

## Field Trip

**CURATED BY ANDREA BACHNER AND CHRISTOPHER BUSH**

# Approaches between Asia and Latin America: A Critical Renga

### ■ FRAMEWORK

**Christopher Bush**

The conceit of a “critical renga” was loosely inspired by Octavio Paz, Jacques Roubaud, Edoardo Sanguineti, and Charles Tomlinson’s 1969 quadrilingual experiment in poetic composition *Renga*, itself loosely modeled on the Japanese poetic genre of that name. This form of “linked verse” became a major literary genre in Japan in the fourteenth century. Starting from an opening *hokku* of three lines of five, seven, and five syllables (this is the origin of the haiku), a group of poets would take turns composing the next link in their chain, each alternating between fourteen and seventeen syllables, with each contributor responding only to the immediately preceding set of verses.<sup>1</sup> A quite complex set of rules developed over time, guiding both the particulars of any set of verses and the relationship between them in the composition as a whole (which could run to one hundred or even one thousand sets of verses).

The goal was to try out a form of critical writing that would be a bit more social, more interactive, and more improvisatory than is typically the case with academic writing. At the same time, we wanted to foreground the constructed character of the connections that constitute a field.

As a practical matter, we decided that instead of a single chain (which would have taken too long to complete), we would have two separate strands that would meet. Each contributor saw all the previous contributions in the chain and was encouraged to dialogue with any or all of them. We then decided to take advantage of this double-stranded structure by

adding a productive constraint: one chain would focus primarily on ways of connecting Latin America and East Asia through comparison and analogy, the other through contiguity and connection.

In his widely cited follow-up to “Conjectures on World Literature,” “More Conjectures,” Franco Moretti asserts that, at least with respect to European novels, “movement [of influence] from one periphery to another (without passing through the center) is almost unheard of; that movement from the periphery to the center is less rare, but still quite unusual, while that from the center to the periphery is by far the most frequent” (Moretti 2013, 112).<sup>2</sup> We specifically sought to explore the dynamics of literary and cultural movements between Latin America and East Asia in such a way that the quality of “movement” itself would come into focus and therefore raise broader questions about the very terms of debate (center–periphery, for example). Our ambition was not to put Latin American–East Asian cultural connections on *the* map (singular) but to sketch out alternative ways of mapping, based on new senses of what it means for cultures to be distant or close—both for them, historically, and in terms of the ways in which they might be studied today.

## ■ 1.1 ANALOGY AS EXPOSURE

### André Keiji Kunigami

Writer, photographer, and theorist Mário de Andrade, one of the most prominent representatives of the Brazilian avant-garde, was also the only one among the organizers of the São Paulo Week of Modern Art of 1922—deemed the inaugural moment of the avant-garde in Brazil—who did not undertake the traditional tour through European metropolitan centers. Instead, in 1927, he went on an “ethnographic” trip from industrial São Paulo through the north of Brazil as well as to the Amazon region in Peru and Bolivia. Uncomfortable with traveling, de Andrade called himself an “anti-traveler . . . always traveling wounded, alarmed, and incomplete” (de Andrade 1976, 49).<sup>3</sup> Instead of Europe, de Andrade’s first major trip was through “native” Brazil and Latin America. In the first draft of the preface to his travelogue, de Andrade frames this experience as overshadowed by comparison: “My comprehension of landscapes, costumes, and men is processed always by a *comparative process* that, in this case, seems to me frankly wrong. . . . The truth is that I’m traveling much around my own self, and selfishly applying my experiences instead of enriching myself with new ones” (de Andrade 2015, 48).<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, throughout his travels, a particular type of comparison asserts itself in

unexpected ways: analogy. For instance, through the lens of analogy, de Andrade repositions Belém, the capital city of Pará, a state in the northern Amazonian region, as akin to (or indeed *in*) Polynesia: “Belém is the main city of Polynesia. They sent Malay immigrants here, and from the space in between the mango trees Belém do Pará was born” (de Andrade 1976, 63).

Even though analogy feels like a dulling mediation, it also seems inescapable. And so de Andrade (1976, 61) couches his complaint that Brazil is nothing but a performative “physiognomy” of its tropical self built upon a failed desire for a European interiority in yet another analogy between Brazil and Asia: “We [Brazilians] should think, feel like Indians, Chinese, people from Benin, Java.” Precisely through these unavoidable events of analogy, de Andrade realizes that he is part of that same performative “physiognomy”: “I want to sum up my impressions of this trip. . . . I can’t quite manage, I’m a bit stunned, astonished, I don’t know. . . . There is a sort of sensation, stuck at insufficiency, of a mottling that ruins all the gray neat European that lingers within me” (61). The writer’s unease and guilt stem from a figural desire that cannot be fulfilled, placing him as a failed judge of similitudes and hovering like a ghost, compelling him to comparisons that, ultimately, dismantle the object of his gaze as much as himself and result in ruins that, ironically, mottle with color the grayness of his European façade. Instead of blocking experience, analogy becomes experience itself—an unforeseen one—arising from the senses. The ghost stands in the way of identity, sets the author floating in mid-air, and makes him acknowledge his in-betweenness by fixing his gaze on a world of surfaces. It is a struggle between representation and experience that is not solved but rather returns: he cannot look away.

This episode is not one of the many factual “points of contact” between Asia and Latin America. It is, rather, a point of noncontact, a *moment of exposure*. Exposure, as thought by Jean-Luc Nancy (1991), indicates a mode of being-together premised on the impossibility of a total communion of subjects within and among themselves, in contrast to the *sensus communis* of Kantian aesthetics. Exposure emerges at the limit and demands an ethics of exteriority in which each singularity—marked by the shared limitation of life itself—exists only as “being-in-common,” inasmuch as it “is not a common being” (29). The outcome, instead of a synthesis or abstraction of equivalences, is the dislocation of different parts exposed to one another. De Andrade’s analogy is such an experience of exposure of noncontiguous elements, tinged with negative feelings. For de Andrade, comparison is not a “discursive strategy” (as Benedict Anderson [2016, 15–18] suggested), because the writer is inescapably *driven* to it instead of intentionally espousing such a perspective.

Analogy is premised on the fact that things are *not* the same: they are *only* analogous. Asia is *not* Latin America; Polynesia is *not* the Amazon; but also, Brazil is *not* Brazil, and even de Andrade is *not* quite himself. De Andrade's analogical thought does not fully subscribe to an Orientalist approach, for it undermines its own epistemological authority: the subject is in ruins. Since all elements compared are imaginary and noncontiguous, they propose disconnection as a mode of relation. De Andrade's photographic camera (this analogical-indexical mechanism par excellence) occupies a central role here, because it reveals surface images—physiognomies—that break through the usual ethnographic tautologies, showing that things can not quite look like what they are supposed to be. It is not a coincidence that the very birth of the photographic image—the moment when the film is sensitized by light—is called the moment of exposure. In de Andrade, as in the photographic exposure, the analogical experience exceeds language and emerges precisely where the elements in comparison move from incommensurability to singularity, thus escaping the binary between difference and identity. Through the frustrated evidence of photography, set in a sort of cinematic duration, analogies surface from physical and aesthetic dislocation. The photographic image itself becomes a mode of analogy: it is *analogous* to its objects, yet not quite identical to them.

In places as disparate as Japan and Brazil, the more mobile and accessible the world became through reproducible images, the more “unlike” oneself the “modernizing” national subjects could grow. These modern machines of technical images, while symbolizing the fetish-idea of “modernity” itself, also exposed this gap radically. In Japan, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō underwent a similar experience to de Andrade's, through film. In what Thomas Lamarre calls the “collapse of geopolitical distance,” film in Tanizaki meant not only the arrival of foreign images but also self-estrangement: the Japanese body magnified on the temporal screen unleashed an uncanny experience in which racial difference emerges within the looker, as a mode of self-exposure. Suddenly, a Japanese individual could look like its colonized Other, too “Asian.”<sup>5</sup> Also, in the 1920s and 1930s, leftist avant-garde artist Murayama Tomoyoshi encounters in film's time-based physicality (including even *smell*) the capacity for undermining modernity's narrative through the possibility of exposing the subject and history itself to their own unfinished and open nature (Murayama 1928, 3–5, 28–31).<sup>6</sup> Seeing oneself on the screen means *seeing oneself as one's own analogy*. Similarly, de Andrade, through his camera, looks at the “natives” and realizes that his self-mastery disappears for the duration of his gaze. For “non-Western” modernists such as de Andrade,

Tanizaki, and Murayama, compelled to speak on behalf of their national space, the modern technologized image evinced the political power of *analogy as exposure*, an experience of modernity that, far from being an “imitation” or a “lagging behind,” could operate as an interruption of the modern regime of spatialized synchronicities by evincing self-difference.

What emerges from these unavoidable, momentary, somewhat traumatic analogies resonates with what Harry Harootunian (2003, 46) calls “ghostly comparison”: throwing the cracks in modernity’s spatialized teleological time into relief by a comparative approach aimed at a “non-synchronous contemporaneity.” Instead of stabilizing the reified units of comparison, it means acknowledging industrial modernity’s repressed spectralities that emerge, aesthetically, at moments of mutual exposure, revealing a possible different mapping in which the modern appears already as its own ruins. The possibility of an analogy between Latin America and Asia lies precisely in this mode of exposure. The guilty discomfort that hit Mário de Andrade in his conflict between his desire for similitude and the inevitability of analogy perhaps still lingers today in the repetitive demands for justification of any comparative approach between “Latin America” and “Asia,” while no such reasoning is required when the comparison goes through “Europe”—as if the world’s image itself were under threat. Why Latin America and Asia? As one way of dismantling hegemonic historicities, this analogical mediation between ghosts and images-in-duration might contribute to the development of a “mimetic faculty” as theorized by Walter Benjamin (2005, 720–22): “to read what was never written,” finding invisible relations that emerge, through a momentary thickness of mediation, on the visible physiognomies of things. But instead of ancient and perennial relations, as suggested by Benjamin, these are relations that emerge at the moment one looks at them. And through the action of retracing these relations, the physiognomic and external aspect of the world regains its political weight, exposing modernity’s Other within itself and showing that nothing can be equal but that everything is mutually exposed.

**André Keiji Kunigami** is a PhD candidate at Cornell University. He has published on questions of aesthetics, violence, and politics in contemporary cinema (in Portuguese) and has experience working in film and video production in Rio de Janeiro. His current research dwells on the political aspects of the aesthetic experience of photography and film, focusing on the prewar avant-gardes of Brazil and Japan.

## ■ 1.2 WHAT COLOR IS *THE YELLOW MAN*? JAPAN AND THE IMMIGRANT AVANT-GARDE IN ANITA MALFATTI'S BRAZILIAN MODERNIST ART

Seth Jacobowitz

New York City, 1915. Anita Malfatti (1889–1964), recognized today as Brazil's first modernist artist, paints a portrait titled *The Yellow Man* (*O homem amarelo*), applying the experimental techniques of expressionism, fauvism, and cubism she acquired during four years of study in Berlin, then under the tutelage of Homer Boss at the Independent School of Art.<sup>7</sup> True to her iconoclastic path, she returned to São Paulo the following year and held her second solo exhibition in 1917–18. Cultural conservatives vociferously criticized it, notably the influential writer Monteiro Lobato (1917), who excoriated her “abnormal” vision and absorption with “ephemeral theories” as no better than caricature. Undeterred, Malfatti continued her groundbreaking work and became one of the leading participants of the Week of Modern Art in São Paulo in February 1922 that successfully introduced homegrown Brazilian modernism in its myriad forms to the public. She likewise joined “The Group of Five,” alongside Mário de Andrade, to defend the aims of the Week of Modern Art.

