan Bullock, *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny* (Harmondsworth, 1962; 1990 repr.), 466.

<sup>7</sup> For an Italian poet's responses to Munich, see Vittorio Sereni's 'In una casa vuota', *Poesie* ed. D. Isella (Milan, 1995), 190, or *Selected Poems of Vittorio Sereni* trans. M. Perryman and P. Robinson (1990), 122.

<sup>8</sup> Bullock, 469.

<sup>9</sup> Page references in parenthesis are to Louis MacNeice, *The Collected Poems* ed. E. R. Dodds (1979 edn.).

<sup>10</sup> Winston Churchill, *The Second World War*, 6 vols., (1948, rev. 1949, citing the Harmondsworth, 1985 edn.) i, 287.

<sup>11</sup> Keith Feiling, *Life of Neville Chamberlain* (1946), 324; see also 366-8.

<sup>12</sup> Bullock, 444.

<sup>13</sup> T. O. Lloyd, *Empire to Welfare State: English History 1906-1985*, third edn., (Oxford, 1986), 208; and see Churchill, 280-1, Bullock, 452, and, for a full account of Munich from the Wehrmacht's viewpoint, see John W. Wheeler-Bennett, *The Nemesis of Power: The German Army in Politics 1918-1945* (1954), 393-435.

<sup>14</sup> *The Nemesis of Power*, 421.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 424.

<sup>16</sup> See Lloyd, 204-8; Feiling, *Life of Neville Chamberlain* (1946), 324; John W. Wheeler Bennett, *Munich, Prologue to Tragedy* (1966), 171; *The Times* 7, 8, 15, 21, 26 September 1938; Franklin R. Gannon, *The British Press and Germany, 1936-1939* (Oxford, 1971).

<sup>17</sup> Richard Griffiths, *Fellow Travellers of the Right, British Enthusiasts for Nazi Germany 1933-1939* (Oxford, 1983 edn.), 304.

<sup>18</sup> Ray Monk, *Ludwig Wittgenstein: The Duty of Genius* (1990), illustrations 44-5. See also Fania Pascal, 'A Personal Memoir', in *Recollections of Wittgenstein* ed. R. Rhees (Oxford, 1984), 39-40: 'It was the days before Munich; Mr Chamberlain was making a stand, acting as though the country was preparing for war. We looked on in silence at the diggers' efforts. I turned to Wittgenstein to protest, to cry out that it's all a sham, that we are lost, but he silenced me by raising his hand forbiddingly. He said: I am as much ashamed of what it happening as you are. But we must not talk of it.'

<sup>19</sup> Christopher Isherwood, *Christopher and His Kind* (1977), 241; cited in McDonald, 90.

<sup>20</sup> William Empson, *The Complete Poems* ed. J. Haffenden (Harmondsworth, 2000), 336, 77, 125.

<sup>21</sup> Patrick Kavanagh, *The Complete Poems* ed. P. Kavanagh (Newbridge, 1984), 238. The poem is cited in a brief discussion of MacNeice and contemporary Irish poetry in the Introduction to *The Penguin Book of Contemporary Irish Poetry* ed. P. Fallon and D. Mahon (Harmondsworth, 1990), xvii-xviii.

<sup>22</sup> *The Strings are False: An Unfinished Autobiography* (1965), 174-5.

<sup>23</sup> Michael O'Neill and Gareth Reeves, *Auden, MacNeice, Spender: The Thirties Poetry* (1992), 183.

<sup>24</sup> For details of the proposals, see Churchill, 256.

<sup>25</sup> Bullock, 454.

<sup>26</sup> See *Fellow Travellers of the Right*, 297, and *The Nemesis of Power*.

<sup>27</sup> See Samuel Hynes, *The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s* (1976), 368-9; Robyn Marsack, *The Cave of Making: The Poetry of Louis MacNeice* (Oxford, 1982), 48; Edna Longley, *Louis MacNeice: a Study* (1988), 64; Julian Symons, *The Thirties and the Nineties* (Manchester, 1990), 120-22; Peter McDonald, 89; O'Neill and Reeves, 199.

<sup>28</sup> See Churchill, 266-7.

<sup>29</sup> Edna Longley, *Louis MacNeice: a Study* (1988), 72.

<sup>30</sup> Bullock, 461.

<sup>31</sup> Cited in Bullock, 463.

<sup>32</sup> *The Strings are False*, 174.

<sup>33</sup> See T. S. Eliot, *The Idea of a Christian Society* (1939).

<sup>34</sup> Marsack, 50.

<sup>35</sup> Hynes, 372.

<sup>36</sup> *Varieties of Parable* (Cambridge, 1965), 76.

<sup>37</sup> Hynes, 368.

<sup>38</sup> Cited in Marsack, 43.

<sup>39</sup> Hynes, 372, 370, but see also 369.

<sup>40</sup> *Selected Literary Criticism of Louis MacNeice* ed. A. Heuser (Oxford, 1987), 9-10.

<sup>41</sup> Cited in Marsack, 43.

<sup>42</sup> McDonald, 89.

<sup>43</sup> See McDonald, 88-9.

<sup>44</sup> *The Strings are False*, 212.

<sup>45</sup> *Selected Literary Criticism*, 9-10.

<sup>46</sup> Cited in Bullock, 472.

<sup>47</sup> *Modern Poetry*, 33.

<sup>48</sup> In *Zoo*, published during November 1938, MacNeice describes keeping a dog: 'When I am alone with my dog, there are not two of us. There is myself — and something Other. It gives me a pleasant feeling of power, even of black magic, to be able to order this Other about and give it food which it actually eats' in *Selected Prose of Louis MacNeice* ed. A. Heuser (Oxford, 1990), 49 and see also 58.

<sup>49</sup> *Modern Poetry*, 5.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>51</sup> *The Strings are False*, 176.

<sup>52</sup> Cited in Marsack, 43.

<sup>53</sup> *Selected Literary Criticism*, 86. Heuser's footnote refers to Auden's 'In Defence of Gossip' in which he states that 'All art is based on gossip', W. H. Auden, *Prose and Travel Books in Prose and Verse, Volume 1 1926-1938*, ed. E Mendelson (Princeton, N. J., 1996), 425-30, and see p. 428.

<sup>54</sup> *Selected Literary Criticism*, 98.

<sup>55</sup> MacNeice had criticised the Auden-Isherwood collaboration *On the Frontier* in these words on 18 Nov 1938: 'But a play cannot live by morals alone', *Selected Literary Criticism*, 103.

<sup>56</sup> Edna Longley, 61.

## 『波』, ルイス, 太平洋

“I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone”

大田 信良

本論は、近年英米の文学・文化研究においてきわめて顕著なポストコロニアル批評の動向をにらみつつも、太平洋の視点からヴァージニア・ウルフの『波』を解釈することを提案する。とはいえ、ここでは単純な文化的他者としてルイスのオーストラリア性を取り上げることにはしない。<sup>1</sup> 大西洋地域 (“Paris, Berlin, New York”) における“the typewriter and the telephone”というメディア言説をてがかりに、まず第一に、非白人種の移民の言説を、次に、オーストラリア・中国の表象を探ってみたい。『波』についてなされた先行研究とりわけポストコロニアリズムや帝国主義の観点による解釈と本発表との関係はあとで触れるとして、まずは、ウルフのテキストを見てみよう。とはいってもより正確には、三年ほど前に書いた拙論の一部であり『波』に言及した箇所であるが。そしてまた、題名の「「文学」の歴史と時間性のレトリック」の意味とか、そこで問題にしたアレゴリーやアイロニーとポストコロニアリズムが一体どんな関わりがありうるのか、といったことも、とりあえず、後回しにして進めたい。もちろん、temporality とか allegory とかの概念も、帝国主義と英文学に関する最近の研究(たとえば Homi K. Bhabha や Jenny Sharpe) にアクセスしている方々にとってはすでにじゅうぶん馴染み深いものであることは、承知しているのではあるが。

まず、移民の言説をめぐる以下の考察からはじめよう。

ここでわれわれはモダニズムの代表的テキストの一つヴァージニア・ウルフの『波』を取り上げてみよう。文化と人種的他者との関係を再考するためにも、まずは、移民のイメージを捜し出してみよう。

But now I am compact; now I am gathered together this fine morning. “The sun shines from a clear sky. But twelve o’clock brings neither rain nor sunshine. It is the

hour when Miss Johnson brings me my letters in a wire tray [. . .] I, now a duke, now Plato, companion of Socrates; the tramp of dark men and yellow men migrating east, west, north and south; the eternal procession, women going with attaché cases down the Strand as they went once with pitchers to the Nile [. . .].”

たしかにここでは、主体の確立と拡散に揺れながらも世界の果ての混沌から秩序を作り出そうと仕事に励む、ヨーロッパ世界の白人男性と対照されて、女性労働者とともに、世界中を移動する“the tramp of dark men and yellow men”が姿を現している。ひょっとしたら、この場面をとっかかりにして、人種の差異の観点から新たな文学解釈を提示することができるかもしれない。今までだれもやったことのない、オリジナルな解釈として。  
(大田 142)

とはいえ、この一場面あるいはそのなかでも一部の表象・言説をもって、ウルフの作品を切ってしまうていいのかという、疑義または異議申し立ての可能性が当然考えられよう。一体そんなことで『波』というテキストを解釈したことになるのかといったような。そこで、このテキストのエンディングにも目を向けてみよう。いわゆる一次資料を実証的にあつかう旧歴史主義や言説の歴史的・社会的編成・実践を対象とする新しい文化研究などとは違って、従来型の文学研究において作品の意味を探るときに、そのエンディングがどのように閉じているのか確認するのは、きわめて基本的な作業であり、また、欠くべからざる読みの作業だろうから。

と同時に、あらためて思い出さなければならないのは、生の否定的なイメージで終わる『波』の最終場面である。

Death is the enemy. It is death against whom I ride with my spear couched and my hair flying back like a young man's, like Percival's, when galloped in India. I strike spurs into my horse. Against you I will fling myself, unvanquished and unyielding, O Death!

*The waves broke on the shore*

(Woolf 1931 211).

野島秀勝によれば、「死への、孤独への挑戦は、たんにウルフの絶望的な悲願にとどまっていた」のであり、そこに表現されたウルフの「人生観上の真のヴィジョン」とは、生きる努力としては解釈できない。『波』の意味は、生、つまり人間の有限な心理的持続としての時間ではなく、むしろ、死、つまり「無感動な自然」としての「海」に象徴される人間存在にかかわりなく流れてやまぬ客観的時間である。このように生から死への過程をたどるウルフのモダニズム文学を、いまやいかに解釈することができるだろうか。「純粹自我の追及はついに自我そのものの喪失にゆきつかざるを得なかった」ということになるかもしれない。ポストコロニアル批評の観点

から解釈し直してみるなら、ひょっとしたら、客観的時間に客体化された自然は善であり、「植民主義者パーシヴァル」という主体は悪ということになるのかもしれない。その死にみられる西洋近代の主体の挫折と崩壊は、ヨーロッパ文化の相対化の兆候としてむしろ肯定的に見えるかもしれない。このような解釈の場合、近代の歴史は、生の過程として「進化」していたのではなく、死を迎えるべくその、終焉へ「退化」していく過程として表象されている。植民地のイメージと重なる生/死のイメージが、ここでは道徳主義的に価値判断されている。  
(大田 143-44)

ひょっとしたら、『波』解釈およびモダニズム論としてこんな風に言いきってみることもできるかもしれない、死に対峙するパーシヴァルの最終シーンがはらむ根源的な曖昧さについて、その構造分析を省略してすましてしまうならば。

これから、作品ではなく、テキストの構造分析を試みたい、そして、『波』について太平洋の視点からの解釈の可能性を探っていきたいわけだが、その前に、これまた当然の作業という手続きだと思われるのだが、従来からの文学研究およびウルフ研究においてふまえるべき先行研究として Jane Marcus のポストコロニアル批評のポイントを、私なりにというか、あるいはより正確には、これまで行ってきた本論の脈絡にそくして、確認しておきたいと思う。

Marcus がたてた問いとはそもそも何であったか。その論文のタイトル“*Britannia Rules The Waves*”から明らかなように『波』というテキストを支配しているのは誰か、言い換えれば、このモダニズムの代表的なテキストの意味を規定しているのは一体いかなる存在か、ということだった。そして Marcus によれば、“the figure of Britannia”つまり“British imperialism”こそがイデオロギー的な支配を及ぼしている。その女神は、“Eton / Cambridge elite”の大部分を構成する男たちとはむしろ立場を逆にするはずでありながら、イギリスの帝国主義に取り込まれその男性的な政治文化を担っている。もう少し具体的な作品の読みにそくしてみれば、以下の引用にあるように、帝国主義および政治的軍事的植民地支配のイデオロギーを端的に具現しているのは、まずは、“the Lady at a Table Writing”であり、さらに主要キャラクターの中では、バーナードである。

