

# A New Horizon of Intercultural Stances\*

Michiko ARIMA

*Lessons of Japan: Assayinés of Some Intercultural Stances.*

By Darko Suvin. Montréal: CIADEST, 1996, 247pp.

(Distributed by Maisonneuve Press, P.O.Box2980,  
Washington, DC 20013-2980, USA.)

Someday in the future the twentieth century may be referred to as the heyday of technology and pseudoscientific mechanical analyses of human beings. Coming to the end of the century, we are now beginning to feel more or less uneasy under the hegemony of technology and mechanical analyses of life.

We have come to understand that mechanical analyses depending on dichotomous organization of binary oppositions will not do, at least for human speech activity. This is one of the main reasons we have entered a new stage in the cognitive study of linguistics, as represented by such scholars as George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, Ronald W. Langacker.

---

\* This review article was originally written in 1997 and has been left as it was in a drawer of my desk without being sent to the editor of the journal. When I read it over again, the article seems to retain the significance I wanted to convey in those days, and now I'd like to reproduce it here as it was as a token of my heartfelt apology for the author of the book Darko Suvin, an internationally distinguished Canadian scholar of Japanese culture, whose earnest wish for my translation of his book into Japanese I could not realize (he came to meet me in London trying to persuade me to translate the book while I was studying at Cambridge), and also for the unfulfilled promise I made with Professor Yoshihiko Ikegami who invited me to write a review article of this book for a Canadian journal of semiotics.

Langacker (1987), for example, says that the strict adherence to rigid dichotomies such as synchrony vs. diachrony, competence vs. performance, grammar vs. lexicon, morphology vs. syntax, . . . results in conceptual problems and the neglect of transitional examples. He argues that semantic structure is not universal but language-specific to a considerable degree, being based on conventional imagery and characterized relative to knowledge structures; that grammar is symbolic in nature, consisting in the conventional symbolization of semantic structure; and that lexicon, morphology, and syntax form a continuum of symbolic structures, differing along various parameters and divisible into separate components only arbitrarily.

This statement will soon remind us of what Benjamin Lee Whorf contended as early as in the 1930s-1940s, and Whorf may have gone even further than most of the present-day cognitive linguists in his lucid recognition of the close involvement of situational, cultural and other contextual patterns in the interpretation of a given text. Whorf contends:

They [=concepts of “time” and “matter”] do not depend so much upon ANY ONE SYSTEM . . . within the grammar as upon the ways of analyzing and reporting experience which have become fixed in the language as integrated “fashions of speaking” and which cut across the typical grammatical classifications, so that such a “fashion” may include lexical, morphological, syntactic, and otherwise systemically diverse means coordinated in a certain frame of consistency. (Whorf 1956: 158.)

By “habitual thought” and “thought world” I mean more than simply language. . . . I include all the analogical and suggestive value of the patterns. . . and all the give-and-take between language and the culture as a whole, wherein is a vast amount that is not linguistic but yet shows the shaping influence of language. (Whorf 1956: 147.)

... situations “actualize” it, structure beyond the probe of the measuring rod governs it; three-dimensional shape there is none, instead— “*Arupa*.” (Whorf 1956: 269.)

Today some people have come to be more and more conscious of such contextual elements as our physical sense of feeling, our related being to others, our being in a given environment, coexisting plural viewpoints, situation as a historical social product, practiced validity of experience, and so on. Those who know the semiotic world of Charles Sanders Peirce, however, will find all of these have already been encompassed in his idea of *synechism* (which is a term Peirce coined by adding *ism* to a Greek work meaning continuity, and which might be roughly paraphrased as creatively changing continuity) which he regarded as of *prime importance* in philosophy. Peirce perceived the universe as a synechic one, i.e. a creatively continuously growing sign.

Synechism or continuously creative change seems to be a reliable key term for indicating one way of possibly breaking through the apparent dead end we are presently faced with. If we are to live life as wholly as possible, it seems to be clear that we will have to give up the mechanical analysis of our life, as if it were static, depending on the binary opposition of self vs. body, subject vs. object, good vs. evil, right vs. wrong, past vs. present, and so on.