In the spirit of this collection of “renga” essays about the linkages between East Asia and South America, I introduce Malfatti's *The Yellow Man* en route to evaluating two of her other renowned portraits, *Japanese Man* (*O japonês*, 1915) and *Japanese Woman* (*A japonesa*, 1924). In form and content, as well as in title, they incorporate her trademark blend of styles into what appear to be overt gestures toward Japonisme. How are we to make sense of these enigmatic works? Does Malfatti's Japonisme signify a revitalizing cultural force transversal to the different movements of European modernism, or is it just another familiar product of Western exoticism, that is, a caricature of the inscrutable Oriental? I would like to argue that Malfatti went beyond the former while avoiding the latter. In her attempts to capture a new state of being in the world that was simultaneously Japanese, American, Brazilian, and modernist, Malfatti articulated a new aesthetic and ethical sensibility that I call here the immigrant avant-garde. It goes far beyond mere abstraction in the transposition of cutting-edge international ideas from a center to a periphery. Rather, it speaks to the relocation of communities, the ethics of knowing and representing the other, and doing so in an artistic manner befitting the new era.

Returning to *The Yellow Man*, let me pose a deceptively simple follow-up question. What color is the yellow man? Smartly dressed in a reddish-brown suit with a yellow and black striped tie, the seated figure has high

cheekbones, red lips, largish almond-shaped eyes, boldly arched eyebrows, a broad forehead, and short black hair. Our first instinct is likely to interpret the title as a marker of race. It turns out, however, that the man is not Asian. The painting depicts an Italian immigrant not unlike Malfatti herself, who was the daughter of an Italian father and an American mother. His skin color reveals no truths about race, only the prerogative of a modern artist's palette. He is an Everyman befitting a new era of urbanism, migration, and mutable identities. I believe this is the key to understanding the two portraits explicitly coded as Japanese as well. They rightfully belong in the same categorical grouping as *The Yellow Man*, not least of all given that two of the largest population flows into Malfatti's native São Paulo were from Italy and Japan.

It is widely acknowledged that *Japanese Man* is a portrait of Yasuo Kuniyoshi, a fellow artist at the Independent School of Art. Kuniyoshi had immigrated to the United States in 1906, one year before the U.S.–Japanese Gentleman's Agreement voluntarily closed the country to Japanese immigration and indirectly necessitated its shift to South America.<sup>8</sup> The painting depicts a man in three-quarter profile wearing a jacket, vest, and bow tie. A hint brighter in color than *The Yellow Man*, the angular features and swept-back hair, the bunching of his suit, and the cropped, imposing posture immediately recall the vigorously masculine effect of the earlier painting. It is also worth noting some broad similarities between Malfatti's portrait of Kuniyoshi and his own style, such as the use of bold lines, swathes of color, a limited tonal range, and cubist touches like the tilted picture plane. In an era of anti-Japanese sentiment, *Japanese Man* is an unabashed statement of, if not homage to, Japanese modernity composed using equally bold avant-gardist techniques.

Did the figure of the Japanese immigrant once again resonate with Malfatti some ten years later as she observed the unprecedented influx of Japanese immigrants into her home city and state? The slow trickle of several thousand per year in the 1910s soared into tens of thousands annually in the latter half of the 1920s, placing *Japanese Woman* right on the cusp of that historical surge. Despite what at first glance may seem the stereotypical cues of a demure woman in a red kimono holding a paper and bamboo parasol, the painting also has markers of *moga* (modern girl) chic less obvious to the untrained eye. One is the woman's bob cut, another her kimono. The kimono in the 1920s did not necessarily connote a return to tradition. It, too, was a site of artistic inspiration and reinvention as women's fashion began to challenge the strictures of Western, as well as Japanese, control over women's bodies.

More pertinently, the figure of *Japanese Woman* represented a fellow



artist named Riu Okanouye. Once again, behind the generic title, Malfatti paid tribute to a colleague with whom she had exchanged ideas and shared aesthetic sensibilities. As Renata Gomes Cardoso (2014) argues,

to paint a portrait of a Japanese painter—Riu Okanouye—whose own works appear to rework certain essential characteristics of Japanese painting, which were for their part, definitive in the artistic transformations of European painting, could be seen as homage by Anita Malfatti. This was as much for the specific characteristics of this painter, which culminated in the conceit of Japonisme, as it was known in the French context, as for a direct reference to artists who worked with Japanese motifs in portraits or interior scenes with typical costumes and other elements of this culture, what were best known as Japonaiserie. . . . Another point to be emphasized about this portrait is the proximity of artists of Japanese descent to Anita Malfatti during these years, such as the aforementioned Riu Okanouye and her husband, Micaio Kono, or Tsuguharu Foujita, who combined in their works artistic concerns proper to the Parisian context with aspects of Japanese art, in associations that demonstrate many affinities with the pictorial research of Anita Malfatti.<sup>9</sup>

Gomes Cardoso thus dispatches the notion that Malfatti was engaged with Japoniste themes alone, seeing her working in close proximity to the artists of Japanese descent who participated in the transformation of Brazilian modernity. Here, too, is a powerful evocation of what I am calling the immigrant avant-garde as integral to Malfatti's work and to Brazilian modernism more generally.

Certainly the Japanese dimensions to the avant-garde ferment of São Paulo in the 1920s and 1930s cannot be overstated. The Week of Modern Art in 1922 was a watershed moment, but there were other major developments involving Japanese artists, such as the four-month visit to Brazil by aforementioned School of Paris celebrity Foujita in 1931–32. There was also the formation of a Japanese immigrant artists' collective called the São Paulo Fine Art Research Group, or Seibikai, in 1935. In contrast to the polyglot and kaleidoscopic "hallucinated city" of Mário de Andrade's modernist poetic masterpiece *Paulicéia Desvairada* (1922), where, as André Keiji Kunigami notes, a spectral physiognomy of Asia had yet to be conceived as a lament, Anita Malfatti's direct engagement with, and representation of, Japanese artists as peers lay squarely at the heart of a new Brazilian cultural vanguard. The immigrant avant-garde as a global movement and artistic affinity, and not as Japoniste affectation, was from the outset her integral contribution to the origins of Brazilian modernism.



**Seth Jacobowitz** is assistant professor of East Asian languages and literatures at Yale University. He is the translator of the *Edogawa Rampo Reader* (2008) and the author of *Writing Technology in Meiji Japan: A Media History of Modern Japanese Literature and Visual Culture* (2015). He is currently working on his next book, *Brazil in the Japanese Imperial Imagination: Immigrant Literature and Transnational Modernity, 1908–1941*.

### ■ 1.3 ANOMALY WITHOUT ANALOGY: MORIMOTO TAZUKO'S U.S.-MEXICO BORDER TANKA

Andrew Leong

If I were to adopt a strict interpretation of the rules of renga, then this essay-link would connect only to the link immediately prior (*maeku*) and avoid “clashing” (*uchikoshi o kirau*) with the link twice prior. As renga scholar Esperanza Ramirez-Christensen (2008, 13) explains, this prohibition against “clashing of words across one-verse intervals” demonstrates that the “functional unit” of a renga sequence is “not a pair of verses but three” and that “in this basic triad, verse 2 is, of course, expected to look back and link up to verse 1, but verse 3 may not do so, for it would precipitate the beginning of a retrogressive movement.”<sup>10</sup> As the composer of verse 3, then, I would be required to link to Seth Jacobowitz’s essay, and its question of how we “are to make sense of enigmatic works,” but I would have to avoid any direct reference to Kunigami’s essay and its theorization of “analogy as exposure.” Here the formal rules of renga themselves clash with the specific theoretical task at hand: I must make an analogy (an “is like” link) to the enigma, or anomaly, of Jacobowitz’s verse 2 that is somehow “not like” the “analogy” of Kunigami’s verse 1. Yet how can one do this? How can one attend to what is unlike the same (*an-homalos*) as if one had no exposure to that which accords to proportion and the word (*ana-logos*)?

If we bracket, as insoluble, the enormous problems of whether the late medieval Japanese poetics of renga can or should be translated through conceptual apparatuses associated with the ancient Greeks, we can note that the *uchikoshi* prohibition raises what appears to be a specific problem of *poiesis* or “making”—in this case, the problem of how one makes a link in a renga. This problem of *poiesis* also strikes (*uchi*) and crosses over (*koshi*) into the conceptual realm of *theoria* (the contemplation of those objects which Aristotle posited as eternal and unchanging). That is, the poietic problem of making a link to Jacobowitz’s anomaly while *not* making a link to Kunigami’s analogy would seem to require a theoretical

solution: a contemplation of there being such an object as an *anomaly without analogy*.

Lacking the time in this setting to fully contemplate the unchanging truth of what such an object would be, I will shift the question instead to the more practical ground of *praxis* and try to work out what *anomaly without analogy* would do if such an object existed. If I were to hazard a provisional definition of what an *anomaly without analogy* could be, it would be this: an error that draws our attention to the working of a form or a process but does not guarantee any direct or mimetic correspondence to a specific content or meaning associated with that form or process.

Seth Lerer's *Error and the Academic Self* offers one potential route for the study of anomalies without analogy. Lerer argues that the "professionalization of literary study took shape" through encounters with a particular variety of the anomalous, the "erroneous" (2). Lerer's conception of error "embraces both the erring and the errant," a "being wrong" that is "also about being displaced, about wandering, dissenting, emigrating, and alienating" (2). While Lerer's route culminates in a reading of Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis*, and "the readings and misreadings that *Mimesis* both encodes and generates" (224), this special issue of *Verge* routes us toward a set of geographical and historical coordinates (at least) once removed from those suggested by the image of "Auerbach in Turkey . . . the German-Jewish scholar of the Romance languages sitting 'helpless at the edge of the desert'" (222).

In the broader context of this special journal issue, which seeks to reframe the "transpacific" as a "lens for comparison" that corrects for a limited "focus on the northern part of the Americas," we might be especially attuned to transpacific anomalies that draw our attention to forms and processes that, on one hand, divide the "United States" from Latin America and, on the other, call such divisions into question.