My calling upon the figure of Britannia in the title of this essay is meant to convey the national anxiety of the former colony about the colonizing process itself, as if there were no other role but col-

onizer or colonized. The Lady at a Table Writing serves as a “Britannia” figure and allegory for Bernard. But in order to read it this way, one has to be open to irony in Woolf’s voice, particularly toward Bernard, the writer figure, and be aware of and open to Woolf’s critique of class and empire. Bernard is a parody of authorship; his words are a postmodern pastiche of quotation from the master texts of English literature. (Marcus140)

もっとも、マーカスが本当に言いたいことは、“Britannia”あるいは“the writer figure”である“The Lady at a Table writing”とかバーナードとかに集約的に表された帝国主義を批判しているのがこのテキストの作者ウルフである、ということだった。バーナードは“authorship”のパロディとなっており、そうしたフェミニスト・ウルフのボイスによるアイロニーによって“critique of class and empire”がなされている。結局マーカスが主張したかったことは、そのthesis statement をふくむ以下の引用にあきらかなように、『波』というテキストの意味が非政治的な“upper-class genteel British culture”の賞賛などでは全然なく、反帝国主義という“radical politics”であるということであった。

Its canonical status has been based on a series of misreadings of this poetic text and of Woolf herself as synonymous with and celebratory of upper-class genteel British culture. My reading claims that *The Waves* is the story of “the submerged mind of empire.” [. . .] this text (roman in typeface as opposed to the italics recording the rise and setting of the sun) of humans making their life history (plotting against history?) is surrounded by an italicized text of “spinning time” in the cycle of the seasons [. . .]. *The Waves* explores the way in which the cultural narrative “England” is created by an Eton / Cambridge elite who (re)produce the national epic (the rise of . . .) and elegy (the fall of . . .) in praise of the hero. The poetic language and experimental structure of this modernist classic are vehicles for a radical politics that is both anti-imperialist and anticlanical. (Marcus136–37)

テキストを構成するローマン体と斜字体との対比、すなわち、六人それぞれの“life history”を作り上げるモノローグとうつろいゆく太陽や季節の周期との対比も、マーカスの読みでは、大英帝国の歴史あるいは“England”という“the cultural narrative”の上昇と下降という二項対立によって分析される。その解釈で主題化されるのは、

These italicized interludes take the form of a set of Hindu prayers to the sun, called Gayatri, marking its course during a single day. These (Eastern) episodes surround a (Western) narrative of the fall of British imperialism. (Marcus 137)



というように、西洋と東洋の関係すなわち“British imperialism”における宗主国と植民地の関係だ。

ところで、その場合に、テキストのエンディングはどのように解釈されていたでしょうか。Marcus の分析・解釈に従いそれをさらにシェイクスピアのソネットとの関係にまで展開しようとした Robin Hackett のまとめによれば、主要キャラクターのセルフを求めるロマンティックな探求は白人男性主体とその人種的・性的他者との対立によって表象される。

Marcus also argues that Woolf's incorporation of hundreds of lines of canonical literature, specifically well-known romantic poems, is part of an attack on a literary mode fully involved with imperialist aggression and expansion: the “Romantic quest for a self and definition of the (white male) self against the racial or sexual Other” (p.137). Bernard's final ride against death is Byronic man's struggle against the disintegration of the imperialist / romantic quest and of the imperialist / romantic self — a disintegration Woolf both predicts and invites.

(Hackett, *Supplanting Shakespeare's Rising Sons* 265)

最終的に死に立ち向かうバーナードの姿はこうしたロマン主義的あるいは帝国主義的な探求とセルフの崩壊を表しており、まさにこの崩壊こそフェミニストとしてのウルフが描きたかったものだともマーカスは主張している。

マーカスの読みがもしこのようにまとめられるとしたら、きわめて興味深いことになる。というのも、ちょっとにわかには信じられないこともかも知れないが、マーカスのポストコロナル批評は、さきほど作品解釈の出発点とした野島の解釈とほぼ同じものであるからである。一見すると、主題として純粋自我を取り上げる野島の読みは、あきらかに Marcus とは正反対に、非政治的なものにはしか見えない。そこで問題にされていたのは、認識論的な問題であった、あるいはいっそ、その解釈は古風な倫理批評の趣があった、と言ったほうがまとを得ているかも知れない。しかしながら、テキストのエンディングが表象しているのは、西洋近代および男性主体の崩壊・喪失であるという論点において、見事にというが奇妙にもというべきか、両者は一致している。「純粋自我の追及はついに自我そのものの喪失にゆきつかざるを得なかった」という野島と“Bernard's final ride against death is Byronic man's struggle against the disintegration of the imperialist / romantic quest and of the imperialist / romantic self — a disintegration Woolf both predicts and invites”という Marcus。これは一体どういうことなのか。素朴な感想としてじつにおもしろい事態であると言わざるをえない。理論

的には、自分自身は非白人種の男性であるのに白人主体に自己を同一化 (identify)しようとしている、あるいは、自分自身は白人種であるのに非白人の場に自己の批評的ポジションを設定しようとしている。いずれの場合も、自己と他者の間の人種の差異を否認(disavow)してしまっている。<sup>2</sup>別の言い方をすれば、近代的男性主体の崩壊は認めながらも、イデオロギー的主体化が帝国主義によってあらたに再編成される可能性にはほとんど全くといっていいほど盲目なように見える。(たとえば、明確な形で認識されたのは第二次大戦が終り政治的・軍事的植民地支配が一応終了した後のことになるのかもしれないが、New Criticism 的なアイロニーやセックスへの欲望を通じての主体化のようなポストコロニアリズムによる文化的支配への再編成。そして、いまさら言うまでもないことだが、これらの一見非政治的な文化的あるいはより限定的には文学的な研究概念のイデオロギー性を、80年代にテキストやリーディングの問題として設定しながら、これでもかというように徹底的に分析し炙りだしたのがディコンストラクション批評の最良の成果だった。少なくとも私はそう考えている。)ここで野島とマーカスの解釈を比較して確認したかったのは、後者が前者に比べていかに理論的・政治的に進んでいて優れているかということでもなければ、また逆に、前者が実は意図はどうであったか別としてその優れた文学的感性と作品に密着した綿密な読解のおかげで後者の成果を先取りするものだったかというようなことでは、ぜんぜん、ない。本論が問題にしたかったのは、ふまえるべき先行研究のそれぞれがどのようなテーマやイメージを主題化しているかといったことではなく、“British imperialism”のイデオロギー的主体化(subjectification)がどのように分析され解釈されているか。別の言い方をするなら、いわゆる作品とは区別されるテキストというものに対して、いかなる読みの対応をしたらよいか、ということだった。(一言断っておくなら、テキストの概念化は、Jacques Derrida, Fredric Jameson, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak 等の仕事に明らかかなように、Louis Althusser 以降のイデオロギー批判と結びついて練り上げられてきた、とここではとらえている。)より具体的に両者の比較から確認しておいていいポイントは、帝国主義や人種といった主題を必ずしも取り上げていない解釈も、ポストコロニアル批評と無関係ではない、あるいは、そうした主題やイメージを取り上げていないからこそポストコロニアリズムつまり現在も存続している文化的・経済的帝国主義の射程内に入ってしまふあるいはイデオロギー的に「どはまり」だ、ということだろうか。

先行する『波』解釈をめぐるポイントをさらに具体的に示すためには、Patrick McGee の Marcus 批判を見るのが簡便かも知れない。“The Politics of Modernist Form: Or, Who Rules *The Waves*”という論文タイトルからも明らかのように、その批判に活用されているのは、主要なキャラクターや内容ではなく、いわゆるディコンストラクシオ的な形式分析あるいはポストモダニズム的なメタ・フィクション性への注目だった。そして、そのモダニズムの文学形式が孕む政治性は、帝国主義のイデオロギーとわがちがたく結びついている点にある。

Nevertheless, the form that modernism rules or draws the line of, so to speak, does not exempt it from appealing to the sources of authorization and legitimacy in the culture of imperialism itself.

(McGee 648)

つまりどういうことか念のために確認しておけば、テキストの著者としてのウルフは単純に反帝国主義の立場であるとはいえないし、『波』に急進的政治性を読み取ることはできない。McGee のウルフ解釈は、Marcus の主張とはむしろ正反対の方向を目指しているようだ。

ただし、Marcus も、一応は、“writer figure”としてのバーナードや“The Lady at a Table Writing”，そして、ウルフのアイロニーにも言及していたので、その違いを明確にしておかなければならない。

It seems to me that Marcus gives too much credit to Bernard and not enough credit to the subtlety of Woolf's *unstable* irony. The lady or woman writing is not just Bernard's projection, although she may very well be a figure of the woman who rules *The Waves* [ . . . ]. The woman who rules *The Waves* is the one who draws the lines that determine its form or arrangement — who decides what is inside and what is outside. In the case of Woolf's novel, she is also the one who draws the lines in such a way as to call attention to the undecidability of those limits, to the very arbitrariness of modernist form. To say that Bernard is a parody of authorship is to grant authorship an authority that Woolf's novel calls into question by insisting on the artificiality or constructedness of the frame that gives the author power over the text he or she writes.

(McGee 640)

McGee の場合、テキスト全体の語り手とキャラクターにして語り手でもあるバーナードとの複雑に絡み合った関係、あるいは、複数の語り手の間に区別を設けることの“undecidability”が、分析の焦点となる、といえれば

ンとくるだろうか。具体的に, McGee が『波』のテキストから引用している箇所を見てみよう。

If, as Marcus argues, the interludes are Woolf's attempt to articulate the repressed of the imperialist social order as the frame of the novel, they also make a significant *return of the repressed* in the main body of Bernard's final monologue. No longer italicized, no longer safely confined to the margins, the voice of the interludes erupts from within the discourse of the imperialist subject:

I can visit the remote verges of the desert lands where the savage sits by the campfire. Day rises; the girl lifts the watery fire-hearted jewels to her brow; the sun levels his beams straight at the sleeping house; the waves deepen their bars; they fling themselves on shore; back blows the spray; sweeping their waters they surround the boat and the sea-holly. The birds sing in chorus; deep tunnels run between the stalks of flowers; the house is whitened; the sleeper stretches; gradually all is astir. Light floods the room and drives shadow beyond shadow to where they hang in folds inscrutable. What does the central shadow hold? Something? Nothing? I do not know. (The Waves 291–92)

Quite simply, what is the reader to think? Has Bernard been the narrator all along? Was it Bernard who *intended* to subvert his own patriarchal and imperialist authority by framing the autobiography of his social class with a voice from Eastern culture (if we accept for a moment Marcus's reading of the interludes as imitations of the Gayatri from the *Rig Veda*)? Has the whole novel been the contradictory and sexually ambivalent internal monologue of a Western patriarchal subject? (McGee 638)

従来ならポストモダンなメタ・フィクション性や自己言及性として言挙げされてきたこの場面こそが, McGee によれば, 斜字体の“interludes”とローマン体の“Bernard's final monologue”の区別, つまり東洋の被植民者のボイス(“a voice from Eastern culture”)と西洋の“the imperialist subject”のボイスの区別を突き崩す契機として再解釈されなければならない。

Indeed, in the passage I have cited, there is an inscription of this undecidability. Everything up to the reference to a sleeper more or less corresponds to the material in the interludes. But who is the sleeper? This figure seems to suggest that beyond the self-conscious subject of modernist art that produces its fictional mouthpiece in Bernard (and to different degrees in the other characters) lies another subject or the subject as the Other. This “sleeper” is the unconscious subject of the discourse of the novel, the subject of those effects that exceed the overt message that the monologues of the six characters and the poetic interludes want to convey.