Now, in *Lessons of Japan: Assayings of Some Intercultural Stances (LOJ)*, Darko Suvin proposes a plausible argument we can take as a possible new horizon of intercultural stances in this sense of synechism: he is aware of the richness of practice, the necessity of <the thinking that follows reality in its contradictions>, and the necessary coexistence of feeling and thought, the old and the new, as well as of the particular and the universal.

*LOJ* strikes us with Suvin's way of speaking of his thought as feeling and his feeling as thought. For example, when he says we “Westerners”, he does not fail

to add, “but again, seen from Japan, China is west and North America east” (p. 14) or “from Canada it is Japan that is west” (p. 13). By this way of speaking, we are persuaded logically and sensitively at the same time to relativize ourselves in any situation. With the suggestion that “the present volume is the result of a protracted not so much project as lived orientation and fascination as well as grief”, *LOJ* gives us a taste of fascination as well as grief of his lived course of experience bloomed into an intellectual flower. It must be indeed “an act of the intellectual love, **agape** he would refuse to sunder from **eros**” (p. 13) that has driven him to pursue new horizons of intercultural stances asking for how to live, that is, how to die, for “death could be the lens inflecting and concentrating the rays of vitality” (p.207), and “the decision about death is a decision how — against what horizon — to live” (p. 207).

This whole book will turn out to be composed of speaking thought as feeling/ feeling as thought. This style may be taken as symbolizing the denial of the binary opposition, what Suvin contends throughout *LOJ*.

On the other hand, *LOJ* may overwhelm the readers by the author’s extensive knowledge-cum-experienced-feeling of multi-cultures, multi-languages, and multi-interests. Suvin was born and largely educated in Yugoslavia; he also studied in UK, France, and USA, and came to Canada as an economic émigré and eventually acquired Canadian citizenship; he can speak English, French, German and Italian, and also knows Russian and can read most European languages. It is no wonder, then, that in *LOJ* we occasionally come across various expressions and references in various languages, though in almost all cases he does not forget to add some English translation or *rewrite* being conscious of the book’s being written throughout in English. It is indeed interesting for us to find from time to time the really appropriate contextual nuance of rhythm and meaning of such various expressions and references as when he attempts to translate a haiku by Kobayashi Issa:

“This fleeting-dew world	Tsuyu no yo wa
A fleeting-dew world, indeed	tsuyu no yo nagara
<b>Ma finche dura . . .</b> *	sari nagara
(Suvin)	(Issa)

Among others French, German and Latin are often used in this way, which, however, should demand some effort on the part of general readers for appreciation, especially where any English *rewrite* is lacking.

*LOJ* is composed of an Introduction and six essays with groups of poems, related in some way or other to the essays, inserted between each of them: Introduction Poems 1 Essay 1 [The soul and the sense: on Roland Barthes on Japan] Poems 2 Essay 2 [Against translation — and yet: seesaws, pivots and parentheses (two voices of translation discourse **a propos** of a haiku by Issa)] Poems 3 Essay 3 [Against originals: parody in Europe-North America vs. pastiche in East Asia] Poems 4 Essay 4 [Revelation vs. conflict: Deity vs. Warrior No plays and comparative dramaturgy] Poems 5 Essay 5 [The use-value of dying: magical vs. cognitive utopian desire in the “learning plays” of pseudo-Zenchiku, Waley, and Brecht] Poems 6 Essay 6 [Sato’s *The Dance of Angels* as counterproject to Weiss’s *Marat/Sade*: two dramaturgic discourses about the revolution in the 1960s] Poems 7. And the whole text is divided into the two parts: part 1 consists of three essays and four poems and Part 2 consists of three essays and three poems.