Although I imagine that examples of such anomalies are legion, I encountered one striking example while skimming through the June 1939 issue of *Harvest* (*Shūkaku*), a literary arts journal that was transpacific in the sense that it was edited and distributed in the United States but printed in Japan. While the study of *Harvest* as a transpacific Japanese American journal is vulnerable to the objection that it erroneously equates the U.S. "American" with the whole of the Americas, there is a typographical quirk, an anomaly that appears at the exact midpoint of a sequence of six poems that happen to address a key geopolitical form that divides the United States from Latin America: the U.S.–Mexico Border. The poem sequence, titled "Mexico Willows" ("Mekishiko asobigusa"), was

composed by Morimoto Tazuko, a Los Angeles-based poet. All six poems are *tanka*—short Japanese poems that generally consist of thirty-one *on*, or “sounds,” divided into five units: 5-7-5-7-7. The typographical quirk is that there should be a dividing line—a full line break that separates the third from the fourth poem—but this break is absent. The third poem and the fourth poem are compressed together at the left of the top column of the page, brought into an odd proximity that I have preserved in my translation below:

川超えて密入國せし同胞のこの山深く餓ゑて果てしと  
無花果の上枝に孵りしモツチイングさ庭に下がりて幼な音に鳴く

kawakoete / mitsunyūkoku seshi / dōhō no / kono yama fukaku / uete  
hateshito  
ichijiku no / uwae ni kaerishi / mocchingu / saniwa ni sagarite / osana oto  
ni naku

they crossed the river  
emigrating in secrecy  
our compatriots  
in the depths of these mountains  
at the limits of hunger  
among the fig tree's  
upper branches the just hatched  
mockingbirds, but down  
down down upon the sacred ground  
the sound the sound of youngling cries (Morimoto [1939] 1997, 32)

One could read the nonhuman image of mockingbirds dispatching the offspring of alien eggs as analogous to human border control. One could also take the anomalous absence of a dividing line as being itself a break with the analogy of border regulation, an invitation toward a borderless world, an anomaly without analogy that registers a mimetic trace or reflection of the errant transpacific processes that produced the poem. Such processes include not only the poem's envisioning at the U.S.-Mexico border, the editorial compilation of the poem in the United States, the printer's typesetting in Japan, and so on, but also, and most importantly, the labor and work of those who migrate across the border.

This anomaly without analogy can also lead us to wilder possibilities: a world of human and nonhuman processes that may occasionally be proximate to the formal divisions designated by the “transpacific” and “Latin America” but often exceed strict correspondence to such divisions. We might consider cross-contaminations or clashes between the realms

of *poiesis* and *theoria*, which, for Aristotle, were the divided realms of noncitizen laborers and citizen thinkers. Aristotle's divisions need not be ours as we attempt to reframe the transpacific while recalling the regulative force of the U.S.–Mexico border. Here one might draw an analogy between the rules of *renga* and the U.S.–Mexico border as a form of rule or regulation that divides the United States from Latin America. By the rules of *renga*, I should avoid this analogy. The excess of anomaly demands otherwise.

**Andrew Leong** is assistant professor of English and Japanese literature at Northwestern University. A comparativist by training, Leong studies literary works produced by persons of Japanese descent in the Americas. He is the translator of *Lament in the Night* (2012), a collection of two novellas by 1920s Los Angeles–based writer Nagahara Shōson. His recent articles have appeared in *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* and *Post-45: Contemporaries*.

#### ■ 1.4 WIPING THE BLADE

**Christopher Bush**

Immediately before condemning the harmful effects of “importing . . . exotic formulas” popular in Europe’s capitals, Paolo Prado’s famous preface to Oswald de Andrade’s *Brazilwood* (*Pau Brasil*, 1925) cites, in French, a certain “Japanese haiku”: “The Japanese poet / wipes his blade: / this time eloquence is dead” (Le poète japonais / Essuie son couteau: / cette fois l’éloquence est morte).<sup>11</sup> The unmistakable allusion to Paul Verlaine’s “Art poétique” (“Take eloquence and wring its neck” [Prends l’éloquence et tords-lui son cou!]) is a tell: the poem was, in fact, originally written in French, by the *haijin* (haiku poet) Julien Vocance, who had used it as the opening shot of his own “Art poétique,” a polemical haiku sequence published in 1921. Vocance (born Joseph Seguin, 1878–1954) belonged to a veritable “haiku movement” that reached its apogee in France in the late 1910s and early 1920s. A September 1920 special issue of the *Nouvelle Revue Française*, for example, included haiku by avant-garde dramaturge Pierre Albert-Birot, a young Henri Lefebvre, future surrealist poet Paul Eluard, and the review’s subsequent editor Jean Paulhan, in addition to writers more exclusively identified with the movement, such as Vocance and Paul-Louis Couchoud. Anticipating the fatal assault on eloquence, Couchoud described haiku as “the literary genre from which *literature* is most completely excluded” (qtd. in Hokenson 694) and championed such works as *One Hundred Visions of War* (*Cent visions de guerre*, 1916),

Vocance's violent haiku about his combat experiences in the Great War. In this context, then, the haiku was associated with the aesthetic values of modernism, even the avant-garde: not an exotic formula but a weapon with which many became proficient in the trenches.<sup>12</sup>

In an echo of Seth Jacobowitz's inquiry about the color of *The Yellow Man*, we have here a Japanese poet who is anything but. What presented itself as a Latin American importation directly from East Asia turns out to have a French connection after all. Is this yet another instance of Paris dictating literary meantime? *Pau Brasil* is, after all, explicitly about how to assert the value of what is "barbarous and ours" in the global literary marketplace, a kind of rehearsal for de Andrade's better known "Cannibal Manifesto" ("Manifesto Antropofágico," 1928). But literary works that travel are like commercial goods generally in that they are rarely the pure product of any one place. The name of a nation might come to signify a commercially successful artisanal product (as with china or japan), or a raw material might be so valued that a nation is named after it (as with brazilwood), but precisely these strongest of identifications are those most likely to come from elsewhere or to be an effect of circulation and distance. Whomever the cannibal eats has probably already cannibalized someone else.

In contrast to what is often said of Hispanic *modernismo*, we do not have here yet another instance of that center-periphery economy in which, "in exchange for its raw materials, Spanish America received culture, primarily in the form of manufactured products" (Jrade 1998, 16).<sup>13</sup> I would go further and argue that the French origin of this "Japanese" poet is a reminder of the extent to which Europe, too, was an active importer of manufactured products. The significance of a literary form need not be determined entirely by its origin (here Japan), nor by its early adopters (here France), nor even by the immediate context in which it is used (here Latin America). For some, haiku was "one denomination in the currency that circulated among the international, intercultural avant-garde" (Johnson 2011, 41). As Mariano Siskind (2014, 156) has argued more extensively, French functioned as "the universal lingua franca of marginal global modernisms . . . because French was the language of exchange between local modernisms, the universal currency" for accessing the literatures of "the world." Even if one suspects that more than a few French particularities might remain in the smelted "universal," neither is this simply an instance of French cultural hegemony.

Contemporaneous with the rise of the French-language movement was a Spanish-language one including poets in Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Peru as well as Spain, but nowhere stronger than in Mexico,

whose *haijin* included Rafael Lozano (whose 1922 *Haikais* was written and published in French, with vertical typography); Carlos Gutiérrez Cruz (who in 1924 “published a brochure of communist propaganda in haikus”); and Francisco Monterde (founding editor of the avant-garde journal *Antena*).<sup>14</sup> The central figure, however, was José Juan Tablada (1871–1945).<sup>15</sup> No belated imitator of the French, Tablada seems to have begun writing haiku during his first stay in Japan in 1900, making him possibly the first non-Japanese to have composed original haiku in his or her own language. After a second trip to Japan in 1910, he spent much of 1911–12 in Paris, where he knew, among many other well-known figures, Couchoud, Eluard, and Paulhan as well as Guillaume Apollinaire.

Less influential as a poet than Tablada, José María González de Mendoza wrote valuable Spanish- and French-language essays on the Hispanophone haiku movement by 1924. One of his articles explicitly raises and immediately dismisses concerns about the Mexican haiku being derivative of either Japan or France. Indeed, he envisions the haiku as a profoundly Mexican genre and is optimistic about its “extend[ing] . . . into the soul of the people [*l’âme populaire*],” specifically “our Indians,” in whose “sober and synthetic expression” in the arts he finds a natural affinity, even asking, “did not the seed of ancient Mexican civilization also come, like the haiku, from the Orient?” (González de Mendoza 1924, 121). Responding directly to González de Mendoza’s article later that same year, French critic Marius André (1868–1927) goes further by claiming that there is no need for a process of indigenization because “it has been in that [popular] soul for a long time. What you believe to have borrowed from Japan was in you even before your birth” (André 1924, 233).

A supporter of the right-wing nationalist *Action française*, André hardly represents a cosmopolitan ideal. However, he and figures like him remind us of the extent to which literary history displaced and exceeded (and, if we let it, will continue to displace and to exceed) those critical limits against which so many scholars today actively struggle in the name of the global. Neither a belated emulation of a French Japonisme nor an unmediated encounter with some Japanese essence, the Latin American modernist haiku archives a rich imaginary of flexible racial identifications, crisscrossing circulations, alternative origins, and utopian futures—all different ways of twisting necks and slitting throats.

**Christopher Bush** is associate professor of French and comparative literary studies at Northwestern University and coeditor of the journal *Modernism/modernity*. His research and teaching focus on comparative

and interdisciplinary approaches to literary modernisms, especially the interactions between European and East Asian avant-gardes, aesthetic theory, and media. His publications include *Ideographic Modernism: China, Writing, Media* (2010) and *The Floating World: Japoniste Aesthetics and Global Modernity* (forthcoming).

## ■ NEXUS

### Andrea Bachner

Does intercultural work between Asia and Latin America always result in tenuous constellations and precarious links? In need of constraints such as this critical renga sequence to stitch very different approaches, sides, and phenomena together, yet unable to speak for itself, to convince by dint of necessary, indeed self-evident connections? The opposite is true—or rather, this very question is profoundly flawed for its problematic presuppositions. Instead of censuring intercultural constellations that are apparently fragile, such as weak links, missed encounters, precarious dialogues, or oblique analogies, for their lack of cohesion and relational ground, we should treat structures based on supposedly strong connections with at least equal suspicion. In fact, who decides which kinds of links are strong and which ones weak, according to what criteria, and based on what methodological tenets?

Part of the insistence—at times overt, most often implicit—on stabilizing intercultural work by looking at spaces or phenomena that are already connected is a reaction against comparative methodologies and their potential ideological pitfalls. After all, the heyday of all things comparative, the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, adulterated comparison as a method by placing it in a framework of universal taxonomies that resulted more often than not in cultural hierarchies (Melas 2007, 1–43). Instead of comparing—of bringing things together (as the etymology of *com-parare*, of “placing in conjunction,” would suggest)—the global quests for shared traits and motifs of that earlier phase of (so-called) comparison easily defaulted to cultural navel gazing, insisting frequently on distance and incommensurability rather than on copresence and dialogue. Rather than allowing for a critical, relativizing stance toward one’s own culture, such endeavors all too often implied a logic that found the other lacking in the absence of a cultural phenomenon defined as “universal” in the eyes of the culture (most often Western) that did possess it.

With such an ideological baggage, approaches that are, as Natalie



Melas (2013, 652–59) theorizes, “merely comparative” by bringing cultural traits selectively into dialogue without the violent repercussions of earlier, taxonomically driven “comparisons” threaten to incur questions about the conceptual surplus value of such a method as well as about the implications of decontextualizing a given cultural articulation in the comparative process. For instance, R. Radhakrishnan (2013, 18) warns against an “unavoidable deracination” and a potentially violent “yoking together” of two works or cultural phenomena that are “deterritorialized from their ‘original’ milieu and then reterritorialized so that they may become cospatial, epistemologically speaking,” in the act of comparison. And yet, the very assumption of what is the “correct” or “original” context of a given cultural phenomenon is rarely scrutinized. Consequently, most intercultural approaches today, even in disciplines (such as comparative literature) that label their methodology overtly as one of comparison, eschew comparative processes. Instead of expending the intellectual labor of putting together two phenomena across cultures, intercultural work frequently presupposes direct links between two or more cultures before they can be treated in conjunction. Instead of forging a connection, a connection is always already assumed, before critical work can run its course, even if the links that ground intercultural reflections need a critic’s archeological intervention to become visible, because they have been obliterated by ideological bias—such as in Shu-mei Shih’s (2013) theorization of a colonially imposed plantation belt culture that reaches from Southeast Asia to the Caribbean or Lisa Lowe’s (2015) intimacies of four continents forged by colonialism.