(McGee 638–39)

さらに、テキストのこの決定不可能性あるいは“instability of the frame”を、McGee は二つのボイス・二つの境界領域の間の中心に置ける決定不可能性、“instability of the centre”に結びつけている。“Light floods the room and drive shadow beyond shadow to where they hang in folds inscrutable”とあるように、ここには、たしかに、影のイメージと対比された光のイメージがある。そしてそのイメージの対照を、ウルフのヴィジョンの表現としてとらえることは、すなわち、むかし習い覚えたニュー・クリティシズム及び観念史の作品読解術を基本的には温存し続けて、文明と自然・白人と非白人・宗主国と植民地の差異として読み取ることは、さして難しくもなければ牽強付会な解釈でもないかもしれない。しかしそれら二つのボイスと境界領域を区別するはずの中心をしてみるならば、“What does the central shadow hold? Something? Nothing? I do not know”とあるように、“central shadow”によって区切られる境界は突き崩され両者の差異は不確定なものとなっている。どうも McGee のポストコロニアル批評が実践するテキストの読みは昔の読み方・解釈の仕方とはずいぶん違うらしい。そして最終的には、反帝国主義者のウルフのアイデンティティは、語りの形式を含めたテキストの構造においては、“undecidable”である、ということにならざるをえない。“*The Waves* subverts the intentional authority of its own author-function.” (McGee 690) 以上が、Marcus の『波』解釈を批判的に検討した McGee の結論だ。

作品とは区別される、テキストの読みの一例として、ここではマックギーの論文を取り上げたが、もちろん日本のウルフ研究においてもこのような読みが、まったく、なかったわけでは、もちろん、ない。80年代においてある種画期的とされた Makiko Minow-Pinkney のウルフ研究を批判的継承・展開を試みつつ『波』の詩的言語を論じた清水知子の論文を見ればそれは明らかだろう。「最後の一文 “*The waves broke on the shore*” この波のイメージは、スキゾフレニックな記号の戯れに終わることなく、テキストの構造に統一を与え、形式的にモダニズムを成立させる。しかし、ピンクニーが結論づけるような、テーマ的にフェミニズムを実現し、内容的にモダニズムを実現させることがウルフの求めた両性具有的なエクリチュール・フェミニンであるというのはあまりに安易ではないだろうか」(清水 40)。そこでは主として両性具有的なエクリチュール・フェミニンが主題化されているが、じつは、Marcus や McGee の研究も視野に入ってい

て、次のようにふまえられている。「馬に乗り、パーシヴァルのように髪をなびかせて敵に立ち向かうパーナードの姿は、ピンクニーが指摘するような両性具有というより、最近のジェイン・マーカスやマックギーが指摘するように、むしろ家父長制と帝国主義の象徴である」(清水 40)。その上で清水が具体的に分析したのは、エンディングをふくんだテキストの構造全体に機能する「詩的言語」、つまり、Paul de Man の言う「時間性のレトリック」(“the rhetoric of temporality”)としてのアレゴリーとアイロニーだった。「なぜなら、これまで見てきたようにテキストの最初に現れる森やエルヴドンの庭のアレゴリー、そしてテキストの最後に現れる死や波といったアイロニーによるイメージ、時間性のレトリックの二つの顕現、そこに生じる差異がテキストの局所的なところでせめぎあい揺れているのだから。両性具有的なエクリチュール・フェミニンを可能にしているのは、むしろテキスト全体に作用するこうした詩的言語であろう」(清水 40)。

また、ウルフの『波』にかぎらず、近年の文学・文化研究では、人種やポストコロニアリズム等に注目する解釈が、明示的にまた暗黙のうちに、試みられてきており、白人の近代的主体あるいは「純粹自我」といった批評的前提を批判しているように見える。そして、temporality をめぐる議論が、そうした批判においてもまた、重要な役割を担っている。<sup>3</sup> そうした意味では、ここで英文学研究とは違う例として、たとえば酒井直樹の議論を挙げそこで何が問題とされているのか確認してみることも、無駄ではなからう。

この点でも、我々は、文化的差異の分節化における二重の時間性に直面する。二つの時間性の矛盾とは、まさに「時間性」について語る時ホミ・バーバが記した文化的差異の分節化に「政治的想像体の社会運動への象徴的なアクセス」を与えるもの、のことである。また、バーバが、フランツ・ファノンに従って「時間のずれ」(time-lag)と呼ぶもの、すなわち象徴と記号、共時性と自己亀裂(caesura)あるいは発作(seizure)(適時性ではない)との間の妨害的な重複のなから生まれる他性反復的・審問的空間」は、二つの時間性へ注意をますます引きつけるものである。(酒井 157)

そこでは、人種的差異をめぐる理論的・政治的対応が問題であって、いわゆる主題批評における人間的時間・意識とか実存主義的な倫理が問題になっていたのではなかった。「例えば植民地における主人と原住民の奴隷とのヒエラルキーのような諸同一性間の仮想のヒエラルキーが、経済的・政治的發展の一般的帰結によって転換を蒙り、逆転したと想像されているような現代のような時代には、以前の「主人」のうち、最も良心的で自己批判的な人たちでさえ、むき出しの自民族中心主義(ethnocentrism)に依

拠したり「回帰したり」する誘惑に抵抗するのはかなり困難なことだろう。(中略)ある意味では、それは主体の同一性の本質主義からの必然的なコロラリーなのである」(酒井 158)。ここで酒井が時間性について語るのは、「文化的差異の異なった分節化を促進するように機能する理論や政治的干渉を生み出すこと」(酒井 158)を目的としているからなのだ。<sup>4</sup>少なくともそうした対応をわれわれも十分にふまえるべきではなかったろうか、ホミ・バーバのような批評家たちの問題提起にそって人種や文化の差異の問題を探求するならば。<sup>5</sup>

さて、本論の最初の問題に立ち返るならば、こうしたテキストの読みの理論や実践を、ウルフ研究やモダニズム論といった脈絡にどのように接続し交錯させたらよいだろうか。ここではとりあえず、そうした脈絡の代表例としての『波』解釈に話を限るとして、“the tramp of dark men and yellow men”という人種的差異の表象はどのようにとらえ直さなければならないのだろうか。まさか、テキストと歴史あるいはサブテキストとの関係を単純反映論的にとらえて、“The central shadow”のイメージはアジアの非白人人種、“yellow men”あるいは日本人を表現している、などと解釈するわけにはいかないだろう。また、既存の歴史研究のリサーチの部分だけをひそかにしかも自分に都合よく流用するだけでことたりるわけでもない。ポストコロニアリズムや帝国主義についての問いは、現代世界にあらわれる現実の事態や傾向に実際に対応しようとする文化研究・歴史研究と連動して探求されているのであり、文学研究の作法や論文作成の新しい技術の問題に矮小化してしまっていいものではもちろんない。そうした世界から、より適切には、テキスト化された現実からウルフの『波』を切り離してその「文学」世界にひきこもりたりそうした空間を脅かされたりするとさまざまないじめや暴力をふるったりしてしまうような事態に対応するためにも、まずは、作品の解釈についての解釈を試みるのがどうしても必要だった。(とはいえ、そうした試みは何かオリジナルで本格的な文学解釈のための予備作業だというわけではないことは、言い添えておいたほうが無駄な誤解や行き違いがなくていいかもしれない。近年の英米文学研究制度における「現前の形而上学」批判をいくらかなりとでもきちんとはふまえ、それをテキストを読むことというきわめて基本的な問題に設定し直してみるなら、解釈について次のような考え方をすることがまさに批判の対象となっていることに気づかざるをえない。われわれ読者がなんの媒介もなく作品にいまここでじかに出会いその存在を経験することができるのか。『波』というテキストは、ヴァージニア・ウルフの署名入り印刷物なかでもその

権威ある原文決定版に限られており、それ以外の印刷物や解釈などはせいぜい二次的なもので解釈されるべきテキストではありえないしそもそも読むにあたいしないものがほとんどかもしれないといったような。) その上でさらに問うなら、『波』自体はどのように再読されなければならないのだろうか。

そもそも、人種をめぐるこうした言説はテキスト全体の構造においてはどのように分節化され表象されていたのだろうか。ウルフや語り手の声ではないどのような voice で、言い換えればどのキャラクターのヴォイスを通じて語られているのか。いうまでもなくそれは、従来の解釈では本格的に論じられることのなかった、“I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone”というルイスのヴォイスだ。

I HAVE signed my name,” said Louis, “already twenty times. I, and again I, and again I. Clear, firm, unequivocal, there it stands, my name. Clear-cut and unequivocal am I too. Yet a vast inheritance of experience is packed in me. I have lived thousands of years. I am like a worm that has eaten its way through the wood of a very old oak beam. But now I am compact; now I am gathered together this fine morning.

“The sun shines from a clear sky. But twelve o’clock brings neither rain nor sunshine. It is the hour when Miss Johnson brings me my letters in a wire tray. Upon these white sheets I indent my name. The whisper of leaves, water running down gutters, green depths flecked with dahlias or zinnias; I, now a duke, now Plato, companion of Socrates; the tramp of dark men and yellow men migrating east, west north and south; the eternal procession, women going with attaché cases down the Strand as they went once with pitchers to the Nile; all the furled and close-packed leaves of my many-folded life are now summed in my name; incised cleanly and barely on the sheet. Now a full-grown man; now upright standing in sun or rain, I must drop heavy as a hatchet and cut the oak with my sheer weight, for if I deviate, glancing this way, or that way, I shall fall like snow and be wasted.

“I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone. With letters and cables and brief but courteous commands on the telephone to Paris, Berlin, New York, I have fused my many lives into one; I have helped by my assiduity and decision to score those lines on the map there by which the different parts of the world are laced together.  
(Woolf 118–19)

そもそも非白人種のイメージを含むセクションは、“I HAVE signed my



name,” said Louis, “already twenty times. I, and again I, and again I” というふう  
に始まっていた。そして, “Clear, firm, unequivocal”なルイスのアイデンテ  
ィティはその正反対の存在様態, ルイスの“many-folded life”と対比されて  
いるが, その二つの自己や生のありようを媒介しているのが紙に書かれた  
名前なのだ。“all the furled and close-packed leaves of my many-folded life are  
now summed in my name; incised cleanly and barely on the sheet” (Woolf 119).

ここで私なりのテキストの読みとして注目したいのは, もちろんエクリ  
チュールあるいは“writer figure”ということであるが, Marcus 等とはちがっ  
て, “the typewriter and the telephone”というメディア言説とバーナードをは  
じめ多様な形で姿をあらわす“writer figure”を関係づけたい。そしてそのよ  
うにして帝国主義のイデオロギー的主体化の表象をグローバルに再考した  
い, というのが本論のもくろみだ。テキストに則してより具体的に言うな  
ら, そのエンディングにおける対立するイメージを, バーナードと“Death”  
あるいはエルヴドンの“The Lady at a Table writing”と砕け散る波という二つ  
のイメージの差異あるいは差異性を, いずれか一方に還元してはならな  
い, むしろ, 両者の差異がいかに生成されるのか, その差異化の過程を読  
み解きたい。これまでの『波』解釈が注目してきた対立は実は偽の対立な  
のではないか。ウルフ研究ということで, ジェンダーあるいは女性作家と  
いう表象イメージがあまりに特権化され続けてきているのではないのか。  
McGee の場合もじつはそうなのだが, テキストの決定不可能性は家父長  
制・帝国主義において女性作家がかかえる矛盾によって解釈されてしまっ  
ている。<sup>6</sup> もちろん, エルヴドンの庭やそうしたある種「始原的な場面」に  
おけるエクリチュールの表象はどう解釈したらよいかという課題は残るか  
もしれないが, それにしても, それらの表象を結局はジェンダーや精神分  
析学的主題の次元にひそかに回収し解釈を終えてしまっていていいとはかぎら  
ないだろう。このテキストを英国帝国主義によって政治的に解釈するとし  
て, そのイデオロギーを構造的に規定する対立は, 実は, エンディングに  
おける対立イメージとは別のところにあって隠蔽され転位され続けてきて  
いるのではないか。

さて, テキストの構造全体において中心となるのはどのキャラクター  
か, と問うなら, その答えは必ずしも「タイプライターとテレフォンにな  
かば恋する」ルイスではないようにも見える。<sup>7</sup> オーストラリア, プリスベ  
インの銀行家を父に持ち自分の訛をなんとか消去したい「汚点」(“certain  
stains”)・「汚れ」(“old defilements”)とみなすこのアウトサイダーは, 男 /

女の差異に代わる有機体/機械の差異や植民地主義の差別という点においては十二分に注目されてしかるべきだとはいえ、『波』全体のなかでは特権的な地位を占めているとは言えない。まずもって名前のあがるのは、キャラクターにして語り手または“life”についての本の完成をめざす「両性具有的な」芸術家としてのバーナードだ。<sup>8</sup>「手紙や電話」で「世界の果ての混沌とした場所」に取引をひろげる」ルイスではない、ということになるだろう。ルイスのオーストラリア性やオーストラリアの表象を社会史・文化史的に探るだけでは、テキストとして読んだとは言えないのは明らかだ。(作品の解釈や文学研究としても通用しなかったはずだ、たぶん。)

にもかかわらず、そのバーナードが、“life”の要約を試みる最終セクションの結末近くになって否定しなければならないのがローダとルイスであった。

I went into the Strand, and evoked to serve as opposite to myself the figure of Rhoda, always so furtive, always with fear in her eyes, always seeking some pillar in the desert, to find which she had gone; she had killed herself. ‘Wait,’ I said [. . .]. In persuading her I was also persuading my own soul. For this is not one life; nor do I always know if I am man or woman, Bernard or Nevill, Louis, Susan, Jinny, or Rhoda — so strange is the contact of one with another.