The title, the subtitle, and all essay titles in the book sound poetic or ambiguous with a significance apparently difficult to understand: we can fully understand the substantial significance of these titles only after reading through the writing just as we have solved the riddle. One may say this is more or less generally what

---

\* / But still, as long as it may last. . . (from the Italian, **Finche dura niente paura**).

the title is, but we can indicate the markedly poetic feature of the title as well as that of Suvin's way of writing-speaking throughout *LOJ*.

The Japanese have long felt something wrong when they have been referred to as mysteriously incomprehensible people in a superficially exaggerated image of this or that limited aspect: the Japanese smile and silence, *hara-kiri*, and the like, on the one hand, and the menacing economic power, on the other. Being abroad, the Japanese are embarrassed to hear the news from Japan often distorted on this line, even though they know a reporter is not willing to tell a lie but is only unconsciously filtering and twisting the fact according to the stereotyped ideas infiltrated in his/her mind. Under the circumstance, most of the Japanese seem to have almost given up their effort to make themselves understood by foreigners though it is indeed doubtful if they have actually exhausted their effort in real earnest, and the West (in the term usually used) on the other hand seem to believe the Japanese far from their model for their intercultural stances. Therefore, at first glance, the title of the book may not only be easily connected with the subtitle but both of them might also sound somewhat nonsensical in the present state of general context.

In fact, however, Suvin understands Japanese culture with deep insight as will be illustrated when he indicates the confusion of atheism and polytheism often made concerning the Japanese or when he argues how two sets of value and attitude (e.g. a Buddhist negation of passions vs. a humanistic affirmation of them, the Shinto renewal vs. the Buddhist desire to escape from the world) can coexist without falling into conflict with each other. And where he argues for the structure of feeling, he is at the same time conscious of the potential danger of structure of feeling transformed into fascism and the like by way of the metaphorical and mystified use of it; "Yet no doubt, the corollary of the potentially cognitive character of X (standing for anything) is the potential use of X for lying and mystification" (p.52).

Suvin is not so simple-minded as fascinated by the enigma of Japan or the East but is distinctly keenly aware of the details of the heterogeneous cultural feature seen from the West, and is making use of Japan as the indispensable distance for a focused seeing of the West in a defamiliarization of familiar norm. In his attempt to find a way out from the heavily dichotomized world view, he finds a cue deep in the core of Japanese art such as haiku, tanka, Noh play [=No play] and even modern experimental theatre.

It is a way of how divine and human values coexist, how the old and the new coexist, how individual and society coexist, and finally how life and death coexist. And it is to Suvin's credit that he has made Japan a lesson for a new horizon of intercultural stances, because the Japanese themselves have nowadays lost themselves more and more deeply in the pseudoscientific dichotomy and are looking for a way out of it as well. Suvin does not make it a point to choose the one or the other, between Japan (the East) and Europe (the West) but he seems to make it a point to find a third way out of the hegemony of the Western universal, taking into account another pole of bourgeois and pre-(or non-) bourgeois.

In Essay 1, Suvin argues that the multiple coordinate system typically found in Bunraku and Noh play which expresses <subject> not being split between body and self (or feeling and reason), will lead to harmony metonymically related to the whole, such as Nature and society, while the unidirectional system of the modern West has produced <self> (what Barthes calls <soul>) which necessarily requires conflict over body, other <selves>, nature and others.

It is especially interesting to trace Suvin's process of identifying a mystified expression of the Japanese without <soul> in *Empire of Signs* by Roland Barthes as without <self>, in developing the detailed sociologically historical discussion of the distinction between individual (l'individu), subject (le sujet) and self (le soi): <individual> in the sense of "the quality of being sufficiently heterogeneous in form to be rendered non-functional if cut in half", <subject> in the sense

of identity added to the individual, and <self> as the dimension of interiority which constitutes him/her as a singular individual to the heart of an intimacy which nobody else can access. Suvin contends that all classical Hellenic and Asian literature seems to be rather ignorant of <self>, for <self> along with monotheism, has been required with the huge social breakdowns of the world of the Roman empire along with polytheism.