The bases for intercultural connectivity can be perceived as strong links, for instance, diasporic constellations or other movements of peoples across cultures and/or shared historical structures such as colonialism or other political-economic constellations that displace populations. Even approaches that rely on a shared linguistic tradition, such as Anglophone, Francophone, or Sinophone studies, spring usually from a history of colonial and postcolonial relations that carries its ideological baggage into contemporary intellectual work. Alternatively, instead of movements of people, intercultural approaches can highlight the movements of texts and ideas, in the more elitist key of intertextuality and authorial influence, or in the more generalized key of world literary reflections, with their focus on textual circulation and translation. Somewhat weaker links that can still stabilize intercultural work without incurring strong critical scrutiny are individual histories of intercultural contact and/or travel, an author’s reference to other cultures, often in the guise of Orientalism or Occidentalism, or the presupposition of socioeconomic and historical

similarities sometimes based on geographic contiguity or equivalence.

These approaches have all yielded productive insights into intercultural routes and constellations that striate the smooth space of globalization, especially since more recent work—such as transpacific studies or studies of the Global South—remap the globe without having recourse to the usual suspects of, for example, Eurocentric, Sinocentric, U.S.-centric, or Northern Hemisphere-centric bias. And yet, privileging preexisting relations as the basis for intercultural critique runs the risk of putting on conceptual blinders. From some of these perspectives, a large number of cultural conjunctions remain invisible, while some cultural spaces remain isolated, leading once more to unnecessarily unequal distributions of cultural and global capital—such inequalities are built into global structures, but we, as critics, do not have to replicate them in our work. More problematically, however, especially the constellations defined as strong links tend to naturalize their intellectual grounds. This means that many of the conclusions of connection-based work are anticipated but also preempted, because they already serve as prerequisites for the intercultural constellation under scrutiny. In other words, critics divest themselves of critical power by taking (more often than not) only one type of intercultural link for granted as the basis of their intellectual endeavor rather than scrutinizing the disciplinary and ideological implications of their very conceptual foundations.

When Shih rewrites comparison in the guise of relation (Shih 2013, 79–98), she makes explicit the implicit rules of intercultural work. We can read this as a plea for tracing, at times unearthing, preexisting connections rather than engaging in a compare-and-contrast mode of analogy. In fact, this is already the reality of most intercultural work, even that which still calls itself “comparative.” And yet, such a dichotomy short-changes both relation and comparison. To radically think comparison as relation implies a thought that remains open to all kinds of links—ones that are underpinned by historical patterns, geographic constellations, and aesthetic flows but also ones that depend more strongly on a critic’s staging and construction. For instance, Rey Chow (2013, 2) reframes the meaning of relation when she invites us to rethink relationality as constellations of entanglement, beyond spatial, temporal, or causal connections, beyond similarity, affinity, and conjunction, toward disparity, partiality, and partition. In addition, even when we work with supposedly preexisting connections, we never just represent what is already there but select, highlight, frame, even script, linked phenomena. After all, *relation*—etymologically from the Latin *re-ferre*, or “to carry back”—designates a link or connection and also refers to an account or a narrative. As we relate

relationality, we also underscore, even create, relationality in an act of putting together or, indeed, of comparing. What emerges, then, is not one connection in splendid, privileged isolation but rather a whole entangled web of different links: a nexus that designates both the complexity and decentered nature of the network and points to specific interfaces, points of contact at which its different strands interweave.

Thinking of comparison (as relation) in the form of a nexus also implies a caveat for the role of the comparatist, because her relation to the entangled interface under scrutiny is itself complex as she is its mediator, which means that she participates in its weaving, even as the patterns of the different nexus components inspire, indeed partially determine, her intellectual handiwork. In other words, relationality also exists between the critic and the phenomena he relates, because connectivity is never just attributed to objects from the outside. Instead, cultural articulations frequently participate in and reflect upon their own relational contexts. In the last link of this renga sequence, Christopher Hill's comment on Zelideth Rivas's reflection on the poetry of Japanese immigrants in Brazil who write in Japanese but take stock of the natural realities of their new country expresses a distrust toward comparison: "Comparative methods also seem unlikely to get much purchase. To whom should these writers be compared?" From the limited perspective often ascribed to comparison, this is a highly relevant critique, and indeed, it throws the problem of the relationship between the critic as comparatist and his objects into high relief. But from a different vantage point, comparison as I understand it is highly relevant in this and other cases. After all, as contact in action, comparison here is not only what we as critics do but is actually prefigured and theorized in the very practice of the Japanese Brazilian poets under scrutiny: their role as mediators is also one of comparison, providing us critics with a way of understanding and scrutinizing a singular instance of interculturality and a specific strategy of how to deal with a situation in which different types of cultural knowledge come into contact. In fact, genuine comparison as a method cannot be untouched by its objects; instead, its very fabric resonates with and is partly patterned according to the phenomena under relation.

As a connector, a bridge between two halves, this midpoint between the two renga sequences that constitute our reflections on the emerging field of work between Asia and Latin America, marks a privileged place for reflecting on the logic of connectivity and the work of intercultural comparison itself. But, by referring to the very last renga link here at the midpoint of its sequence, I am also jumping ahead, or maybe this is merely a valuable reminder that complex structures struggle with the

linear medium of writing and that even a complicated constellation such as a double renga chain cannot contain the multiple voices of the emerging field of approaches between Asia and Latin America, represented here precariously by nine critics with very different conceptual agendas. For instance, this critical renga, due also to the positionalities of its contributors, focuses more on the contributions of Asian cultures to Latin America than on those of Latin American cultures to Asia. And yet, its attention to different intercultural methodologies, we hope, will prove fruitful for present and future work between Asia and Latin America. Rather than abiding by the laws of argumentative cohesion and regard for representativeness, as a group with divergent voices, we have opted for keeping disjunctions and disconnections alive. Consequently, as a reader, you can follow the linear flow of the text or start at any point and follow a randomized reading pattern. And you are also welcome to skip the following thoughts on the specific contributions to an interconnective, impure type of comparison of each of the renga links.

Our renga sequence begins with the unusual suspects of intercultural approaches, at the extreme of work that is not based on preexisting connections or only very weakly so, and indeed critiques the supposed need for such structures as itself tinted by Eurocentric bias. Instead, André Keiji Kunigami proposes Jean-Luc Nancy's notion of exposure as a comparative alternative, exchanging a *cum* for an *ex*, by pointing to the problematic and yet productive workings of analogy, because, rather than stabilizing cultural identities, they help destabilize the sense of self of he who cannot escape analogical thinking. Seth Jacobowitz's piece reshapes an apparently Orientalist structure—Anita Malfatti's paintings of "Japanese" portraits—as a collegial homage, a sign of a shared aesthetic avant-garde sentiment. Couched in terms of Kunigami's use of the notion of exposure, Jacobowitz bridges the divide between artist and content (especially whenever the representation of another culture is at stake) by presenting a case in which such an artistic practice leads to the invention of the self as other and marks an aesthetic affiliation across cultures. Andrew Leong's piece pits anomaly against analogy so as to show how anomaly sustains analogy. His example of a Japanese poem on the U.S.–Mexico border puts into motion the sliding scales of comparison. As a critical, readerly sleight-of-hand, a productive, provocative second-guessing, it restructures relation as a reflection on disconnection, based on a methodology of oblique analogies between different textual and cultural levels. In the final piece of the first renga chain, Christopher Bush frames the haiku as an intercultural phenomenon between Japan, France, and Latin America, traveling along entangled routes and through

different linguistic traditions. As such, an example of the transmission of one aesthetic form through France contests rather than underwrites the notion of the correspondence of the margins always through the (European) center and challenges assumptions about the identity between cultural tradition, language, and place.

The second renga chain (spoiler alert!) starts out with what many would perceive as the conceptual antipodes of the first chain, underscoring connection-based constellations between Asia and Latin America. Ana Hosne's link, for instance, uses the network of the Jesuit missions to bring China, Tibet, and Latin America into a global picture, one institution working across vast swathes of the globe. By focusing on the disciplines of rhetoric and dialectics, Hosne shows the unequal ascription of cultural and scriptural prestige between Asia and Latin America, based on a divergence in political structures and power. From a connection based on the translocal work of one institution, Rosario Hubert's piece brings us into the realm of world literature by taking as its example the circulation of Chinese texts to Argentina between the 1950s and 1980s. Rather than only underlining the translation of ideologically inspired work, part and parcel of China's attempt to garner Maoist purchase worldwide, she puts emphasis on a varied corpus of texts about and of Chinese culture that traveled in translation to Argentina at the same time. Zelideth Rivas in turn theorizes cultural contact between Japan and Brazil in the form of Japanese immigrant poets who strove to bring experiences of Brazilian nature and society into their haiku creations, thus showcasing that diasporic movements result in quite specific strategies of cultural bridging. This renga chain (as well as our collective *Fieldtrip* feature as a whole) concludes with Christopher Hill's reflections on the mapping of aesthetic movements across the globe, with a focus on naturalist writers in Brazil and Japan. Starting by way of disconnection, namely, the (supposedly) missed encounter between Azevedo and Katai, Hill proceeds to questioning world literary assumptions pace Moretti about the misinterpretation or mistranslation of literary forms and trends, such as the naturalist novel, when they travel from the supposed center to the so-called margins. Instead, he urges us to rethink the geographic and cultural blinders involved in conceiving of the distributions of literary fields as well as of the differences between origin, original, and derivation. With this movement, Hill not only echoes some of the concerns raised at the end of the first renga sequence, in Bush's reflections on the haiku as intercultural art form. He also brings the two renga sequences full circle by resonating on a critical metalevel with Kunigami's and Leong's caveats against the uses and abuses of analogical thinking.

Although the individual case studies and concepts proposed in each renga link do not fit into a neat, representative picture of a whole, we would like to invite you to read them as part of a complex, multifaceted nexus that links Asia and Latin America, on one hand, and as a polyper-spectival thought on intercultural methodologies, on the other. In their interplay between specific examples of intercultural practices and phenomena and reflections on the politics and ethics of framing connections, they elegantly showcase the dynamic nexus between concrete examples and conceptual thought, in which specific cases drive theoretical reflections rather than providing mere material for illustration.

**Andrea Bachner** is associate professor of comparative literature at Cornell University. She is the author of *Beyond Sinology: Chinese Writing and the Scripts of Culture* (2014) and *The Mark of Theory: Inscriptive Figures, Post-structuralist Prehistories* (forthcoming) as well as a coeditor (with Carlos Rojas) of *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Chinese Literatures* (2016). She is currently working on a book that scrutinizes the rules of comparison through an analysis of exchanges and affinities between Latin American and Sinophone cultures.