“Swinging my stick, with my hair newly cut and the nape of my neck tingling, I went past all those trays of penny toys imported from Germany that men hold out in the street by St. Paul’s [. . .]. I thought how Louis would mount those steps in his neat suit with his cane in his hand and his angular, rather detached gait. With his Australian accent (‘My father, a banker at Brisbane’) he would come, I thought, with greater respect to these old ceremonies than I do [. . .].

(Woolf 199–200)

その箇所は、主題的には、自殺と宗教 “the certainty, so sonorously repeated, of resurrection, of eternal life” (Woolf 200) の問題として表象されているが、修辭的には、(ローダと沈黙の問題だけでなく) グローバルな情報メディアの反芸術家ルイスと真正なモダニスト芸術家であるバーナードの対立・矛盾が問題とされるべきだと思われる。あるいはローダの存在に注目するにしても、“Yet I still keep my attic room. There I open the usual little book [. . .] there Rhoda sometimes comes. For we are lovers.” (Woolf 121)とあるように、一時的ではあれ言及されている二人の愛人関係も、(兆候的な) 読解の対象として取り上げるべきではないだろうか。<sup>9</sup> また、ロンドンでひととき静かな時を過ごす孤独なルイスの隠喩的イメージ“attic

room”は、同じ人物が関与する海外での活発で行動的な商いを換楡的にあ  
らわすカントリーハウスのイメージ“a place in Surrey with glass houses, and  
some rare conifer, melon or flowering tree which other merchants will envy”  
(Woolf 120)とはずいぶん対照的であり、こうした一連のイメージの関係性  
は、これまで国民国家の枠組みでなされてきた研究が無意識に前提として  
きた、都会／田舎やメトロポリス／植民地といったいくつかの基本的二項  
対立をいとも軽々と突き崩しているかのようだ。<sup>10</sup>

ともあれ、バーナードとルイスの表象は、“writer figure”の多様性そのも  
のとして、これまで考えられてきたよりもずっと重要なテキストの構造要  
素であるようだ。そうして、帝国主義のイデオロギー的主体化の痕跡とし  
て、単純な対立をこえた興味深いかたちで提示される二人の錯綜した差異  
性こそが、『波』というテキストをまさに分節化している。

I said life had been imperfect, an unfinished phrase. It had been  
impossible for me, taking snuff as I do from any bagman met in a  
train, to keep coherency — that sense of the generations, of  
women carrying red pitchers to the Nile, of the nightingale who  
sings among conquests and migrations. (Woolf 201)

とあるように、未完成の本(“an unfinished phrase”)にたとえられたバーナード  
の“life”は、“that sense of the generations, of women carrying red pitchers to  
the Nile, of the nightingale who sings among conquests and migrations”というル  
イスと密接に結びついたイメージやフレーズと対立しているように見え  
る。だが実は、そのちょっと前の箇所では、以下のような異様なバーナード  
像がしっかり示されていた。

Toast and butter, coffee and bacon, *The Times* and letters — sud-  
denly the telephone rang with urgency and I rose deliberately and  
went to the telephone. I took up the black mouth. I marked the  
ease with which my mind adjusted itself to assimilate the message  
— it might be (one has these fancies) to assume command of the  
British Empire; I [. . .] had created, by the time I put back the  
receiver, a richer, a stronger, a more complicated world in which I  
was called upon to act my part and had no doubt whatever that I  
could do it. (Woolf 185)

明らかにここでは、バーナードの“life”も、ルイスと同様、帝国主義(“com-  
mand of the British Empire”)に分かち難く結びついていることを、“*The  
Times* and letters”, “the telephone”などの言説が暴露している。ただし、あ  
くまでウルフの意識がテキストにおいて主題化しているのは、成功した

「資本家」としてのルイスとは対照的なというよりはむしろなんら特別な意味のある関係性も持っていないような、バーナードの芸術家像のようだし、そのように従来から解釈され続けてきたように思われる。こうした主題化の過程においてバーナードと“Death”の差異が生成してくるのだが、もう一人の芸術家像が『波』の中心からはなはだしく周縁化されてしまっているのは一体どうしてなのか。英国の植民地に由来するその主体あるいはアイデンティティの問題のほかに、ルイスの形象はさらにどのような形で帝国主義の差異性に関わっているからバーナードとの差異が消去され隠蔽されているのか。

以上のようなテキストの構造分析をふまえたいま、ようやく本論文の冒頭に言及した中国の表象を単純化せず有意義に探り始めることができるかもしれない。ルイスの欲望あるいはいっそこういってよければルサンチマンはたんに個人的・倫理的な次元をはみ出し噴出しているかのようであり、実際、その内的独白自体においては、人種的差異と差別をあぶりだす自身のオーストラリア性の記号が中国の記号と併置されていた。

“I like to be asked to come to Mr. Burchard’s private room and report on our commitments to China. I hope to inherit an arm-chair and a Turkey carpet. My shoulder is to the wheel; I roll the dark before me, spreading commerce where there was chaos in the far parts of the world. If I press on, from chaos making order, I shall find myself where Chatham stood, and Pitt, Burke and Sir Robert Peel. Thus I expunge certain stains, and erase old defilements; the woman who gave me a flag from the top of the Christmas tree; my accent; beatings and other tortures; the boasting boys; my father, a banker at Brisbane. (Woolf 119–20)

こうした記号の連鎖を見るならば、帝国主義の文化が産出する非白人移民の言説を単純な文化的他者としてのルイスだとかオーストラリアだとかにだけ探るべきではないという本論の読み方も、あながち見当はずれというわけではないらしい。中国との経済・外交関係に結びつきつつもよりグローバルな太平洋地域に拡張するその地理的な表象には、世界のあらゆる領土を支配しようとする白色人種の歴史的命運が大きくかかっている。“I roll the dark before me, spreading commerce where there was chaos in the far parts of the world” (Woolf 119). ここでは、“order”に対立するのは“chaos”で、“commerce”の仕事に精を出すルイスが直面しなくてはならないのは白のイメージとは対照的な“the dark”のそれだ。一度はルイスという名前に取り込まれてしまったかに見えた非白人移民の多様性が、イギリスと中国、秩序と混沌、中心と周縁の対立群として表象 = 再現されている。

る。ここで注目すべきは、多様な文化的他者たちは必ずしも白人文明あるいは大英帝国が退化する決定的なしるしとはなっていないことである。メディア言説の連鎖をたどりテキストのほかの箇所をトレースしてみるなら、むしろ、以下のような人種再生の歴史的ヴィジョンが書き記されている。

Louis [. . .] must sit down in his office among the typewriters and the telephone and work it all [. . .] for our regeneration, and the reform of an unborn world.  
(Woolf 141)

このように再読してみると、ウルフが大英帝国の死を描いているという従来の解釈はずいぶんと疑わしい。むしろその退化や衰退への不安が当時のイギリス社会や大西洋地域においてさまざまに生み出され流通していたことは間違いない。だからといって、イギリス帝国主義が崩壊し終焉してしまったと考えるわけにはいかない。『波』というテキストをルイスの形象すなわちタイプライター・テレフォンの言説に注目して解釈するならば、むしろ正反対の可能性を読み取らなければならない。

以上のようにウルフの『波』と帝国主義の関係には、単に反帝国主義としては読むことができない。あるいは、そのテキストの「根源」には構造的曖昧さと差異性が刻印されているとして、その歴史的・地政学的条件を、さらに、探ってもいいかもしれない。じつは先ほどあげた引用にあるように、退化した白人文明あるいは大英帝国の再生を成し遂げるとされるルイスの仕事を、テキストは具体的には、“our commitments to China” (119)つまり大西洋だけでなく太平洋にまたがって売買契約をむすぶ英国経済のグローバル化として表象していた。そしてまた、バーナードもその要約で想起するように、“British imperialism”自体も決して一枚岩ではなく、その内部において二つの帝国主義が対立しているように見える。パーシヴァルの赤裸々な植民地支配とその暴力がまるで見てきたかのように描かれた直後、友人たちのなかでもルイスについての回想がなぜか過剰にしかしなにか意味ありげに付加される。“[Louis] ascendancy was resented, as Percival’s was adored.”(Woolf 173)「パーシヴァルの卓越」は肯定され、他方、「ルイスの優越は」は否定される。どちらかと言えばパーシヴァルとインドの関係が政治的なものに見えるのに対して、ルイスと中国の関係は経済的なものである。インドの視点からの研究も必要なものだろうし、実際すでに、そうした論文たとえばLinden Peach (1999)も出てきている。しかし、インドといってもそれはいまだ大西洋の視点にとどまっているのではないだろうか。私としてはこれまで理論的・政治的にあまり光を当てられてこなかった後者の関係をとくに注目し対応したい。そして、経済的グローバ

リズムの痕跡としてのルイスの意味は、地政学的には、大西洋地域に意識の中心を置くバーナードの語りからは抑圧され周辺へと排除された太平洋地域の存在として解釈することができるのではないかと思っている。テクストの最終シーンに関しては、バーナードと砕け散る波という一見すると宗主国と植民地の対立もバーナードとルイス・大西洋と太平洋という対立・矛盾によって再解釈されるべきではなかっただろうか。『波』というテクストをめぐり帝国主義やポストコロニアリズムの問いを立てるには、と同時に、そうしたウルフ解釈およびモダニズム論を有意義なやり方で現代の文化研究や歴史研究に交錯させたり開いていくためには、太平洋の視点が重要である、これが本論の主張したかったことであった。

## Notes

\* 本論は日本ヴァージニア・ウルフ協会第20回全国大会(2000年10月2日、於東京家政大学板橋キャンパス)における口頭発表「『波』, ルイス, 太平洋 “I am half in love with the typewriter and the telephone”」にもとづいている。

<sup>1</sup> 人種, 移民, 帝国主義, ポストコロニアル批評等による『波』解釈については, Carter, Phillips, Usui およびそれらで言及されている文献を見よ。Phillips の『波』解釈は, ルイスを中心に取り上げながらもそのオーストラリア性を単純反映論的には論じていない例であるが, 本論とは異なり, 全体主義・ファシズムと結びつけている(Phillips 153-83)。またこれらとは別に加藤, 近藤, Matsumoto も参照のこと。ウルフを論じたものではないが, オーストラリアとの関係については, 朝日がその研究のやり方においてある意味で典型的な例かもしれない。中国や黄色人種に関するイメージについては, 東田, Hoppenstand, Waller がある。より一般的な研究としては, Midgley, Panayi, Thomas, 山形をあげておく。

<sup>2</sup> 興味深いことに, 「自我の問題」に取り組みながら, 性的差異についてはある程度において意識的であることが, あるいは, なにがしか弁解的な言辞を示す必要を感じるくらいには不安をかかえていることが, テクストというよりは作家ウルフを作品『波』を中心に論じた野島の別の論考, とりわけ, その「あとがき」で示されている否定の身振りに, 明らかである。「或る女性がぼくのこのエッセイを読んで, 『野島さんは女流作家ということを顧慮していない』と言っていた, と友人がぼくに告げてくれた。然り, ぼくは別にウルフを女流作家として語りはしなかった。ウルフはぼくにとって作家であれば足りた。と言っても聞き直ったわけでも, また作家に女流も男流もあるものではない, という一応の正論で弁解しようなどとも考えていない。それはそれで正当な批判であるとは思っている」(野島『ヴァージニア・ウルフ論』178)。

<sup>3</sup> 時間性や歴史といった概念は, 現在の資本主義社会のグローバリゼーションとそれに理論的対応を試みる社会論・文化論における「空間論的転回」(spatial turn)によってすっかり時代遅れのものとなってしまい, 代わって, 「空間性」(spatiality)や「地理」(geography)といった概念や表象が議論のまともになっているようにも見える。そのようなカルチュラル・スタディーズといわれる場において実質的に問題にされているのは, しかし, 時間的差異か空間的差異かいずれが優れたそして正しい