We may recall here the American mythologist Joseph Campbell (1904-87) who views the varieties of myth as necessitated from the given historical social situation of human life (see Sartore ed. 1994; Campbell 1988). Campbell illustrates how the mythological idea undergoes metamorphosis in terms of the legend of the Holy Grail. The Grail is the chalice of the Last Supper and the chalice that held Christ's blood when he was taken from the cross. And the Grail is associated with Christ's passion. But, according to Campbell, one earlier writer tells about the Grail brought down from heaven by the neutral angels during the war in heaven between God and Satan, between good and evil, with some angelic hosts siding with Satan and some with God; and Grail represents the spiritual path between pairs of opposites, between fear and desire, between good and evil. And in the Grail romance, true spirituality comes from the union of matter and spirit. (Campbell 1988: 195-197).

Incidentally we might also give attention to what a Japanese folklorist Yanagita Kunio said: the Japanese language in old days has a tendency to express a meaning concerning body, mind, and heart all in the same one expression without any clear-cut distinction between them: e.g. *mamena* (physically and/or mentally healthy), *mameyaka* (honest, conscientious, diligent, comfortably healthy, labor hard), and *mamemameshii* (careful and diligent way of working).

As is well known, <Mu> is most distinctive in the core of the thought of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu. <Mu> is grasping and accepting reality wholly as it is given, without trying either to dichotomize it or to escape from it. Yet it is never a giv-

ing up or indulging, but a freeing or liberating to the utmost extent, where it is impossible to seek or lose one's <self> because the culturally invented <self> has evaporated. This does not mean the <subject> is ignorant of its degree of human authenticity, genuineness or profoundness, which is well demonstrated through all its work. Though he highly evaluates Barthes's serious attention to <subject> without <self>, Suvin rightly criticizes Barthes's interpretation of <Mu> as is represented when Barthes writes, "One of the two most powerful cities of modernity is thereby built around an opaque ring of walls, streams, . . . whose own center is no more than an evaporated notion, subsisting here, *not in order to irradiate power, but to give to the entire urban movement the support of its central emptiness*, forcing the traffic to make a perceptual detour" (Barthes 1970 English tr. 1982: 32. Italics Suvin.) It is true this touches on a very delicate phase of interpretation but, as Suvin says, it seems that Barthes's interpretation could lead to a highly dangerous acceptance of despotism.

In this connection, it is regrettable Suvin does not make any mention of Ikegami's introductory article on <Mu> as a metonymical feature in his edited book *The Empire of Signs: Semiotic Essays on Japanese Culture* (1991) which, significantly enough, has the same title as Barthes's book. Ikegami (1991) does not go into criticizing Barthes's <Mu>, but rather tacitly understands <Mu> rightly as the metonymical feature related to the whole context (see Ikegami 1991: esp. 1-24).

This metonymical relationship is, as Ikegami (1991: 17) says, a part-to-whole relationship, such as a <man>-to-<nature> or <individual>-to-<group>, and may be called a <figure>-to-<ground> relationship in terms of Gestalt psychology. This will agree with Suvin's view e.g. socially metonymical Japanese <Shame and Honor> in contrast to the Western <Sin and Guilt>. Japanese <Shame and Honor> do not come into exist without social context while the Western <Sin and Guilt> do by themselves. The key idea is the <highly contextual> character of the

metonymical semiotic structure deeply kept in traditional Japanese culture.

Essay 2 discusses the issue of translation both from the theoretical and from the poet-practitioner's viewpoint—two voices of translation discourse—centering on an example of a poem by Kobayashi Issa, a famous Japanese poet in the 18-19 c., and its translated version by Lewis Mackenzie and by Suvin himself. Suvin takes the appropriate translation to be the version depending on or requiring social, political, temporal, spacial and other contexts: in his use of Eco's terms, not from one dictionary to another but from one encyclopedia to another, and the target encyclopedia is always a contemporary one (p. 80). Thus parody and pastiche which connect different level of context of a given text are taken to be precious means for translation.