## ■ 2.1 THE TRAVELS OF RHETORIC AND DIALECTICS IN THE JESUIT MISSIONS IN CHINA, TIBET, AND MEXICO (SIXTEENTH TO EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES)

Ana Carolina Hosne

What compels us to bring Asia and Latin America together, each of which is an extremely broad spatial unit, construct, and imaginary? Doesn't the use of these very categories run the risk of overlooking their complexities, the internal game of scales they entail, and the fact that they did not exist as such in different historical periods (for instance, in the early modern world)? How can we approach them from a historical perspective? Maybe it is time to look at alternative spatial units for comparative and intercultural work. In the past two decades, the impact of globalization has inspired new methodologies for revisiting the past, expressed by terms such as *global*, *connected*, and *entangled histories*. As some historians point out, there is nothing new about a "global" perspective, because history on a world scale and concomitant universal narratives emerged in the sixteenth century (Subrahmanyam 2005, 28–29). But these methodologies also attempt to get rid of old paradigms: the concepts of global, connected, and entangled histories all strive to leave behind the predominance of the



West and its claim to a central role in the making of the modern world. In this regard, approaches “between Asia and Latin America” might not necessarily exclude Europe but reorient the analysis of its interaction with these alternative spatial units. In turn, far from mere names of places, the latter need to be questioned as analytic categories, because they can be the historical actors’ own categories, representations or imaginings for which the historians must provide analytic explanations (Hart 2013, 2–5).

To examine those spaces in the early modern world, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, which spatial units of analysis should we apply? While the early modern empires, such as the Iberian empire, make for a more large-scale category, the Jesuit missions that expanded within Iberian imperial endeavors—as the Society of Jesus was summoned by its rulers to evangelize its overseas possessions—allow a more focused comparative approach. The Jesuit missions enable an examination of how religion and knowledge became entangled in a context in which the production and transmission of knowledge became purposes in themselves because of the Jesuits’ emphasis on a humanist education. Among the subjects promoted vigorously by the Jesuits were rhetoric and dialectics, although they played widely differing roles across different mission spaces, such as China, Tibet, and Mexico. As a field of knowledge and core subject in the Jesuit colleges in Europe, rhetoric became not only a sign of social distinction but also the cornerstone of argumentative skills used in the public sphere by both intellectuals and statesmen (Grafton and Jardine 1986, xi–xiii, 4–28). As an art Jesuit missionaries were familiar with, in overseas missionary spaces, rhetoric turns into a lens through which we can explore the different processes of circulation and transmission of knowledge as coloniality drew the line between those under the Spanish Patronato, such as Mexico, and those under the Portuguese Padroado, such as China and Tibet.

A common pattern in the missions to Asia, where missionaries did not have coercive or political power on their side, was their search for similarities with beliefs and knowledge patterns within local literati circles. For instance, in the context of the China mission, Italian Jesuit Giulio Aleni (1582–1649) describes rhetoric to his Chinese literati friends in his *Compendium of Western Studies* (*Xixue fan*, 1622) by emphasizing the similarities between China and Europe as two traditions that have classical works by ancient sages. When he refers to the curricula offered at European universities, such as rhetoric, transliterated into Chinese phonetically as *leduolijia*, as well as philosophy, medicine, law, canon law, and theology (Chan 1997, 478), Aleni uses the overarching category of *wenyizhixue*, or “literary arts,” comprising the five parts that make up



rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Through the latter, Aleni briefly introduces the oral dimension of rhetoric to the Chinese, explaining how speech is delivered, that is, by its pace and by the facial expression and body language of the orator, who moves his audience as he speaks (Aleni 1965, 28–29). In his search for similarities with the Chinese lettered culture, was Aleni disruptively introducing something new in it, that is, the five canons of rhetoric? It has been widely debated among scholars whether there was a Chinese rhetoric, but it is beyond the scope of this work to address this matter. We may infer that Aleni briefly introduced an essential component of rhetoric he did not observe in China, that is, its oral dimension and the persuasive power of emotions, without providing further explanation as it differed from a crucial aspect of the local lettered culture praised by the missionaries: the importance, power, and influence of the written word.

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* played a relevant role in understanding rhetoric and how it relates to dialectics in the Jesuit schools (Battistini 83). Both subjects were extremely relevant in the training of persuasive speakers provided by the Society and its schools throughout Europe—and the missionaries made good use of it in their overseas missions. Dialectics gained a prominent role in the Jesuit mission to Tibet, as we observe in the accounts by the Italian Jesuit Ippolito Desideri (1684–1733). Like Aleni, Desideri also searched for similarities in what called his attention on Tibetan soil: the argumentation techniques that were part of the religious training in some Buddhist monasteries. In his *Historical Notices of Tibet*, addressed to a European audience, Desideri (2010, 189–90) claims that the Tibetans “have their own dialectics, terms, definitions, divisions of the argument . . . a way of propounding theses . . . of denying or conceding hypotheses. . . . They have a way of raising and resolving problems that is the same as ours.” In fact, Desideri came to master these techniques at the Sera monastery near Lhasa, where he often discussed religion with the monks. Back in Rome, Desideri composed a booklet for missionaries willing to establish a mission in Tibet, mentioning the Tibetan Buddhist lamas and monks who are “of great veneration, esteem of goodness and doctrine. It must be a purpose to have them as friends . . . for learning the language, their books, the things of their sect, because they are literati” (Desideri 1928, 26). The writings by Aleni and Desideri target different readerships, Chinese and European, respectively, and take into account different modes of transmitting knowledge within local learned circles and—implicitly or explicitly—comparing them with their own. In China, where sophisticated conversations and dialogues lost out in significance to published texts (Hsia 2003, 100), rhetoric did not prove so useful to

the Jesuit missionaries—hence the brief reference to rhetoric made by Aleni. However, in Tibet, local argumentation techniques, which Desideri came to master, could be more easily assimilated to European dialectics, as the missionary clearly states.

We observe a different interaction by shifting the focus to colonial mission contexts such as Mexico, where rhetoric was not intended to be a conversational topic within literati circles but rather one among many subjects in Jesuit schools in order to educate Spaniards and Creoles. Vicente Lenocchi, an Italian Jesuit, was in charge of rhetoric at Mexico College (Colegio de Mexico, in central Mexico) in the 1570s. And yet, in 1583, the Provincial Plaza wrote of Mexico in a letter that “the fruits of letters are scarce in those lands” (Zubillaga 1959, 134).<sup>16</sup> However, prior to the arrival of the Jesuits, men like the Franciscan Bernardino de Sahagún (1499–1590) had drawn attention to the Aztec pendant to “rhetoric,” designated as *huehuetlahtolli* (Sahagún 1829, 33–34). In the sixth book of his *General History of New Spain* (*Historia de las Cosas del Nuevo Mundo*), Sahagún reproduced orations in Nahuatl recited by his Aztec informants as examples of indigenous rhetoric (Abbott 1987, 254). But the imposition of European rhetoric in Jesuit schools would not take into account these local forms, even as some of the first Spaniards had regarded both traditions as similar, nor would they allocate them the status of techniques to be mastered.

The transmission and circulation of a given field of knowledge from the so-called West provides a means to analyze how the local contexts and what missionaries observed there helped shape differential structures within the early modern empires. Whether they related to local knowledge or dismissed it, the missionaries’ attitudes and views toward it were determined by the nature of these spaces. Circulation, transmission, or imposition of knowledge does not necessarily connect the missions in those vast modern empires, at least not in a direct way. And yet, they help us understand the intricate and dynamic nature of their different scales and interactions across the globe.

**Ana Carolina Hosne** is associate professor at the National University of San Martín (UNSAM), Argentina. She is the author of *The Jesuit Missions to China and Peru, 1570–1610: Expectations and Appraisals of Expansionism* (2013). She is currently working on another book, *Transcending Words and Images: The Different Expressions of Memory in the Overseas Jesuit Missions (16th–18th Centuries)*, as an EURIAS fellow at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Paris.

## ■ 2.2 TRANSLATION, DIPLOMACY, AND WORLD LITERATURE: INTELLECTUAL NETWORKS BETWEEN REVOLUTIONARY CHINA AND ARGENTINA, 1950–1980

Rosario Hubert

Along with Ana Hosne, I emphasize the relevance of networks of transmission and circulation of knowledge in the exploration of how cultural products reinvent themselves in different cultural contexts. For this, I consider translation to be a crucial unit of analysis in the study of contacts between Asia and Latin America. Rather than as a form of transculturation in a colonial power relation—as translation has been discussed in a transatlantic dimension (Mignolo and Schiwy 2003)—I propose to examine it in the light of an imperial context on the edges of the bipolar world of the Cold War. Like Christopher Bush, who notes the illusion of a direct relationship between Asia and Latin America and, in turn, demonstrates crisscrossing networks of circulation, I also point to more complex forms of relation. I argue that international Maoism, like haiku, can be read as “one denomination in the currency that circulated among . . . international, intercultural” Marxist intellectuals. I propose to read Maoism as a global ideological currency in the postwar order that took different symbolic and material shapes in Europe, Africa, and South America and generated new pathways of cultural exchange that went beyond the political. In the case of Latin America, Maoism not only became a particular form of leftist discourse but also generated the material structure and intellectual labor that facilitated the transmission of other Chinese forms of discourse that went beyond the revolutionary ideology and that would otherwise not have traveled in such directions. As I will discuss briefly, the creation of the Beijing Foreign Languages Press and the training of Spanish translators of Chinese gave rise to a significant body of Chinese culture available in Spanish curated by local intellectuals that exceeded the agenda of the revolution.

My scrutiny pays attention to the practice, the industry, and the institutional framework that facilitate the circulation of books between languages and across national borders in cultural spaces as far apart as Argentina and China. In the understanding of world literature as a body of literary works that circulates beyond its culture of origin, either in translation or in its original language, and that, in its most expansive sense, has an effective life whenever and wherever it is actively present within a literary system beyond that of its original culture (Damrosch 2003, 4), I propose to consider international channels of circulation that facilitate the transit of printed culture between regions not necessarily

connected by the literary market or academia. These, I argue, give way to possible approaches that challenge the center–periphery model that has traditionally been used to read cross-cultural contacts between these two regions. This leads back to Hosne’s observation on the need to nuance the analytic significance of places and instead define them in terms of specific forms of transnational interactions (as she does with the Jesuit world). In the next few paragraphs, I discuss the relationship between cultural diplomacy and translation between the People’s Republic of China and Argentinean Marxist intellectuals in the postwar years.

Intrigued by the possibility of visiting Asia after attending a performance of the Beijing Opera in Buenos Aires in 1956, the writer Bernardo Kordon (1915–2002) accepted the invitation of the Communist Party to travel to the People’s Republic of China the following year. This would be the first of eight trips, four travel texts, and dozens of translations of Chinese literature he would complete between 1958 and 1984. Although Kordon never joined the pro-Chinese lines of the Party after its split from the Soviets in early 1960s, he ran the Chinese–Argentinian Friendship Association for almost three decades and arranged tours of professionals and intellectuals from the region to China, and vice versa. More of a Sinophile than a Maoist, Kordon published numerous critical works on Chinese traditional theater and was the editor of many of the Spanish versions of Tang Dynasty anthologies circulating to date.