概念化かといったことではないし、したがって、方法論上の立場についていずれか選択すればそれでその個人の研究の評価が定まりOKだ、というわけにもいかない。この点についてはすでに大田 146-47 で論じたことがある。de Man, *Allegories of Reading* に関しては, Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 156 注のように Transnational Cultural Studies に向けた展開の仕方もある。ここでは、とりえず、次にあげる簡略だが明快な解説のように理解しておけば間に合うかもしれない。「しかし、社会人文学における空間や空間性(spatiality)の強調は歴史性や時間性を無視しようとするもので決してない。むしろ、社会を空間的に考え、社会と空間的なものとの間の節合 = 節節の関係を見ることは、歴史をリニアな連続性としてみならず早急な理論的判断に面と向かって疑問を呈すること、そして、歴史や時間を異質な諸契機がからみあい重なり合って織りなす多層的な構造としてあつかうことなのである」(上野・毛利 224)。

<sup>4</sup> 「文化的差異の分節化」の問題は、McGee の場合がそうであったように、文化的他者にまつわる表象不可能性の問題としてとらえることもできるかもしれない。「表象の不可能性を越えて」「『難民』に生成すること、難民的生を生きること」を提案しているのは岡『記憶 / 物語』112 である。特にフェミニズムあるいはジェンダー・セクシュアリティとの関連で論じているものとしては、同じ著者の『彼女の「正しい」名前とは何か 第三世界フェミニズムの思想』および竹村、田崎を参照せよ。

<sup>5</sup> 本論ではそのウルフ解釈だけを取り上げたが、日本における文学・文化研究の歴史の読み直しについては、たとえば、次のような諸テキストがその目印となる。まずは、1972 年という特定の歴史的脈絡において書かれた柄谷行人の評論のなかに以下の論評がある。「日本のシェークピア学者の多くは、エリョットがつくった枠組みの中で思考している。近年のシェークピア研究の中で傑出した論考といえる野島秀勝の『近代文学の虚実』は、その代表的な例である。野島氏は、ロマンズ、道徳劇、エリザベス朝演劇、ジェームズ朝演劇、悲劇の死といふふうには、中世ヨーロッパ世界像の分解と変質のあとを史的にたどってみせる。完璧な『存在の偉大な鎖』におおわれた世界が分解していくというこの見方は、ヘーゲルを逆向きにしただけのことである。つまり、『近代』を否定しようとするこの反歴史主義的な史観が、すでに充分『近代』的であるばかりでなく、そのことに対する自覚すら欠けているのである」(柄谷 156)。ここでの「近代」の問題は「自我の問題」と同型であるとみなしてよい。さらに、野島の allegory や figura をめぐる論点は、T. S. Eliot だけではなく Erich Auerbach の受容のしかたをも、欧米などでの受容のしかた(たとえば Edward Said や Rachel Bowlby)と比較しながら、われわれは再検討しなければならないことを示唆している。言うまでもなく、Auerbach の主著『ミメシス』の最終章が、おもにウルフ『灯台へ』を論じていたことの意味は、それが執筆されたトルコや最後にちらと言及される Pearl Buck と中国の表象と同様、見過ごしていい問題ではない。さらに現在、Eliot (あるいは John Milton と『欽定訳聖書』)と対立するとされる Oscar Wilde (あるいは Walter Pater) を、そして、吉田健一によるその受容を批判的に検討しているものとして、富山なかでも「オスカー・ワイルドを読むために」145-54 を参照のこと。また時代は少しさかのぼるが、第二次大戦の敗戦後の東北大学において法学部の学生向けに H. G. Wells を講じたのが土居だった。

<sup>6</sup> McGee 640 を見よ。

<sup>7</sup> ここでは詳しく検討する余裕はないが、1899 年の *Nineteenth Century* 45 号に掲載された“An Imperial Telegraph System”やちょっと意外かもしれないが Karl Pearson の *The Grammar of Science* (1892)、そして C. R. W. Nevinson が 1930 年に出した“Amongst the Nerves of the World”など、あるいはタイプライターやテレフォンとい

った情報メディア・テクノロジーの文化研究・歴史研究も視野にいれる必要がある。たとえば、ウルフとの関連では Whitworth, Caughie を、また Kittler, Ronell も参照。

<sup>8</sup> 旧来の教養小説論としては、Beebe, Guber, 川本を参照。レズビアニズムと人種退化の理論との関係からローダを再解釈した近年の例としては、Hackett, *Sophism and Degeneracy* がある。

<sup>9</sup> こうした観点から振り返れば、インドへ赴くパシヴァルのために催された送別の宴においてすでに、ルイスとローダはともに「共謀者」として、「野蛮人たちの踊りのように」(100)集い、それから「傲慢な獣がとりつき」「行動の声」(101)で語り出す他の友人たちから疎外されているかのようだが、その前に、自然の大地や母性を具現するかのような女性、「愛するスーザンの横に坐る」(88)パシヴァルたち二人と、対照的に表象されていた。

<sup>10</sup> 基本的には Jameson を、また、いわゆるジェントルマン資本主義論と交錯する歴史研究としてはルーピンステイン、さらに、最近の文化研究としては Friedman とりわけ『灯台へ』解釈の新たな可能性を示唆する Chapter 4 “Geopolitical Literacy: Internationalizing Feminism at “Home”: The Case of Virginia Woolf” 107–31 を見よ。

## Works Cited

- Beebe, Maurice. *Ivory Towers and Sacred Founts: The Artist as Hero in Fiction from Goethe to Joyce*. New York: New York UP, 1964.
- Bhabha, Homi K. “Conclusion: ‘Race’, Time and the Revision of Modernity.” *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. 236–56.
- Bowlby, Rachel. ed. *Virginia Woolf*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Carter, Françoise. “*The Waves* and Virginia Woolf’s Anti-imperialism.” *Virginia Woolf Review* 17 (2000): 49–68.
- Caughie, Pamela L. ed. *Virginia Woolf in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. New York: Garland, 2000.
- de Man, Paul. “The Rhetoric of Temporality.” *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Second Edition. London: Methuen, 1983. 187–228.
- . *Allegories of Reading: Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings: Feminism and Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.
- Guber, Susan. “The Birth of the Artist as Heroine: (Re)production, the *Kunstlerroman* Tradition, and the Fiction of Katherine Mansfield.” *The Representation of Women in Fiction*. Ed. Carolyn G. Heibrun and Margaret R. Higonnet. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993. 19–59.
- Hackett, Robin. “Sapphism and Degeneracy in *The Waves*.” *Virginia Woolf and Her Influences*. Ed. Laura Davis and Jeanette McVicker. New York: Pace UP, 1998. 44–8.
- . “Supplanting Shakespeare’s Rising Sons: A Perverse Reading through Woolf’s *The Waves*.” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 18. 2 (1999): 263–80.
- Hoppenstand, Gary. “Yellow Devil Doctors and Opium Dens: A Survey of the Yellow Peril Stereotypes in Mass Media Entertainment.” *The Popular Culture Reader*. Third Edition. Ed. Christopher D. Geist and Jack Nachbar. Ohio: Bowling Green UP, 1863. 171–85.
- Jameson, Fredric. “Modernism and Imperialism.” *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*.



- Ed. Terry Eagleton et al. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1990. 43–66.
- Kittler, Friedrich A. *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*. Tr. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1999.
- Marcus, Jane. "Britannia Rules *The Waves*." *Decolonizing Tradition: Views of Twentieth-Century "British" Literary Canons*. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992. 136–62.
- Matsumoto, Hogara. "Mrs. Manresa and *Between the Acts*: Woolf's Figurative Use of Race." *Virginia Woolf Review* 15 (1998): 44–58.
- McGee, Patrick. "The Politics of Modernist Form; Or, Who Rules *The Waves*?" *Modern Fiction Studies* 38. 3(1992): 631–49.
- Midgley, Clare, ed. *Gender and Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.
- Minow-Pinkney, Makiko. *Virginia Woolf and the Problem of the Subject*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1987.
- Panayi, Panikos. *Immigration, Ethnicity and Racism in Britain 1815–1945*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1994.
- Peach, Linden. "No Longer a View: Virginia Woolf in the 1930s and the 1930s in Virginia Woolf." *Women Writers of the 1930s: Gender, Politics and History*. Ed. Maroula Joannou. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999. 192–204.
- Phillips, Kathy J. *Virginia Woolf Against Empire*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1994.
- Ronell, Avital. *The Telephone Book: Technology, Schizophrenia, Electric Speech*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1989.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
- Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards A History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1999.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *In Oceania: Visions, Artifacts, Histories*. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- Usui, Masami. "A Portrait of Alexandra, Princess of Wales and Queen of England," in *Virginia Woolf's The Waves*." *Virginia Woolf: Themes and Variations: Selected Papers from the Second Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Vara Neverow Turk and Mark Hussey. New York: Pace UP, 1993, 121–27.
- Whitworth, Michael. "Woolf's Web: Telecommunications and Community." *Virginia Woolf and Communities: Selected Papers from the Eighth Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Jeanette McVicker and Laura Davis. New York: Pace UP, 1999. 161–67.
- Waller, P. J. "The Chinese." *History Today* 35 (1985): 8–15.
- Woolf, Virginia. *The Waves*. London: Hogarth, 1931.
- 朝日千尺 『D. H. ロレンスとオーストラリア』 研究社出版, 1993.
- 東田雅博 『大英帝国のアジア・イメージ』 ミネルヴァ書房, 1996.
- 加藤めぐみ 「ミルクと帝国主義と ウルフにおける「母性」の言説」 『英語青年』 143, 12(1998):69–96.
- 柄谷行人 「マクベス論 意味に愚かれた人間」 『意味という病』 講談社文芸文庫, 1989.9–66.
- 川本静子 『イギリス教養小説の系譜 「紳士」から「芸術家」へ』 研究社出版, 1973.
- 近藤章子 「表象としてのジブシー 『オーランド』における母の不在」 *Virginia Woolf Review* 15 (1998):16–30.
- ルーピンスティン, W. D. 『衰退しない大英帝国 その経済・文化・教育 1750–1990』 藤井泰・平田雅博・村田邦夫・千石好郎訳 晃洋書房, 1997.

- 野島秀勝「ヴァージニア・ウルフ 純粹自我のゆくえ」『講座英米文学史 10 小説』, 大修館, 1973. 55-80.  
・『ヴァージニア・ウルフ論 美神と宿命』南雲堂, 1962.
- 大田信良「「文学」の歴史と時間性のレトリック 文化の定義をめぐる覚書」『東京学芸大学紀要 第二部門 人文科学』48 (1997):141-47.
- 岡真理『記憶 / 物語』岩波書店, 2000.  
・『彼女の「正しい」名前とは何か 第三世界フェミニズムの思想』青土社, 2000.
- 酒井直樹「文化的差異の分析論と日本という内部性 主体そして / あるいはシュタイと国民文化の刻印」『日本思想という問題 翻訳と主体』岩波書店, 1997. 143-205.
- 清水知子「両性具有と“a play poem” 『波』における詩的言語」*Virginia Woolf Review* 13(1996):29-44.
- 竹村和子『フェミニズム』岩波書店, 2000.
- 田崎英明『ジェンダー / セクシュアリティ』岩波書店, 2000.
- 土居光知「ウェルズの世界国家」『英文学の感覚』土居光知著作集第五巻 岩波書店, 1. 1977.333-64.
- 富山太佳夫『ダーウィンの世紀末』青土社, 1995.
- 上野俊哉・毛利嘉孝『カルチュラル・スタディーズ入門』ちくま新書, 2000.
- 山形和美編『差異と同一化 ポストコロニアル文学論』研究社出版, 1997.