Suvin discusses translation as Variants, Adaptations and Rewrites. Variants are defined to preserve the central invariants or structural features of the text being translated, any translation being therefore a Variant. Adaptations use only some central invariants of a text such as are sufficient to establish its <family likeness [family resemblance]> to other members of that family, while Rewrites preserve only a few central invariants of a text to be used for a radically different purpose. Suvin recognizes the limits of allowable translation in Adaptations as that they must reactualize some of the central invariants of the original, and in Rewrites only very loose limits. He seems to find rich pleasure in his idea that there is not a limit to uses of a given text while there may be a limit to interpretation.

Attempting to make a critical comment on the Mackenzie's translation of Issa's poem, Suvin hypothesizes the two units-centered syntactic and semantic structure of the poem. And he finds the homologically same structure oriented in the works of other Japanese poets such as the great 12<sup>th</sup>-century poet-priest Saigyō and others as well.

It is the syntactic see-saw structure oscillating on either side of a pivot (zero morpheme), like a paradoxical anti-syllogism: <A (pivot) A> pivot <B(pivot)B>--

here B is Non-A. He also illustrates another interpretation: A is A (and yet =pivot)  
B is B.

Tsuyu no yo	(wa)	Tsuyu no yo	(/)	Nagara	(sari)	Nagara
A	(pivot 1)	A	pivot	B	(pivot 2)	B
Tsuyu no yo	wa	Tsuyu no yo	/	Nagara	sari	Nagara
A		A	pivot	B		B

These analytically detailed interpretations might invite some opposing argument, but the core contention of the see-saw structure oscillating between the one and the other side of the pivot should be welcomed, even if we were to take the usual viewpoint of haiku as a collision of two contrastive images in the three phrases of 5, 7, and 7 moras (=beats) each.

Suvin's constructive point may rather be in the semantically contrastive structure of [A (and yet) Non-A] in his discovery of a feedback loop between two logically contradictory but, in Japanese cultural history, richly complementary stances such as strong detachment and strong attachment. Indeed it may be attributed to the cultural context of seeking the harmony of apparently conflicting elements that has produced the syntactic and semantic see-saw textual poetic form (p.75 et passim). This argument will converge on the indispensable artistic integration of text and cultural context as a genuine music in word (in this connection, see Arima 1995: 137-152 as for the differences of the apparently similar poetic text of traditional Japanese haiku, modern Japanese haiku, English haiku and concrete poetry in their respective relationships to cultural context).

Essay 3 is a detailed discussion of parody and pastiche whose significance has been briefly touched on in Essay 2. A useful definition is made concerning the relationship of parody and pastiche: of both as sharing the <marking> of some textual elements as taken over from another text, and as to the two levels of the texts concerned, parody features their incongruity — one glimmering critically through the other — while pastiche makes it possible to fit the pieces of the two

levels harmoniously without incongruity; thus parody can be structurally educed by adding the aspect of incongruity or referential critique to pastiche which secures a necessary presupposition for parody.

It is significant that the importance of a semantically rich and wide network of intertext is indicated: neither pastiche nor parody are to be looked down upon as the second-rate on their non-<originality> (and there is presented an interesting discussion about <originality> (see pp. 114-115 for detail)). Suvin finds in the East-Asian or Japanese tradition of pastiche an especially creative new way of making use of the old to give appropriate meaning or insight to a necessarily changing given contemporary context, which will turn out to be a deeply layered intertextual *harmonious* expression of wisdom and art far from being the second-rate. He emphasizes the significance of taking this Japanese cultural practice into the highly Westernized intercultural stances in order to build a global model. We may note, in this connection, that modern Japanese tanka poetry has almost lost this precious practice of pastiche with whose technique Suvin is marvelously familiar, in line with a general Westernization of other aspects of culture, but that there still certainly remains something of the kind in the deeply suggestive use of some word or phrase in tanka poetry as well as in the deeply habitual ways of everyday life.

Part 2 dealing with intercultural comparison in an example of theatre begins from Essay 4 on Zeami's creative work in Noh play.