A first note on the historical contingency of the literary systems is critical to assessing the relatively large volume of Chinese texts Kordon published from 1958 to 1984. The Chinese Communist Party under Mao established a massive external propaganda machine, translating and publishing Chinese works and revolutionary literature and arts into hundreds of languages, aimed particularly at Third World countries, where the majority of the peasant populations would be potential revolutionary allies (Liu 2015). The creation of the Beijing Foreign Languages Press, guided tourism, and long-term residence for writers from the developing world set the grounds for a flow of information, printed culture, and intelligence in the years to come. By the same token, Buenos Aires replaced Madrid and Barcelona as the center of the Ibero-American book market and translation industry after the main publishing houses had fled Europe during the Spanish Civil War and settled in the Americas. Therefore, although vindicated as peripheral nations in the cartography of the Third World of the time, in the light of the study of the book industry and the publishing market, these two spaces can by no means be identified as marginal. Rather, they are crucial nodes of transmission of knowledge and printed culture, both in global terms (the Beijing Foreign Languages Press sent

books to more than fifty countries) and in regional ones (Spanish translations of Chinese texts were distributed from Argentina to other countries in South America and to Spain).

Like for many other Latin American intellectuals, traveling to China in the context of cultural diplomacy supposed an unprecedented opportunity for Kordon to encounter Chinese culture directly and engage with it in his own literary production and cultural field. Unlike in Europe or North America, in Argentina, there was no institutional framework for the study of ancient Chinese culture nor an expert body of journalists or government officials specialized in current affairs (e.g., “China watchers”), let alone military men or missionaries, who had traditionally been the transmitters of knowledge about China in the West. Besides, the thesis by which the formation and circulation of ideas about a foreign culture in a community is strongly marked by the transnational links established by immigrant groups does not apply to the case of the Chinese in Argentina. Because the first Chinese immigrants to arrive in 1910 were few and rapidly married and mixed with the local populations (Bogado Bordazar 2003), there is little evidence that institutions or associations promoted printed culture in Chinese throughout the twentieth century. In other words, in the absence of a local Sinological archive or a Sinophone community, figures like Kordon can be studied as cultural agents who—regardless of the lack of a specialized linguistic or cultural background—take over the roles of the philologist, the interpreter, and the editor in the rendering of a foreign culture for the eyes of the local community.

What exactly did he translate? It is notable that Kordon’s personal selection of Chinese texts is limited to traditional or folkloric works—such as *Chinese Traditional Theater* (*El teatro tradicional chino*, 1959), *Chinese Ghost Stories* (*Cuentos chinos con fantasmas: Dinastías Tang a Tsing*, 1969), and *Tang Dynasty Stories* (*Cuentos de la dinastía Tang*, 1965)—while it does not include a single page of revolutionary literature. How ironic is it that the author of a paean to the Cultural Revolution, *China, or the Endless Revolution* (*China o la revolución para siempre*, 1968), would simultaneously critique the protocols of socialist realism and popular theater and print those same books that the Revolution was burning in a crusade against its past? This is exactly the point: although Kordon did employ the infrastructure of Maoism to bridge the intercultural gap, he consumed, imported, and reproduced Chinese texts in Spanish in accordance to the fertility of the local book industry and, specifically, to his own modes of reading. Studying Kordon as an agent of world literature illuminates the autonomous spaces and positions involved in the transit of texts from disparate cultural contexts and thus overcomes the predominant idea

forwarded by Cold War scholarship that the spread of Chinese literature in Spanish was a mere effect of Maoist propaganda in the Third World. As this approach suggests, it was, rather, a creative product of a literary center located in a periphery of the world.

**Rosario Hubert** is assistant professor of language and culture studies at Trinity College. She is working on a book manuscript titled *Disorientations: Latin American Writings of China* that discusses the epistemological and disciplinary problems of writing across cultural boundaries and proposes a novel entryway into the study of East Asia and Latin America in the framework of world literature. She is a recipient of several research fellowships, including from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Tanaka Ikuekai Foundation.

## ■ 2.3 ERASED HISTORIES, IMAGINED GENEALOGIES

**Zelideth María Rivas**

The field of studies between Asia and Latin America struggles between existing cartographic and disciplinary boundaries, emphasizing interdisciplinarity. More importantly, however, it is not a new field. Since the beginning of the Manila–Acapulco Galleon Trade (1565–1815) that also transported peoples and ideas, translation has always been pivotal in transmitting, renegotiating, and reframing this field of studies, as Rosario Hubert underlines. This critical *renga* mirrors the movement of the Manila Galleons, pointing to a critical comparison that shifts from aesthetic theory (André Keiji Kunigami, Seth Jacobowitz, André Leong, and Christopher Bush) to the framing of history through rhetoric, dialectics, and world literary circulations (Ana Hosne and Hubert). The transpacific movement of peoples challenges notions of nation, identity, and citizenship, all of which become fluid. As Benedict Anderson (1999) reminds us, theories of nation, nationalism, and national identity typically stress the individual's language as an inclusive tool for imagined communities. For example, in the study of Asians in the Americas, Anderson's concept of print capitalism can be extended to Japanese- and Chinese-language presses that establish community, maintain ties to the homeland, and transmit knowledge between Asia and the Americas. The concept of imagined communities allows scholars to consider diasporic communities, even when they are beyond the purview of the fields of Asian studies or Latin American studies, and are thus oftentimes erased from national histories.

Whether searching for roots in an Asian past or quickly adapting to the host country, immigrants create imagined genealogies. These genealogies work against their erasure from Asian and Latin American narratives, negotiating an identity that citizenship and national identity often deny. For instance, works of literature in Latin America and the Spanish Caribbean in languages other than Spanish or Portuguese are often denied inclusion in national literary histories, and vice versa in East Asia. This makes it necessary for such writers to claim a literary space and allows scholars to consider how such communities, after being erased from national histories, imagine their literary genealogies.

Genealogy charts from the 2005 Japan Festival in São Paulo depict how Brazilian haiku by members of the Japanese diaspora was passed down from teacher to teacher, starting with Matsuo Basho in 1644 through Katō Shūson (加藤楸邨) in Japan and concluding with Mashima Tōkasui (間島稻花水), the founder of the Japanese Brazilian literary magazine *Brazilian Haiku and Literature* (*Burajiru haibungaku*). The Japanese Brazilian genealogical chart reinserts Japanese Brazilians into a Japanese literary context by including the most important Japanese Brazilian haiku teachers and their students on the bottom of the chart, broken away from the established Japanese poetic lineages. Although not all of the Japanese Brazilian literary groups have a confirmed genealogy with poets from Japan, these poetic lineages cannot be denied their roots in Japanese Brazilian literature, an origin that is profoundly hybrid.

In Brazil, this hybrid genealogy of poetry coincided with the arrival of the first ship of Japanese immigrants, the *Kasato-maru*, on June 18, 1908. Moments before arriving into the port of Santos, São Paulo, Uetsuka Shūhei (上塚周平, 1876–1935), whose poetic name was Hyōkotsu (瓢骨), composed the following haiku (Kayano 2006, 155):

涸れ滝の仰ぎて着きぬ移民船

kare taki no  
aogite tsukinu  
imin sen

Looking up  
at the dried waterfalls  
the immigrant ship arrives

This seventeen-syllable haiku poem used a new poetic image that specifically symbolized the experiences of the Japanese diaspora—“the dried waterfalls.” Here the poet suggests that the incongruous image of “dried



waterfalls” will parallel the immigrants’ own experiences and their dreams of returning to Japan someday drying up like these waterfalls. The presence of these seasonal words, or *kigo*, created new genealogies of Japanese prosody in Latin America that appeared in two collections, *A Collection of Brazilian Seasons* (Burajiru kiyose, 1981) and *A Catalog of Brazilian Seasonal Words* (Burajiru saijiki, 2006). Both of these collections emphasize the *dai shizen no henshen*, or vast changes in the forces of nature, found in Brazil’s ecology that can shift the emotional response in poetry (Kajimoto 1981, 459). Introducing *jikō* (season), *tenbun* (nature), *chiri* (geography), *shokubutsu* (flora), *dōbutsu* (fauna), and *hitogoto* (human affairs) *kigo*, both sources emphasize new genealogies that emerge in the southern hemisphere or, more specifically, in Brazil’s seasonal cycle. The *kigo* are, oftentimes, romanized Japanese words that have been transliterated from the Portuguese. The hybrid Japanese–Portuguese in these texts allows for an expansion upon existing prosodic genealogies. Moreover, the inclusion of both languages in these collections and the accompanying Japanese-language haiku examples offer a glimpse into the experiences of first-, 1.5-, and second-generation immigrants who composed in Japanese. Because of the difference in languages, these older generations are often absent from narratives of Asian Latin American cultural productions, which focus on Spanish and Portuguese language productions. Moreover, Japanese-language haiku produced outside of Japan are oftentimes not included in Japanese cultural productions because others see them as an example of foreign, modified haiku (ハイク) as opposed to Japanese haiku (俳句). The exclusion of Japanese Brazilian haiku from literary histories therefore illustrates how linguistic boundaries limit the expansion of a field of studies between Asia and Latin America.

The field of Asian–Latin American studies allows us to explore a Japanese Brazilian literary narrative by analyzing its insertion into both Japanese and Brazilian literary histories. This crossroad is illustrated when Japanese Brazilian poetry is oftentimes showcased on Japan’s NHK (Japan Broadcasting Corporation) morning shows, while modernist Brazilian poetry has been greatly influenced by Japanese poetry, for instance, in the case of Paulo Leminski. This relationship challenges established literary genealogies that hold the legacies of erasure as truth while also demonstrating the deep connections between literary modes of representation. I turn to Japanese Brazilian poetry as an example of such a pattern of literary inclusion.

In my early fieldwork in Brazil in 2001, a group of haiku poets invited me to Atibaia, a municipality in São Paulo, to conduct participant observation research. The private garden in Atibaia was a flora and rock garden

that took its inspiration from Japanese gardens, emphasizing the beauty and benefits of nature while illustrating Japanese–Brazilian friendship, the legend of Urashima Tarō and the turtle, and a guardian samurai. I observed that Atibaia was especially important for the poets because there they could participate in a Japanese *ginkō*, or haiku walk, an important part of creativity in which poets immerse themselves in nature so as to compose poetry with *kigo*, or seasonal words. While walking along the garden, the Japanese Brazilian poets composed haiku in Japanese with Japanese *kigo* to participate in an NHK-sponsored haiku competition alongside Japanese poets. Here we have an example of a disrupted genealogy of poets that must learn how to access Japanese nature from abroad. They imagine themselves to be back in Japan, a place that typically erases these first-, 1.5-, and second-generation poets from literary histories. By using Japanese *kigo*, they insert themselves into a Japanese literary narrative, refusing to set themselves apart from the other NHK poets by using Brazilian *kigo* based on Brazil's seasonal calendar, flora, and fauna. Though they include themselves in a literary genealogy, this insistence on Japanese as the language of poetry oftentimes erases the Japanese Brazilian contribution from Brazilian literary histories and genealogies. But when they use Brazilian *kigo*, they erase themselves from Japanese literary histories and genealogies.

In fact, literary histories about the haiku, or *haikai*, as it is referred to in Brazilian literary history, rarely discuss the contribution of Japanese Brazilians. Instead, they “discovered” the form transnationally, as Bush reminds us in his essay, through Orientalist narratives in English and French, such as those by Couchoud, Blyth, and Allan Watts (Franchetti 1995, ii). However, the modernist writers composed haiku-inspired poetry without much reference to Japanese tradition, excluding some of the important contributions found in Japanese haiku, such as *kigo*. Bush's essay exemplifies this by arguing how Oswald de Andrade and his French contemporaries “associated [haiku] with the aesthetic values of modernism, even the avant-garde.” Later, the creation of Japanese Brazilian Portuguese-language *haikai* groups, such as that of Grêmio Haikai Ipê, reinstated some of the principal characteristics of haiku. Most importantly, Brazilian *kigo*, which in turn influenced Japanese-language haiku, shifted haiku from that which is imagined to that which is historical.