## 出来事の記述を逃れて

### Julian Barnes の *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* (1989) の主題

正宗 聡

“referent”とは、その定義からして、指示行為に先立って存在しているものはずである。しかし指示行為はわれわれが行うものであるという意識は、この定義を揺るがしてしまった。“referent”としての「出来事」を問題にしているのが英国に限らず postmodernism 期の歴史小説、Linda Hutcheon のいうところの“historiographic metafiction”の共通の特徴である。<sup>1</sup> その問題の立て方は“referent”としての「出来事」を言葉の外に認める立場と認めない立場に分かれる。Patricia Waugh は metafiction における立場の違いを次のようにまとめる。

What has to be acknowledged is that there are two poles of metafiction: one that finally accepts a substantial real world whose significance is not entirely composed of relationships within language; and one that suggests there can never be an escape from the prisonhouse of language and either delights or despairs in this.”<sup>2</sup>

Steven Connor は英国ではそのような小説が生まれた背景に大英帝国の戦後の衰退があり、歴史が日常生活を支配する力を失い始めたのだと述べている。<sup>3</sup> Julian Barnes, Graham Swift, Kazuo Ishiguro ら戦後生まれの英国の作家達は、大小さまざまな歴史や出来事の“reference”をめぐる作品を書いている。<sup>4</sup> Barnes の代表作 *Flaubert’s Parrot* (1984) において、主人公の医師が文豪 Flaubert が小説を執筆時に Rouen 美術館から借りた一羽の鸚鵡を探していくと、終いには 50 羽の鸚鵡の剥製に出くわすという物語の結末はその代表例である。

それでは Barnes の作品の特色は何か。Barnes の小説について Gregory Salyer が “Julian Barnes is representative of those fiction writers who wish to

throw a healthy dose of theory — or at least theorizing — into their novels.”と述べているように<sup>5</sup>、Barnes には作品全体を通じて結論を出すのではなく作品の中で断続的に結論を出していくという特徴がある。それゆえ読者が作品全体の結論を捉えることは、他の作家達と比べて難しいように思われる。

Barnes の *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* (1989) の評価は、10 と 1/2 章からなるこの作品の構成をめぐって、好意的なものとそうでないものとに分かれた。Miranda Seymour, Jonathan Coe, Joyce Carol Oats, D. J. Taylor らは各章の間のつながりの悪さを指摘している。<sup>6</sup> 筆者は「反復」を主題の一つとするこの作品において、ある出来事が章を変えて異なる文脈のもとに見事に反復的に言及されていることを評価したい。

ところで、この作品には「権威者による記述」対「個人による記述」、及び「権威者による記述がもつ拘束力」対「愛の力」という二つの二項対立の構図が見られる。第1の対立は「権威者による記述」が優勢であるために次第に消滅する方向に向かうが、第2の対立は作品の主題として残り続ける。Merritt Moseley はこの第2の対立が Matthew Arnold の詩 *Dover Beach* (“Ah, love, let us be true to one another”) を連想させると述べている。また Gregory Saylor は、愛は権威者の記述と異なり、任意の機関の権力構造を免れた個人的な経験であると分析している。<sup>7</sup> 本稿ではまだ分析の余地が残されていると思われるこの第2の二項対立について、その対立する二項が「記述」をめぐる同じ問題を内包している点では対立していないことを明らかにしたい。さらに、その「記述」をめぐる問題を解決する道を模索する過程で、この作品が従来の *metafiction* が扱っていない“referent”の問題に立ち入っていることにも触れてみたい。

この作品ではノアの箱舟伝説を確かめるべく、伝説上、舟が辿り着いた場所である Ararat 山へ異なる人物が旅をする。第6章においては信仰をもたずに亡くなった父の魂を清めるためにその娘 Amanda Fergusson が、また第9章においては元宇宙飛行士 Spike がこの山へ向かう。旅のメンバーも時代も異なりながら、聖書の記述は彼らに同じ行動を引き起こしている。

彼らはその山で、聖書に記されている出来事の結果とおぼしきものと遭遇する。例えば、伝説を信じている山麓の村の人達に言われて、彼らは

目の前に広がるぶどう畑がノアが舟を降りてから作ったぶどう畑だと信じる。しかし、ぶどう畑の看板にそのことが記されている訳ではなく、歴史家でもない彼らが行なっていることは、聖書に登場する事物、事象を彼らの目の前に存在するものへ関連づけようとする作業である。<sup>8</sup> 関連づけられない部分は多く残ってしまうものの、彼らは聖書の記述の方を固く信じているため、関連づけはごく部分的であって構わない。

対照的にこの作品の第1章では、聖書の箱舟の航海の記述に異議が唱えられる。箱舟に密航者として乗船したというこの章の語り手のキクイムシは、自分が出来事の全貌を捉えられないことを認めている。そのため、このキクイムシは俯瞰的な視点を空を舞う鳥に委ね、その力を借りて出来事的全貌をコラージュ的に構成する。またキクイムシは自ら直接に経験していない事柄に関して複数の記述があることを示し、そのいずれを採るかにについては読者の自由意志に基づく選択に任せている。この章にはキクイムシが出来事を記述するにあたっての苦勞が示されていて、その点で聖書の記述に従って出来事の発生を鵜呑みにする人々の安易さとは対照をなす。この対照は、出来事の記述の受け手になる場合と出来事について改めて物語る場合の相違である。

一般に出来事と呼ばれるものは、出来事自体ではなくその出来事の記述である。その考え方の根底には出来事を意識する、または語る際の必然的な「遅れ」がある。まず第一に、主体が自ら経験する出来事を問題にする場合、出来事存在を前提にした論点先取を承知の上で述べるならば、その出来事はその発生時においては直接捉えることができない。<sup>9</sup> なぜなら、出来事を出来事として意識するということは、それを「表象化 = 再現前化」して記述することを意味するからである。第二に、主体が自ら経験したことにせよ、そうでないことにせよ、時を経た過去の出来事を問題にする場合、その出来事というのは明らかに「表象化 = 再現前化」した出来事の記述である。さらに、こうした出来事の記述についての認識論的真偽の問題に加えて、Arthur Dantoらが分析する歴史記述に見られる物語性的の問題もある。<sup>10</sup>

いずれにしても主体は、出来事の記述に頼りながら理念的な出来事自体というものを捉えようとする。記述を拒否すれば、世界の中ですぐに迷い子になってしまうことは、初めて Ararat 山を訪れる二人の女性が感じている。

When preparing for their expedition [Miss Fergusson and Miss Logan] had been told that magnetic compass was useless on such

mountains as these, for the rocks were loaded with iron. It seemed evident that you could lose your bearing here in other ways as well. (163)<sup>11</sup>

ところで、一つの出来事に対して互いに相いれぬ複数の記述がある場合、われわれはそれらを突き合わせ、記述を行った異なる視点、パラダイムなどを考慮した上、その中から幾つかの記述を選択する。ところが時に、そういった選択が共同体の中で権威を有する者（達）によってなされ、ある特定の一つの記述だけが人々に支持されるようになることがある。Barnesはこの作品でその例として、伝説と区別のつかないものも含めた幾つかの世界史の記述を取り上げてその恣意性を問題にする。

作品の第1章では、聖書にあるノアの箱舟航海の記述が、それとは内容的に異なる点を含むノアの箱舟航海についての物語の中で取り上げられる。<sup>12</sup> この物語は、化学物質名など、現在社会におけるわれわれの知識を盛り込んでいることから、出来事についての純粋な記述ではなく出来事についての現代的解釈である。ククイムシは、この物語を“my revelations” (25) と呼びながら、ノアの“a really oppressive role-model” (21) について告発する一方で、箱舟の建造過程について触れるとき、自分が木の権威であることを口走る。“Anyone who knows anything about wood — and I speak with some authority in this matter [ . . . ].” (21) 自らの木の知識についての言及は、「権威」を持ち出した上でなければ、自分の語ることを信じてもらえないというククイムシの危機意識を反映したものと言える。また、その危機意識に加えて、ククイムシは自らの敵として「時間」を挙げている。“But even so we had an enemy, and a patient one: time. What if time exacted from us our inevitable changes?” (18) 自らの形態が変化する恐怖は、自分の語りが誰にも聞き入れられずに跡形もなく消え去ってしまうことへの恐怖を表している。

一方、歴史上の出来事の記述から芸術作品を創造することで、出来事に一つの記述しかない状態の縛りから抜け出す試みの過程も描かれている。19世紀に起こった Medusa 号の難破について取り上げた第5章は、まず、その史実が言説の形で作品の中に用意されている。わずか2名の生存者の証言に基づくこの言説は本来、史実の一記述に過ぎないにもかかわらず、対立記述がないためそのまま「正しい」史実となっている。

この悲劇から3年を経て画家 Géricault は、この史実を基に一つの絵を完成する。美術の権威らしいこの章の語り手は、画家がこの絵を製作した過程を紹介した後、この絵と史実との相違を分析する。芸術は人生の模写

ではないと主張する語り手は、筏に乗って生死を彷徨う漂流者達が皆、筋骨隆々とした姿をしていることに注目する。彼は、史実との紛れもないこの矛盾にもかかわらず、この絵が助かるかもしれないと思った漂流者達の希望の強さを表し、鑑賞者には希望と絶望の間を揺れ動くダイナミズムを直に感じさせるとして芸術の独自の意義を主張する。

こうして、史実を基に生まれた芸術作品は、それを描いた Géricault 並びにそれを鑑賞する者を史実の記述の縛りから解放し、彼らに記述が取り込めなかった漂流者達の感情を経験させてくれるように思われる。“Catastrophe has become art; but this is no reducing process. It is freeing, enlarging, explaining.” (137) ところがここに読者が忘れてしまうような、語りの落とし穴がある。それは、Géricault の絵の機能について語り手が下すこの積極的な評価も、語り手の記述に他ならないということである。各主体が絵を鑑賞する、その直接の経験自体はそこでは考えられていない。この章全体が、一つの史実とそれを基にした芸術作品との関係についての語り手の記述なのであり、それを読む者はこの術学者の主張どおりに絵を鑑賞することを要求される。しかも、絵に描かれた漂流中のこの瞬間に、過去から現在を貫く人間の本质が描かれていると主張する語り手は、「流れる」という時間の性質を無視している。

この例は、史実の記述の縛りを、その史実の芸術化を通して断ち切ろうとする運動自体が、その道の権威者によって物語られた瞬間、その運動の記述としてわれわれを縛ることになるという悪循環を示している。この悪循環は Linda Hutcheon が postmodernism の言説が陥ってしまう危険として指摘したことと通ずる。“[Postmodern discourse] will essentialize its ex-centricity or render itself complicit in the liberal humanist notions of universality (speaking for all ex-centrics) and eternity (forever).”<sup>13</sup> 果たして、歴史上の出来事と同様に、我々の個人的な経験の出来事も、権威者による記述によって既に確定されているのだろうか。

作品には必ずしもそう断定してない部分がある。第6章には Amanda という女性が、小さい頃、父親と一緒に Géricault の先の絵の展覧会に行ったときのことが描かれている。神の計画を信じず混沌を信じる父親は、他所でやっていた同じ遭難を扱った回転パノラマの方を高く評価し、Géricault の絵の方に感銘を受ける娘を理解しない。その後 Amanda は、父親と意見が一致しなかったこの件が大人になっても心に残っている。彼女は Ararat 山の洞窟で月を眺めながらそのことを思い出し、父親の意見を改めて否定

する。

ところが、展覧会における Amanda の絵の鑑賞経験、並びにその後の人生において彼女が Géricault の絵に対してどのような気持ちを抱いているのかについては、父親の絵に対する気持ちとは違ったものという程度であまり語られていない。その点で、この絵の詳細な分析を行った章とは明確な対照をなす。

Amanda の鑑賞経験を記述しなかったこの章の語り手は、先の美術の権威者の記述に必ずしも収まらない経験の可能性を読者に示唆している。ただし、そうした個人的経験の内容は共同体の公の場に出ることなく、個人の内面で時間の経過による変容を被りながら終いには消えていく。<sup>14</sup>

Amanda は Ararat 山において聖書の記述の確認作業を幸せそうに行っている途中に滑落し、Amanda の旅の友 Miss Logan を驚かせる。“Miss Logan halted, initially in surprise, for it appeared that [Amanda] had lost her footing on a little stretch of solid rock which should have afforded no peril.” (164) もし Amanda が自ら進んで滑落したとすればそれは、自分の個人的な経験もすべて神の意志に従って定められているものかどうか、彼女が確認しようとしたのだと考えられる。<sup>15</sup>

作品に挿入された 1/2 の章（挿入章）において、語り手は愛についての個人的な見解を展開する。“We must believe in [love], or we're lost. We may not obtain it, or we may obtain it and find it renders us unhappy; we must still believe in it. If we don't, then we merely surrender to the history of the world and to someone else's truth.” (246) この見解は、権威者による記述だけの世界に対する語り手の憂慮を端的に表している。その上で Barnes は “I love you.” という発話が真摯になされた時にもつ行為遂行的な機能に、その事態を解決する糸口を見い出そうとしている。