Zeami occupies an important place in the history of Noh play because it is Zeami who has artistically completed a new theatrical genre of Noh play which was founded by his father Kannami, under the patronage of a new warrior aristocracy in the 14th century.

The historical past of Noh was rooted in *Sarugaku* theatre performed at temples and shrines in all parts of Japan for the ordinary country people and priests of low rank by a travelling group whose social status was extremely low. Zeami

was well aware of the patronage of a warrior aristocracy but had never forgotten the importance of the practical tradition completely dependent on the favor of the contemporary audience, which will be found in *Fuhshi-Kaden*, a well-known “must” book of Noh play, written as the secret message of the art of the Noh play for his successor at various ages: 37 (the 1-3 parts), 39 (the 4-5 parts), and an unknown (the 6-7 parts). Suvin finds that this theatrical stance oriented to the contemporary people is strongly working in the decisive change Zeami made in Deity Noh and Warrior Noh.

A Noh-performance program is in principle based on a five-category system of division: Deity (about the blessings by deities), Warrior (about dead warriors recounting their memorable downfall), Woman (about beautiful women), Miscellaneous (about the spirits of plants or non-sentient beings), and Final Piece. Zeami changed Deity from fierce agent to benevolent guarantor of an existing state and practically invented Warrior Noh where the fallen warriors' final permanence differs radically from the <positive> evergreen permanence of the *Shinto* deities (pp. 141-142,145).

Suvin here asks why Zeami did so. Suvin tries to answer this question by way of asking further what deities and warriors in the Noh play stand for. He thinks there is little doubt that they symbolize the value of power in the Japanese politics of those days when a clear distinction was not made between politics and religion. Thus, Suvin finds that Zeami added the human heart and mind to the demon type deity of rulers and that Zeami invented Warrior Noh as the anamorphic transformations of Deity Noh. Suvin also finds the affects of the warriors intensified by way of the rhetorics of double negation in Warrior Noh, where conflict of the affects are systematically expunged or subordinated to revelation and Buddhist pacification, the intensified affects subsumed in the true awareness of something: this awareness might be what is essentially in the thought of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu. And this discovery seems to have motivated Suvin to classify various the-

atrical forms, such as Noh play, Nonsense play (Beckett), classical tragedy, Brecht's *Naysayer*, Individualist comedy, Revolutionary tragedy and drama sérieux, into stage stories in relation to their framework of the predetermined (including revelation) and the contingent (including conflict) (for the detail see the Table 3 at p. 151). This viewpoint will contribute much to dramaturgy. Thus Essay 4 seems to be proposing a deeply context-conscious significance of Noh play to the present-day dramaturgy.

Essay 5 presents how different social contexts necessitate different translations (*rewrites*) of a text by way of an exquisite example of Noh play *Taniko* (its author unclear, though once attributed to Zenchiku), Waley's and (through Hauptman's) Brecht's (two versions of) translation. And these translations as *rewrites* are discussed in detail.

Suvin gives the outline of the story of *Taniko* (literally, *Going to Valley*) as follows:

A Boy living with his ailing Mother in the capital persuades his religious Master to let him participate in a rigorous pilgrimage into the mountains so as to pray for her. During the ascent, he is struck by sickness which represents pollution (**tsumi**, the greatest offence against the gods) and jeopardizes the pilgrimage. The participants follow the ancient Great Law of the gods and, with his consent, hurl him into the valley. But his Master is then himself struck by such grief he cannot go on, so that the whole stage universe is threatened. In that impasse, the pilgrims pray to the sect's founder, En no gyoja, who appears and with help of his servant, a Daimon of dance, resuscitates the buried child. The daimon's triumphant final dance indicates the healing of the stage world. (p. 179.)

Suvin provides keen insight into the work of *Taniko* and their *rewrites* (translated versions), construing them as parables for a situation of mortal danger for

the whole community and/or the bearers of its future—the Young Man and the Mother; in this sense, *Taniko* and its *rewrites* present <plays for learning>, pedagogic poetry and political drama. (p. 201).