Examining the literary while engaging in historical archival work and anthropological participant observation is a methodology familiar to those in area studies. Many scholars in the field of Asian–Latin American studies produce knowledge in similar ways. The genealogies of Japanese Brazilian poetry, however, are not simply contingent on an inclusion

in Japanese or Brazilian literary histories. They also work against the “systems that keep people of Asian descent on the peripheries and in the shadows of national inclusion” (Lee-DiStefano 2016, 3). This suggests that new methodologies, such as those rooted in bilingual research and exemplified in this critical renga, need to evolve to better capture the future of Asian–Latin American studies.

**Zelideth María Rivas** is associate professor of Japanese at Marshall University. Her research focuses on the conception of race through literature written by Asian immigrants in the Americas as well as the representation of race in Japan in post–World War II literature and film. She is a coeditor of *Asians in the Americas* (2016) and is currently completing a book manuscript on Japanese Brazilian cultural productions.

## ■ 2.4 HAVEN’T WE MET? ON THE SCALES OF CONNECTION

Christopher L. Hill

In 1891 Tayama Katai encountered an English translation of Emile Zola’s novel *The Conquest of Plassans* (*La Conquête de Plassans*, 1874) in a used bookstore in Tokyo. Katai had learned about Zola a few years earlier—ironically, because a friend refused to lend Zola’s “atrocious” (*hidoi*) novels—and borrowed from his mother to buy the book (Tayama 1994, 476–78).<sup>17</sup> The purchase may have been the beginning of naturalist fiction in Japan. By the end of the 1890s, Katai and a few peers—inspired too by English translations of Maupassant—were developing alternatives to the sentimental realism then in vogue. The *shizen shugi*—or naturalism—practiced by Katai dominated fiction for twenty years, morphing along the way into a psychological realism.

In 1897, just as Katai and peers began to craft the new style, Aluísio Azevedo, a Brazilian diplomat and ex-novelist, arrived in Yokohama to take the post of vice consul. Azevedo had been a pioneer of naturalist fiction in Brazil through novels such as *The Mulatto* (*O Mulato*, 1881) and *The Slum* (*O Cortiço*, 1890). One wonders: How great would it be if Azevedo had met Katai and played an unnoticed role in the rise of naturalism in Japan? The peripheries meeting, pace Moretti. An instance of the contiguity that, as Keiji Kunigami observes, one is expected to produce to justify comparisons that do not run through Europe. Alas, the manuscript of *Japan* (*O Japão*), the ambitious book of reportage Azevedo began before he was reposted to Argentina in 1899, says nothing of it. The only mention of literature is the “renaissance” in the literary arts in the Edo

period (Azevedo 2010, 80–81).<sup>18</sup> The careers of Azevedo and Katai, and the histories of naturalist fiction in Brazil and Japan, were unentangled—or they were not entangled where they actually crossed.<sup>19</sup> Azevedo probably knew nothing of Katai, and vice versa, yet the fact that each contributed to what critics called “Zolaism” tells us that their careers were connected, in fact, through the geographically extensive history of naturalist fiction. Perhaps the *absence* of a meeting, this instance of noncontiguity, can tell us something about how to approach a history unfolding on such a large scale.

Zelideth Rivas evocatively describes another literary encounter, of *haiku* with the land and climate of Brazil upon the arrival of the first ship of Japanese migrants to São Paulo in 1908. “Asian–Latin American” writers were practicing—but, more significantly, *developing*—genres such as *haiku* that may have originated in Asia but were in current practice in communities of Asian migrants. Their poetry was neither Latin American nor Asian according to the conventional boundaries of fields, revealing fissures in existing research methodologies. Comparative methods also seem unlikely to get much purchase. To whom should these writers be compared? As Asian writers to Latin American ones? As Latin Americans to Asians? And as much as these writers’ arrival in Latin America would seem an epitome of entanglement—as a meeting of Azevedo and Katai would also have been—their fit-nowhere quality shows instead how much the idea of entangled history assumes the existence of cultural unities that are distinct before the snarl.

Why do these writers occupy such a seemingly anomalous position? Conditions both local and global put them where they were: locally, the shortage of agricultural labor in Brazil and the surplus of it in Japan; globally, the production, trade, and consumption of coffee, sugar, and other commodities. Brazil and Japan were connected directly (by migration) and indirectly (by the capitalist market). As I would put it—this is a *renga* after all—the positionality and genealogy of Rivas’s poets reflect a “history of connection” manifest on multiple scales.<sup>20</sup>

This history is not just the backdrop but provides the substance for the narrative sociology of Azevedo and other Brazilian naturalists, such as Adolfo Caminha. *The Mulatto* is a study of the social milieu of a provincial capital (São Luís do Maranhão) as revealed through the arrival of a character whose late father settled in the town after escaping an anti-Portuguese and slave rebellion. His mother was a slave who alerted her master to the peril. Raimundo, who has returned from studies in Portugal and wants to sell his property before settling in Rio de Janeiro, stimulates a slavocratic racism more powerful even than the town’s Lusophilia. He is murdered to stop a marriage to the privileged young woman who carries

his child. If *The Mulatto* is a rather static study of social relations, *The Slum* examines their creation in a poor quarter of Rio. Two characters originally from Portugal follow diverging paths, João climbing into the city's white capitalist elite, Jerônimo melting into a hybrid popular milieu modeled both by the neighborhood and by the novel's argotic narrative voice. Both novels announce Azevedo's affiliation with Zola, notably through references to *L'Assommoir* (1877), and yet are more than localizations of Zola's method. Rather than reflecting a literary "compromise," in Franco Moretti's (2000) phrase, or an attempt to catch up with the "literary mean time" of Paris, as Pascale Casanova would have it, Azevedo's naturalism seems both a revision of and a departure from Zola's. In Quentin Skinner's term, it was a "redescription" of earlier naturalist practice that by definition changed it.<sup>21</sup>

Writers such as Katai produced their own revision of naturalist themes and form through their interrogation of the forces shaping Japanese society. The most obvious engagement with the geoconditions linking writers in Japan and Brazil can be found in Shimazaki Tōson's *The Broken Commandment* (*Hakai*, 1906), at whose end members of Japan's *burakumin* minority emigrate to Texas to escape discrimination, and Katai's "One Soldier" ("Ippeisotsu," 1908), set during the clash of European and Japanese colonialism in the Russo-Japanese War.<sup>22</sup> Like Azevedo and other naturalists in Brazil, these writers created characters that embodied social contradictions, but with a stress on the anguished subjectivities society was creating. Young intellectuals in Tōson's *Spring* (*Haru*, 1907) struggle against the ideologies of striving and success that appeared during the new Japanese state's "civilizing" project of the 1870s and 1880s. Katai, in a series of stories such as "The Quilt" and "The Girl Watcher" ("Futon" and "Shōjo byō," both 1907), described transformations in male subjectivity that followed the superficial liberation of women. (The protagonists slip into a state of envious, lecherous passivity.) Defined by fatalistic description of social transformation, on one hand, and of the mental life shaped by it, on the other, this variety of naturalism too departed from the forms traveling under the name of Zolaism, but in a way markedly different from Azevedo and his peers.

A question arises: would Azevedo and Katai have recognized each other's naturalism? If the answer is no, one explanation—the Casanova explanation—would be that Azevedo and Katai mis-imitated French naturalism differently in their attempts to catch up to Europe. Another, however, would be that the history of the naturalist novel consisted of multiple, dissimilar revisions of a form to which French writers contributed less and less. Iterations of naturalism in Brazil and Japan were

connected through their joint engagement with naturalist methods. Yet they were entangled—if one keeps the phrase—in something big enough that they did not directly cross.

The mediated quality of the connections among naturalist writers in Brazil and Japan (and Finland, Greece, the United States, etc.) is evidence they formed a kind of literary field that we do not yet have the method and vocabulary to describe well. The field was not national or regional in a way intelligible to area studies, but neither was it global. There were patterns to the naturalist novel's circulation, but looking only for the contiguities they created would miss the way writers across an ocean, and on opposite sides of Europe, imagined themselves contributing to the same enterprise, however different were their views of it. Understanding a history like this, then, requires working on multiple scales; a willingness to look beyond received expectations of comparability; and perhaps the conviction, shown by all the contributors to this *renga*, that theory comes from practice, never the other way around.

**Christopher L. Hill** teaches Japanese literature and history at the University of Michigan. He began working out new methods of comparison in *National History and the World of Nations* (2009) and is continuing the exploration in *The Travels of Naturalism*, a transnational history of the naturalist novel that provided the research for his contribution to the *Verge renga*.

#### ■ NOTES TO FIELD TRIP

1. I use here the familiar terminology of “line,” “syllable,” and so on, but more precise terms would be used by specialists. See the “*renga*” entry in Greene (2012) for a brief but helpful primer.

2. The citation here refers to the essay as reprinted in Moretti (2013).

3. All translations in section 1.1 by André Keiji Kunigami.

4. This passage appears in the latest reedition of his travel writings published in 2015.

5. See Lamarre's (2005, 112) discussion of Tanizaki's *A Lump of Flesh* (*Jinmenso*, 1918). Other examples of this process in Tanizaki's writing can be found in *Naomi* (*Chijin no Ai*, 1924) and *Mr. Aozuka's Tale* (*Aozukashi no Hanashi*, 1926).

6. Murayama includes smell as a feature of film in a note to his screenplay *Actress* (*Joyū*) in the film journal *The Age of Film* (*Eiga Jidai*) in 1926, transcribed in Iwamoto (2012, 225–58).

7. In 1915, Malfatti drew a second version of the man's face in profile in charcoal and pastel on paper with the same title.



8. Although the New York-based Kuniyoshi was not sent to an internment camp during World War II, he was denied American citizenship and classified as an “enemy alien.”

9. Translation by Seth Jacobowitz.

10. For additional treatments of *uchikoshi* as “clash,” see Carter (1987, 38–39) and Horton (2002, 210).

11. For a recent English-language account of Prado’s important role as a patron of Brazilian *modernismo*, see Gouveia (2013).

12. For a recent collection of French-language war haiku, see Chipot (2013).

13. I do not mean to conflate the Spanish and Portuguese senses of *modernismo* (the latter being closer to what in Spanish would be called the *vanguardismo*) but rather to bring out the common use of import–export metaphors to describe the dynamics of their cultural relationships to Europe and North America. For a concise overview of this critical model, see Franco (1975).

14. The internal citation is from González de Mendoza (1924, 113).

15. Tablada is discussed in many of the sources cited in section 1.4, but the most recent and extensive study of his relationship to Japan is Ota.

16. Provinces were administrative units within the Society of Jesus, and those appointed provincials were the superiors within those units.

17. Henshall dates the purchase at 1891 (Tayama 1987, 66). Japanese names throughout are given in the customary order (family name first), but section 2.4 will refer to Tayama and the novelist Shimazaki by their pen names (Katai and Tōson, respectively).

18. Christopher Hill thanks Melissa Gelinis for help with Azevedo’s book.

19. On the concept of entangled history, see Werner and Zimmerman (2006).

20. On the importance of working on multiple scales, see Revel (2010).

21. For Skinner’s (1996) explanation of redescription, see chapter 4 of *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*.