行為遂行的文の使用または発言という分析の道具は、言語哲学者 J. L. Austin のものである。Austin は、われわれが使用する文または発言する文を二種類のタイプに区別し、事実確認的文と行為遂行的文と名付けた。<sup>16</sup> 事実確認的文を使用する、あるいは発言するとは、ある出来事や事態を「陳述する」、「報告する」、「記述する」ことであり、一方、行為遂行的文を使用するとは、たとえば、「私は約束します」という発言のように、そ



の文を使用する、または発言すること自体が、当の行為を実際に行うことになる文の使用を意味する。

ところが Austin は自らこの二項対立を撤回する。Austin は、事実確認の文においても、その使用にあたって行為遂行的な要素を見出すことができるという。つまり、事実確認の文の使用によって、われわれがある出来事や事態を陳述する際の「陳述する」という言語行為面に着目したのである。Austin は次のように述べる。

What we need to do for the case of stating, and by the same token describing and reporting is to take them a bit off their pedestal, to realize that they are speech-acts no less than all those other speech-acts that we have been mentioning and talking about as performative.<sup>17</sup>

この視点で、例えば、「1492年 Columbus は新大陸を発見した」という文の使用を考えてみる。この文の使用は、この文を「陳述する」、「発言する」、「主張する」という行為遂行を伴う。<sup>18</sup> それによって文の読み手、聞き手の方は、文の内容の受容を要求される。

行為遂行的文の使用は1回的なものであり、1回の行為遂行に対して、その遂行の時点と場所をそれぞれ一つ特定できる。また一般に、行為遂行的文の使用がその行為遂行の資格をもたない者によって為された場合は、行為遂行が機能しない。共同体の中で出来事の記述を「主張する」ための資格は何か考えてみると、Barnes のこの作品では、主張が及ぶ共同体の中で「権威」を有することだと思われる。この場合、「権威」というのは政治的なものだけでなく、さまざまな分野におけるその道の「権威」も含む。

さらに、共同体の権威者の主張は権威者によってなされるだけではない。権威者でない者が権威者になりすまし権威者の主張を反復するのである。したがって、その主張は権威者が死んだ後でも拘束力を持ちうるし、また、主張内容は変わらずに権威者の名前だけが変まっている場合もある。こうした過程を通じて次第に、主張内容は共同体の「信念」、「事実」として通用することになる。

それでは権威者以外の者はあらゆる場合に権威者の主張を最初から信じて、それを繰り返すのかと言えば勿論そうではない。われわれは日常、経験する出来事を随時、紙の上であるいは頭の中で記述化している。その記述の前には常に、英語で言えば“I claim”という言葉がつくはずにもかかわらず、その言葉は省略される。

しかし今、一つの個人的な経験、しかも目撃者のいない状況における経

験を考えてみる。仮に、その経験した出来事をそこにいなかった第三者に伝えるとする。そうなると、その経験を「誰が主張するのか」という問題が急に生じて、主張力の信憑性が問われ始める。その具体的な例が作品の第9章にある。

元宇宙飛行士 Spike Tiggler は、Ararat 山の斜面にある洞窟で、少なくとも Spike 自身にとってはノアとおぼしき人の骨とノアが身につけていたとおぼしき着物を発見する。他に発見者はこの旅の同行者である地質学者 Jimmy だけである。Jimmy からこの発見の出来事を世間に伝えるにあたって慎重さを期すべきだと指摘された Spike は、前に宇宙飛行士として地球に生還したときと比較すると、世間における自分の権威が低下していることに気づく。

‘I’m with you about the repercussions, Spike. Let me put something to you, though. You and I are men of faith.’

‘Men of science, too.’ said the astronaut to the geologist.

‘Check. And as men of faith we naturally wish to preserve our faith from any unnecessary slanders.’

‘Sure.’

‘Well, maybe before announcing the news we should, as members of science, check out what we as men of faith have discovered.’

‘Meaning?’

‘Meaning I think we should shut our big bazoos until we’ve run some lab tests on Noah’s clothing.’

There was a silence from the other half of the tent as Spike realized for the first time that not everyone on earth would necessarily put their hands together the way they’d done for the astronauts coming back from the moon. (277-8)<sup>19</sup>

そもそも Ararat 山へ向かうこの旅の発端は、Spike が月の上で聞いた“‘Find Noah’s Ark’” (256) という声にあった。この「お告げ」を聞いた経験を地球に帰還後、彼は公の場では発表しない。その経験を唯一告げられた彼の妻は、夫が記者会見でその経験を話そうものなら、きっと次のようなことが新聞に書かれるのではないかと想像し心配していた。“She imagined headlines like ‘GOD SPOKE TO ME’ CLAIMS GROUNDED ASTRO-NAUT and WADESVILLE MAN MINUS SOME BUTTONS.” (262-3; my italics) Spike は Ararat 山から帰った後、発見した物の科学的調査を依頼するが、あいにく彼にとって不都合な結果が集まる。彼は Ararat 山への次の遠征の計画を発表するが、その発表内容は記されないままに終る。

このように、出来事の主張をめぐるには、その主張内容の真偽に関する問題だけではなく、「誰が主張するのか」という問題がある。Spike は山に遠征し発見した物を科学的に調査することも行った。しかし、われわれは過去の出来事について、自ら経験した出来事も含めて、権威者の主張をただ信じている場合が少なくない。

作品の第 10 章には、権威者に対するそうした依存度が強まった場合が描かれている。夢の中の話という枠があるこの章では、天国にいる主人公がどんなことも満たされたまま生きて語っている。やがて彼は、自分の人生を自分以外の誰かに評価して欲しいと、天国の係りの者に願い出る。それは自分ではどうしても満たせない欲求なのだ、と彼は言う。そこで、この天国で権威をもっているとおぼしき人物がこの主人公に評価を言い渡すが、その評価はただ “‘You’re OK’” (294) という内容で、多くの事を期待していた彼を落胆させる。なお、彼に評価を下したこの人物は時計をしていて、その時計が「評価を下す」ということの行為遂行的な面を表している。

実質的な内容を伴っていないこの発言は、発言者の権威を重視するわれわれの態度をあざ笑うかのようである。この評価には「おまえたち人間は、権威者からのものでありさえすれば、内容はどうでもよいのだろうか?」というような意味が込められている。しかしここまで内容が簡単であると、評価を受けた者は権威者の権威に多少なりとも懐疑的にならざるを得ない。

しかし、発言内容の真偽を決める根拠がないことと権威者に依存することの容易さは、どうしても発言内容を吟味することを鈍らせ、共同体の中の権威者への依存度を強める。その結果、各主体は自らの固有の経験や考え方を持たずに、権威者の発言に従って過去の出来事をただなぞらえるだけになる。主体が自らの自由の剥奪に手を貸すのは皮肉なことである。

こうして、権威者による発言の内容は権威者以外の人による反復的主張に支えられて、時間が経過する中でも共同体の「信念」、「事実」としてあり続ける。しかし、その支えには永遠の保証がないことを第 2 章の語り手は、発言を記録する媒体の非永続性に着目して象徴的に表現している。語り手は自分の物語が依拠する、ある裁判の写本について次のように述べる。

Here the manuscript in the Archives Municipales de Besançon breaks off, without giving details of the annual penance or remembrance imposed by the court. It appears from the condition of the parchment that in the course of the last four and a half centuries it

has been attacked, perhaps on more than one occasion, by some species of termite, which has devoured the closing words of the juge d'Élise. (79-80)

羊皮紙に書かれた判決文の最後の部分が「経過する時間」の比喩であるシロアリの一種に食べられてしまっているというこのくだりは、最終的にはどんな出来事の記述も、時間の経過の中で無に帰してしまうという指摘である。<sup>20</sup> これは権威者による記述に不自由を感じている者にとっては自由を享受するための観念的手段となる。時間の経過はそうした人の味方である。しかしこの考え方は、これから先の未来を見据えたものであり即効性がなく、またニヒリズム的思考にも結びつく。

それでは作品の挿入章で展開される“I love you.”という行為遂行的な発言をめぐる語り手の考察は、権威者の記述から逃れる別の解決策を見出すのであろうか。語り手は、愛の力に信頼を寄せたかと思えば、“Let’s start at the beginning. Love makes you happy? No. Love makes the person you love happy? No. Love makes everything all right? Indeed no [. . .]” (231) と言って一貫した見解を示さず、語り手の結論を期待する読者を待たせる。

語り手の隣には、彼女が彼に背を向けて眠っている。彼が恐怖で怯えたとき、彼女はうなじから髪をよけて、彼が唇を置く場所を作ってくれるのだという。その行為が意識的なものでなく無意識的なものであることを、語り手は彼女が髪を切った日の夜にも同じ動作を繰り返したと訴えて読者に信じてもらおうとする。

やがて語り手は、愛と真実は密接に結びついているという見解、すなわち恋愛をしているときわれわれは真実を語るのだという見解にやや自信を得て、自分の想いを伝えるために彼女を起こそうとする。しかし“Don’t wake her” (246) と自らに言って自制する。彼は結局 ‘I love you’ をそっと囁く以上のことはしない。彼はなぜ躊躇したのか。

“I love you.” という行為遂行的発言の特徴は、それが「約束」の発言ということである。この言葉を発した者は、約束をした相手に対して約束内容を恒常的に守らなくてはならない。言い換えれば、約束によって「未来」が先取りされてしまうのである。Shoshana Fellman は *The Literary Speech Act* (1980) において Molière の戯曲 *Don Juan* を分析し、主人公ドン・ジュアンが、誘惑した女性への愛の約束を守らずに新たな女性を誘惑するこ

とによって、彼にとって死を意味する、前の女性との恒常的関係を忘れると分析する。

If Donjuanian eroticism presents itself, structurally and symbolically, as a relation with death, the passage from one woman to another, that is, the promise-breaking itself, turns out to be a breach in memory [a breach in the memory of desire] to the extent that it constitutes an act of forgetting death.<sup>21</sup>

Fellman は新たな愛の約束と忘却力を結び付け、ドン・ジュアンの心理と行動を説明する。

一方、Barnes の作品、第 10 章の主人公は天国で、自分のところを夜中訪れた、妻以外の女性と関係を結んだことに後ろめたさを感じる。彼の相談役の女性 Brigitta は妻のことを忘れるように彼を導く。

‘Will [my wife] mind?’ I asked this time referring more definitely to my visitor.

‘Will [your wife] know?’

‘I think there are going to be problems,’ I said, once again talking more generally.

‘This is where problems are solved,’ she replied.

‘If you say so.’ I was beginning to be convinced that it might all turn out as I hoped. (293)

時間が無限に続く天国で退屈状態にある彼が、妻との関係を忘れ、別の女性との関係を持ったことは、ドン・ジュアン流に考えれば、彼に自分が生きていると感じさせる出来事だったのかもしれない。しかしそれも同じ経験を重ねることで習慣化されていく。

ドン・ジュアンが愛の誓いを守らずに相手の期待を裏切っていくのは、彼が愛に対して幻滅しているからである。新たな愛の誓いによって再生するのだとしても、誓いの後には再び自分を縛る誓いの記述しかない。彼としては、ただ別の女性へと遍歴を続ける他はない。

ドン・ジュアンと同様、愛に幻滅しているものの、同時に愛に希望を託す挿入章の語り手は、容易に愛の誓いを発しないことが大事なのだと語る。“‘I love you.’ For a start, we’d better put these words on a high shelf; in a square box behind glass which we have to break with our elbow; in the bank.” (229) 彼女を起こしてこの言葉を言ってしまうれば彼は今後、“impaled by incompatibility [. . .]” (245) となるやもしれない。大小さまざまな歴史や過去の出来事の記述の拘束に加えて、さらに愛の誓いによって拘束が増えることを彼はよしとしないだろう。むしろ、相手に想いを伝えないことによ

って逆に想いを抱き続けられる，この束縛のない状態が，彼にとってはずっとよいのである。<sup>22</sup>

語り手は“paradox of love” (238) と題して，われわれが詩的側面と散文的側面の両方を兼ね備えていることを指摘する。それによると恋愛をしている者は，時間について相反する気持ちを抱くという。

I am in love, I want to savour it, study it, lie around in languor with it; may today last forever. This is your poetical side. However, there is also your prose side, which urges time not to slow down but hurry up. How do you know this is love, your prose side whispers like a sceptical lawyer, it's only been around for a few weeks, a few months. You won't know it's the real thing unless you (and she) still feel the same in, oh, a year or so at least; that's the only way to prove you aren't living a dragonfly mistake. (238)