In *Taniko* in the social context of Middle Ages, people have to conform to a Law and they can attain to complete freedom only through the strict observance of this Law, for this Law transcends the individual (p. 201). In Wayley's version of *rewrite* in the social context of individual-social conflict typical of the Cambridge-Bloomsbury intellectual elite, the Young man is killed by the elders in power, the Massacre of the Innocent. In Brecht's context of the intense interest in what stance to take when faced with death trying to find a way out of the traditional German split between thought and deed, the Young man proceeds to debate and, denying the necessity of following an unworkable Great Custom, opts for the new Great Custom to think anew in each new position,

Essay 6 deals with Peter Weiss's theatrical text *Marat/Sade* and its *rewrite* in a different Japanese social/cultural context.

According to Suvin, three different performances of Weiss's work, each directed by Konrad Swinarski (April 1964 in West Berlin), Peter Brook (August 1964 in London and N.Y.) and Hanns A. Perten (March 1965 in Rostock DDR), keep Weiss's historiosophic framework as given with the shifted stresses in the balance between Marat and Sade; whereas the Japanese *Tsubasa o moyashita tenshi-tachi no buto* (*The Dance of Angels Who Burn Their Own Wings*) written as a counter-project to Weiss's work and directed by Makoto Satoh and others (hereafter "Satoh" as collective authorship) is a radical *rewrite* (a collage and pastiche or parody centrally based on Weiss's *Marat/Sade* and borrowing from a wide variety of writing) in terms of Japanese youth rebellion (1970 in Japan).

Weiss's theatre-as-world is a madhouse asking <Marat or Sade?>, but Satoh's is a *dream*, asking <if not Marat-Sade, then what? Who dreams most deeply?> (=if revolution conceived along the lines of the French model cannot be accept-

ed, then how is revolution to be conceived? Is it really a possibility?) (Goodman 1988: 293 of “*The Dance of Angels Who Burn Their Own Wings: commentary*” in his *Japanese Drama and Culture in the 1960s: the Return of the Gods*. Armonk NY: Sharpe, quoted in Suvin p. 232.) Suvin indicates that Satoh’s *rewrite* is extremely sensitive of his generation’s structure of feeling and imagination: Japanese history represents a bad dream soon to be forgotten. Suvin explicates all these, pointing to the detailed metaphorical structure of Weiss’s and Satoh’s work.

All of these Essays along with sophisticatedly inserted groups of poems seem to have beautifully converged on a semiotic new horizon of intercultural stances.

## References

- Arima, Michiko (1996) “Japanese haiku vs. English haiku vs. concrete poetry” in *Poetica: An International Journal of Linsuistic-Literary Studies* 46: 137-152. Tokyo: Shubun International.
- Barthes, Roland (1970) (*L’Empire des Signes.*) *Empire of Signs*. Tr. by Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Campbell, Joseph, with Bill Moyers (1988) *The Power of Myth* ed. by Betty S. Flowers. New York: Doubleday.
- Chuang-tzu (Date unknown: 4c. B. C.?) [Tr. with commentary by Mitsuji Fukunaga (1978)] *Chuang-tzu*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun-sha.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko ed. (1991) *The Empire of Signs: Semiotic Essays on Japanese Culture*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1987) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1. Stanford, California: Stanford UP.
- Lao-tzu (Date unknown: ca. 5-4c.B.C.?) [Tr. with commentary by Mitsuji

- Fukunaga (1978, 1987) *Lao-tzu (Taoism)*. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbun-sha.
- Peirce, Charles S. (1931-58) *Collected Papers*, 8 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Sartore, Richard L. ed. (1994) *Joseph Campbell on Myth & Mythology*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Whorf, Benjamin L. (1956) *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf* ed. by John B. Carroll. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Yasumaru, Yoshio (1983) "Seikatsu shiso ni okeru Shizen to Jiyuh", *Nihon Shisoh*, vol. 1 (Shizen) ed. by Tooru Sagara, Masahide Bitoh and Ken Akiyama. Tokyo: Tokyo UP.