22. So-called *burakumin* were historically associated with occupations considered unclean, such as leather tanning. Although the official designation was abolished in 1871, discrimination continues.

## ■ WORKS CITED

Abbott, Don. 1987. “The Ancient Word: Rhetoric in Aztec Culture.” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 5, no. 3: 251–64.

Aleni, Giulio. 1965. *Xixue fan* [Compendium of Western learning]. In Li



- Zhizao, *Tianxue chuhan* [First collection of heavenly studies], 28–29. Taipei: Xuesheng shuju.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1999. *Imagined Communities*. 9th ed. London: Verso.
- . 2016. “Frameworks of Comparison.” *London Review of Books* 38, no. 2: 15–18. <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v38/no2/benedict-anderson/frameworks-of-comparison>.
- Andrade, Mário de. 1976. *O Turista Aprendiz: Estabelecimento de Texto, Introdução e Notas de Telê Porto Ancona Lopez*. São Paulo: Duas cidades, Secretaria de Cultura, Cidade e Tecnologia.
- . 2015. *O Turista Aprendiz*. Brasília: Iphan.
- Andrade, Oswald de. 2000. *Bois Brésil*. Paris: Editions de la Différence.
- André, Marius. 1924. “Les haï-kaïs mexicains et les chants populaires espagnols.” *Revue de l’Amérique latine* 8, no. 33: 229–34.
- Azevedo, Aluísio. 2010. *O Japão*. Rio de Janeiro: Cadernos da Biblioteca Nacional.
- Battistini, Andrea. 1981. “I Manuali di retorica dei Gesuiti.” In *La “Ratio Studiorum”: Modelli culturali e pratiche educative dei Gesuiti in Italia tra Cinque e Seicento*, edited by Gian Paolo Brizzi, 74–120. Bulzoni: Roma.
- Benjamin, Walter. 2005. “On the Mimetic Faculty.” In *Selected Writings*, vol. 2, part 2, 1931–1934, edited by Michale W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, 720–22. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bogado Bordazar, Laura Lucía. 2003. “*Migraciones internacionales: Influencia de la migración china en Argentina y Uruguay*.” PhD diss., Instituto de Relaciones Internacionales, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentina.
- Carter, Steven D. 1987. *The Road to Komatsubara: A Classical Reading of the Renga Hyakuin*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Casanova, Pascale. 2004. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M. B. DeBevoise. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Chan, Albert. 1997. “The Scientific Writings of Aleni.” In *Scholar from the West: Giulio Aleni S.J. (1582–1649) and the Dialogue between Christianity and China*, edited by Tiziana Lipiello and Roman Malek, 455–78. Sankt Augustine: Fondazione Civiltà Bresciana, Monumenta Serica Institute.
- Chipot, Dominique, ed. 2013. *En pleine figure: Haïkus de la guerre de 14–18*. Paris: Bruno Doucey.
- Chow, Rey. 2013. *Entanglements, or Transmedial Thinking about Capture*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Couchoud, Paul-Louis. 1923. *Sages et poètes d’Asie*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.
- Damrosch, David. 2003. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Desideri, Ippolito, S.J. 1928. *Di uno scritto poco noto del p. Ippolito Desideri*

- da Pistoia*. Edited by Luigi Foscolo Benedetto. Firenze: Tip M. Ricci.
- . 2010. *Mission to Tibet: The Extraordinary Eighteenth-Century Account of Father Ippolito Desideri, S.J.* Translated by Michael J. Sweet, edited by Leonard Zwilling. Boston: Wisdom.
- Dussert, Eric, ed. 2011. *Au fil de l'eau, suivi de Haikais: les premiers haiku français (1905–1922)*. Paris: Mille et une nuits.
- Franchetti, Paulo. 1995. Preface to *Haikai: A Poesia do Kigô*, edited by H. Masuda Goga, Teruko Oda, and Eunice Arruda, i–xiii. São Paulo: Aliança Cultural Brasil-Japão.
- Franco, Jean. 1975. “Dependency Theory and Literary History: The Case of Latin America.” *Minnesota Review* 5 (Fall, New Series): 65–80.
- Gomes Cardoso, Renata. 2014. “Anita Malfatti em Paris, 1923–1928.” 19&20 9, no. 1. [http://www.dezenovevinte.net/artistas/artistas\\_amalfatti.htm](http://www.dezenovevinte.net/artistas/artistas_amalfatti.htm).
- González de Mendoza, José María. 1924. “Les ‘haijins’ mexicains.” *Revue de l’Amérique Latine*, August.
- Gouveia, Saulo. 2013. *The Triumph of Brazilian Modernism: The Metanarrative of Emancipation and Counter-Narratives*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Grafton, Anthony, and Lisa Jardine. 1986. *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Greene, Roland, ed. 2012. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. 4th ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Harootunian, Harry. 2003. “Ghostly Comparisons.” In *Impacts of Modernities*, edited by Thomas Lamarre and Kang Nae-hui, 39–52. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Hart, Roger. 2013. *Imagined Civilizations: China, the West, and Their First Encounter*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hokenson, Jan. 2007. “Haiku as Western Genre: Fellow-Traveler of Modernism.” In *Modernism*, edited by Astradur Eysteinnsson and Vivian Liska, 693–714. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Horton, H. Mack. 2002. *Song in an Age of Discord: “The Journal of Sôchô” and Poetic Life in Late Medieval Japan*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Hsia, Po-Chia Ronnie. 2003. “Translating Christianity: Counter-Reformation Europe and the Catholic Mission in China, 1580–1780.” In *Conversion: Old Worlds and New*, edited by Kenneth Mills and Anthony Grafton, 87–108. Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester Press.
- Hu-DeHart, Evelyn. 2015. “The Future of Diaspora in Diaspora Studies: Has the Word Run Its Course?” *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* 1, no. 1: 38.

- Iwamoto Kenji. 2012. "Puroretaria eiga undō: riron to jissen" [Proletarian film movement: Theory and practice]. In *Murayama Tomoyoshi: Engekiteki sentan* [Murayama Tomoyoshi: Theatrical edge], edited by Iwamoto Kenji, 225–58. Tokyo: Shinwasha.
- Johnson, Jeffrey. 2011. *Haiku Poetics in Twentieth-Century Avant-Garde Poetry*. Plymouth, U.K.: Lexington.
- Jrade, Cathy L. 1998. *Modernismo, Modernity, and the Development of Spanish American Literature*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Kajimoto Hokumin, ed. 1981. *Burajiru kiyose* [A collection of Brazilian seasons]. São Paulo: Nipaku Mainichi Shinbunsha.
- Kayano Keizan. 2006. "Haikai shōshi" [A short history of haikai]. In *Burajiru nikkei koronia bungei* [Literature of Brazil's Nikkei colonia], vol. 1, edited by Kiyotani Masuji and Kayano Keizan, 155–227. São Paulo: Centro de Estudos Nipo-Brasileiros.
- Kordon, Bernardo. 1959. *El teatro tradicional chino*. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veinte.
- . 1965. *Cuentos de la dinastía Tang*. Buenos Aires: Capricornio.
- . 1968. *China o la revolución para siempre*. Buenos Aires: Jorge Álvarez.
- . 1969. *Cuentos chinos con fantasmas: Dinastías Tang a Tsing*. Buenos Aires: Juárez.
- Lamarre, Thomas. 2005. *Shadows on the Screen*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lee-DiStefano, Debbie. 2016. Introduction to *Asians in the Americas*, edited by Zelideth María Rivas and Debbie Lee-DiStefano, 1–7. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Lerer, Seth. 2012. *Error and the Academic Self*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Liu Kang. 2015. "Maoism: Revolutionary Globalism for the Third World Revisited." *Comparative Literature Studies* 52, no. 1: 12–28.
- Lobato, Monteiro. 1917. "A Propósito da Exposição Malfatti." *O Estado de São Paulo*, December 20.
- Lowe, Lisa. 2015. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Melas, Natalie. 2007. *All the Difference in the World: Postcoloniality and the Ends of Comparison*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- . 2013. "Merely Comparative." *PMLA* 128, no. 3: 652–59.
- Mignolo, Walter, and F. Schiwy. 2003. "Double Translation: Transculturation and the Colonial Difference." In *Translation and Ethnography: The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding*, edited by T. Maranhao and B. Streck, 3–30. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Moretti, Franco. 2000. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1: 54–68.
- . 2013. *Distant Reading*. New York: Verso.
- Morimoto, Tazuko. (1939) 1997. "Mekishiko asobigusa" [Mexican willows]. *Shūkaku* [Harvest], June. Reprinted in vol. 1 of *Nikkei Amerika bungaku zasshi shūsei*. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.
- Murayama Tomoyoshi. 1928. *Puroretaria Eiga Nyūmon* [Introduction to proletarian film]. Tokyo: Zen'ei Shobō.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. 1991. *The Inoperative Community*. Translated by Peter Connor, Lisa Garbus, Micheal Holland, and Simona Sawhney. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ota Seiko. 2014. *José Juan Tablada: su haiku y su japonisme*. México DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Paz, Octavio, Jacques Roubaud, Edoardo Sanguineti, and Charles Tomlinson. 1972. *Renga: A Chain Poem*. New York: G. Braziller.
- Radhakrishnan, R. 2013. "Why Compare?" In *Comparison: Theories, Approaches, Uses*, edited by Rita Felski and Susan Stanford Friedman, 15–33. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ramirez-Christensen, Esperanza. 2008. *Emptiness and Temporality: Buddhism and Medieval Japanese Poetics*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Revel, Jacques. 2010. "Multiple Narratives: Scale and Discontinuity in History." In *Unsettling History: Archiving and Narrating in Historiography*, edited by Sebastian Jobs and Alf Lüdtke, 49–61. New York: Campus Verlag.
- Sahagún, Bernardino de. 1829. *Historia General de las Cosas de Nueva España, que en doce libros y dos volúmenes escribió, el R.P. Fr. Bernardino de Sahagun*. Mexico: Imprenta del Ciudadano Alejandro Valdés. <https://archive.org/details/historiagenerald03saha>.
- Satō Gyūdōshi, ed. 2006. *Burajiru saijiki* [A catalog of Brazilian seasonal words]. São Paulo.
- Shih, Shu-mei. 2011. "The Concept of the Sinophone." *PMLA* 126, no. 3: 709–18.
- . 2013. "Comparison as Relation." In *Comparison: Theories, Approaches, Uses*, edited by Rita Felski and Susan Stanford Friedman, 79–98. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Siskind, Mariano. 2014. *Cosmopolitan Desires: Global Modernity and the World in Latin America*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1996. *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. 2005. "On World Historians in the Sixteenth Century." *Representations* 91, no. 1: 26–57.

- Tayama Katai. 1987. *Literary Life in Tokyo, 1885–1915*. Translated by Kenneth G. Henshall. New York: Brill.
- . 1994. *Tōkyō no sanjūnen* [Thirty years of Tokyo]. In *Teihon Katai zenshū* [Standard edition of the works of Katai], vol. 15. Tokyo: Rinsen Shoten.
- Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmerman. “Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity.” *History and Theory* 45, no. 1 (2006): 30–50.
- Zubillaga, Félix, ed. 1959. *Monumenta Mexicana*, vol. 2, 1581–1585. Rome: Monumenta historica Societatis Iesu.