後者の気持ちは状態を確定させたい気持ちであるのに対し，前者の気持ちは確定の手前で留まりたいという気持ちである。このように愛は約束をすることによって，権威者による記述がもつ拘束力と類似の拘束力を生み出してしまいが，その拘束力を生み出さないようにする方法も残されているのである。

## 結

二人の間でまだ愛の約束を交わしていない恋愛の状態を，挿入章の語り手は評価するのだという本稿の解釈は，その語り手が独我論の世界に救いを求めているのだという解釈である。この解釈は，その語り手が語った愛の対他者的な役割を見落としているのではないかという反論をすぐさま受けそうである。<sup>23</sup> 確かに作品には以下のようなくだりがある。“If you're selling [love], we'd better point out that it's a starting-point for civic virtue. You can't love someone without imaginative sympathy, without beginning to see the world from another point of view.” (242) しかしこのくだりは二人の世界の枠を越えて，公の場における，愛の「役割」を問題としている箇所である。

この作品の世界は全般に権威者の記述が個人的な記述を圧倒し，二人の間で交わす愛の言葉さえも，Wittgenstein の言葉を使うならば約束の「言語ゲーム」によって機能している世界である。Barnes はこの作品で，そのような私的な言語使用の余地が全くなさそうに思われる世界の中から逃れうる方法を挿入章の語り手に見つけさせたと考えられる。他者に

よる記述を締め出し、その上で自らの恋愛の感情を“referent”として指示するその特異な継続状態は、私的言語の可能性の第一歩であるかもしれない。もちろん「私的」であるがゆえにそれ以上は何も言えないのであるが。もしこの推測が正しいとするとこの作品は「権威者による記述」対「個人的な記述」という二項対立だけでなく、「日常言語」対「私的言語」という二項対立にまで踏み込もうとしているのだと言える。

この作品は、“referent”の問題を扱っている点では紛れもなく metafiction である。しかし Patricia Waugh が“referent”の扱い方をめぐって metafiction を分類した2つのグループのいずれにも属することがなく、独自に“referent”の問題に取り組んでいるという点で特異な作品である。

## Notes

\* 本稿は日本英文学会第72会大会（2000年5月、於立教大学）における口頭発表の原稿を加筆修正したものである。

<sup>1</sup> “historiographic metafiction”の詳細については Linda Hutcheon, *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (1996; London and New York: Routledge, 1988) を参照。

<sup>2</sup> Patricia Waugh, *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction* (New York: Methuen, 1984) 53.

<sup>3</sup> Steven Connor, *The English Novel in History 1950-1995* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996) 134.

<sup>4</sup> これらの作家達を括って論じたものとしては以下のようなものがある。David Leo Higdon, “‘Unconfessed Confessions’: the Narrators of Graham Swift and Julian Barnes,” in *The British & Irish Novel since 1960*, edited by James Acheson (New York: St. Martin P, 1991) 174-91; Andrzej Gąsiorek, *Post-War British Fiction: Realism and After* (London: Edward Arnold, 1995); Adam Zachary Newton, “Telling Others: Secrecy and Recognition in Dickens, Barnes, and Ishiguro,” in *Narrative Ethics* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995) 241-85.

<sup>5</sup> Gregory Salyer, “One Good Story Leads to Another: Julian Barnes’ *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters*,” *Journal of Literature and Theology* 5(2)(June 1991) 220.

<sup>6</sup> 作品を構成する各章の題は次の通りである。1 The Stowaway; 2 The Visitors; 3 The Wars of Religion; 4 The Survivor; 5 The Shipwreck; 6 The Mountain; 7 Three Simple Stories; 8 Upstream!; Parenthesis; 9 Project Ararat; 10 The Dream。第1章の初出は、“Shipwreck,” *The New Yorker* 65(17) (12 June 1989) 40-50。作品の構成をめぐっての批評家の評価については Merritt Moseley, *Understanding Julian Barnes* (Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997) 110 を参照。好意的な評価としては Fred Botting, *Sex, Machines and Navels* (Manchester and New York: Manchester UP, 1999) 73。がある。

<sup>7</sup> Moseley, 123; Salyer, 227.

<sup>8</sup> この関連づけ作業は Kendall Walton の虚構論を思い出させる。彼は実際にはそうでない物を「小道具」(prop)として用いることで虚構世界を構築することが「ごっこ遊び」の本質だとしている。Kendall Walton, *Mimesis as Make-Believe* (Cam-

bridge: Harvard UP, 1990) 35-43 参照。なお Barnes の小説 *England, England* (1999) は別の島にもう一つの英国を作ろうという壮大な「ごっこ遊び」を描いたものである。

<sup>9</sup> *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* では第 10 章の主人公が現実にはかなわぬ夢として “I wanted my life to be looked at.” (293) と言ったり、第 9 章に登場する宇宙飛行士が月から地球を眺めてみたいという望みを抱く。これは出来事をその発生と同時に捉えることの不可能性を比喩的に表しているのだと思われる。

<sup>10</sup> Arthur Danto はある出来事の記述は時間を経た後続の出来事との関係によって変わることが常であり、単一の出来事だけを純粹に問題することの不可能性を、出来事の “ideal chronicler” という架空の存在者を設けて論じている。Arthur Danto, *Analytical Philosophy of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1965) 143-82.

<sup>11</sup> Julian Barnes, *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* (London: Picador, 1990) を使用。以下、引用はこの版により末尾に頁数のみ記す。

<sup>12</sup> Barnes はこの作品に関して題材にどんな種類の歴史を用いようと、その背後にある衝動は話をしたいという衝動だと interview で語っている。Amanda Smith, “Julian Barnes,” *Publishers Weekly* 236 (3 November 1989) 73.

<sup>13</sup> Hutcheon, 69.

<sup>14</sup> 澤野雅樹に個人の記憶と歴史との関係を扱った興味深い論考がある。澤野雅樹 『記憶と反復』青土社、1998。

<sup>15</sup> この作品を Benjamin の哲学と関連させて論じた次の論文が同様のことを指摘している。Jackie Buxton, “Julian Barnes’s Theses on History (in 10 Chapters),” *Contemporary Literature* 41(1)(Spring 2000) 77.

<sup>16</sup> J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (1997; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962) 1-11.

<sup>17</sup> Austin, *Philosophical Papers* ed. by J. O. Urmson and G. L. Warnock (1961; Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 1979) 249-50.

<sup>18</sup> Austin は著作で主に「陳述する (state)」という言葉を使うが、本稿では論の文脈に合わせて「主張する (claim)」を用いる。

<sup>19</sup> この箇所先立って Jimmy は、自分が Spike より背が高いことに気づき驚く。“Even on his knees, [Jimmy] retained a height advantage over the ex-astronaut.” (275) これは月に行ってきた英雄 Spike がそれまで実際よりも大きく Jimmy の目には写っていたことを示していて、英雄の世間的権威の低下の実例になっている。

<sup>20</sup> デジタル化時代は記述媒体の非永続性についての Barnes の主張を覆すように思えるが Barnes の小説 *Metroland* には美術に慰めを見い出そうとする登場人物が地球がゆっくりとなくなる方向に向かっていることを言われる場面がある。Julian Barnes, *Metroland* (New York: Vintage, 1992) 55.

<sup>21</sup> Shoshana Fellman, *The Literary Speech Act: Don Juan with J. L. Austin, or Seduction in Two Languages* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1980) 41.

<sup>22</sup> Barnes は三角関係を描いた小説 *Talking It Over* (1991) においても、“I love you” という言葉を発することに固執する人物を描いているが、三角関係そのものが常にこの言葉の約束の効果を機能させないような状況を作り出している。

<sup>23</sup> Gąsiorek, 164-5 を参照。



## 研究会会則

### 第1章 総則

- 第1条 本会は「試論」英文学研究会と称する。  
第2条 本会は、事務局を東北大学文学部英文学研究室内に置く。

### 第2章 目的及び事業

- 第3条 本会は、英語英文学研究の発展と向上を目ざし、同時に会員相互の親睦交流をはかる。  
第4条 本会は、第3条の目的を達成するために次の事業を行なう。  
1. 研究誌「試論」の発行（年一回）。  
2. その他必要な事業。

### 第3章 組織

- 第5条 本会は、会員により組織する。入会には会員二名以上の推薦と、会長の承認を必要とする。  
第6条 本会は次の役員を置く。  
会長1名  
編集委員若干名（うち事務局幹事1名）  
第7条 役員は次の会務にあたる。  
1. 会長は本会を代表する。  
2. 編集委員は、会長と共に編集委員会を構成し、「試論」への投稿論文の審査、「試論」の編集、及びその他の会務にあたる。  
3. 事務局幹事は、庶務会計の任にあたる。  
第8条 会長は、会員の互選により選出する。会長の任期は2年とし、重任を妨げない。  
編集委員は、編集委員会の推薦により選出する。編集委員の任期は2年とし、重任を妨げない。事務局幹事は編集委員の互選とする。  
第9条 本会には名誉会員を置くことができる。

### 第4章 会計

- 第10条 本会の会費は別に定める金額とする。

### 第5章 会則改正

- 第11条 会則の改正には会員の過半数の賛成を必要とする。  
(平成13年10月1日発効)

## 投 稿 規 定

次号の原稿締切は4月末日とします。

原稿はタイプ、ワープロなどによる清書原稿5部を提出してください。パソコンのワープロ・ソフトにより作成した場合は、そのワープロソフト形式のファイルと「標準テキストファイル」の両方を入れたフロッピーを添付してください。ワープロ専用機等のファイルは組版ソフトに読み込めないため提出不要です。

手書き原稿でもかまいません。清書原稿5部(コピー)を提出してください。

ワープロの清書原稿に手書きの書き込みをする場合は、書き込みのない清書原稿をさらに1部追加してください。ファイルが読めなかった場合等にOCRで読みとりをするためです。論文は和文、欧文いずれでも可。

和文の場合は原則として400字詰原稿用紙35枚程度(注を含めて)。

欧文の場合は原則として6,000語程度。採用の場合、ネイティブ・スピーカーによる校閲は編集委員会が行います。

和文・欧文とも長さは一応の目安です。必要な場合には大幅に超過してもかまいません。

論文には英文のシノプシス(300～400語程度)を添付してください。

特殊活字、図表などの使用や原稿量が多いことにより標準的な印刷費用を大きく超過する場合は、超過分のみを執筆者負担とする場合があります。

注は末尾にまとめ、通し番号をつけてください。

論文の書式の細部については、原則として *MLA Handbook* (邦訳『MLA英語論文の手引』第4版 北星堂発行) または *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th Edition に準拠してください。

## 編集後記

本号の刊行が大幅に遅れましたことをお詫び申し上げます。締切を過ぎても原稿が揃わず、編集作業になかなか入ることができませんでした。早めに原稿をご提出いただいた方には本当に申し訳なく思います。

ともあれ、『試論』も本号で第四十集という節目を迎えたこととなります。東北大学では現在「百年史」の編纂が全学的に進められておりますが、英文学研究室の歴史も執筆しなければなりません。1924年に土居光知教授、小林淳男助教授で発足して以来、約八十年に及ぶ歴史をわずか10枚の原稿にまとめるには大変苦労しましたが、その中に『試論』についても一節をさきました。年配の会員にはご存知の方もおられますが、本誌は、土井光知により1933年に創刊され第五号で廃刊となった旧『試論』の名称を引き継いだものです。1950年創刊の東北英語英文学会機関誌『英米文学』を直接の前身とし、1958年に「試論」同人会による発行として再出発しました。現在の本誌は全国組織の研究会機関誌となり、伝統の厳正なレフェリー制によって高い水準を維持しています。そのためでしょうか、海外からの本誌掲載論文についての問い合わせ（コピー取り寄せ、PDFファイルのダウンロード等）も最近急増しております。審査制学術誌である本誌の掲載論文は、他とは異なる研究業績として位置づけられ、大学評価等の際にも非常に有利になっています。

本誌の長い伝統を振り返ってみますと、現会員である私たちの責任の重さを痛感します。研究会の財政はきわめて豊かです。原稿不足で刊行が遅れてしまうというのは誠に残念なことですので、会員の皆様、とくに中堅・ベテランの皆様の投稿を是非お願いいたしたく存じます。

(原)

### 試 論 第 40 集

平成 14 (2002) 年 3 月 1 日印刷発行

発 行 「試論」英文学研究会  
 会 長 原 英 一  
 〒 980-8576 仙台市青葉区川内  
 東北大学大学院文学研究科 英文学研究室  
 電 話 022(217)5961  
<http://charles.sal.tohoku.ac.jp>  
 振替口座番号 02200-1-4966  
 印 刷 (株)東北プリント