

The Joyce Agenda: Itō Sei and the Stream of Consciousness

Michael Chan

Professor Lewis

Moderns Seminar

Yale University

27 May 2008

The Joyce Agenda: Itō Sei and the Stream of Consciousness

Although he was one of the major literary and critical voices of Japanese literature throughout the Shōwa period, Itō Sei (1905-1969) is surprisingly marginalized today. Recent Japanese-language studies of Itō are few, and English-language scholarship counts only one major study devoted to him. For one of the most prolific translators of English literature into Japanese, as well as a prominent literary critic of the 1950s, Itō has certainly lost much of the attention given to him while he was alive. Itō is perhaps most remembered for his translation of D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in 1950, as well as the subsequent trial and media frenzy that ensued surrounding its censorship for indecency. This trial was a pivotal moment not just for Itō, but also for Japanese intellectual thought. Despite Itō's defeat, prominent cultural critics such as Yoshida Seiichi and Yoshida Ken'ichi rallied around Itō in the name of defending free speech in post-World War II Japan. Such thinkers were instrumental in propelling Itō into the literary spotlight following the trial. However, focus on this incident and Itō's subsequent heyday during the 1950s overlooks the major contributions that Itō made to Japanese literature much earlier, when he took part in the first Japanese language translation of James Joyce's *Ulysses* in the 1930s. *Ulysses* had its own share of battles with censorship; nevertheless, as opposed to the *Lady Chatterley's Lover* incident, where intellectual reception was overshadowed by media spectacle and political grandstanding, Itō's translation of *Ulysses* was much more significant on a literary level. It brought Japanese readers to the text, which had previously been available only in imported and bootlegged English-language versions. Furthermore, it also served as a textual catalyst for the creation of scores of new writers who carried the label "modernist" with them at one time or another.

Other studies have been concerned with locating Itō's interest in Joyce within the scope of a continued interest in Western literature: other authors such as D.H. Lawrence and Graham Greene are also considered to be major influences on Itō. In considering his work with *Ulysses*, much scholarship is

concerned with nitpicking Itō's translation of *Ulysses* and the subsequent criticism it received from leading cultural critics of the time upon its publication. However, it is perhaps more interesting to view Itō's translation of *Ulysses* as the culmination of stylistic interests that Itō had in Joyce's writings. Through Joyce, Itō discovered the stream of consciousness and viewed it as an important element in two different literary narratives. He felt that the stream of consciousness as Joyce used it was the answer to the call for an exploration of the interior and the unconscious that was proposed by Freud and gradually explored by Flaubert, Henry James and Dostoyevsky. Itō also felt the stream of consciousness served as a new frontier for Japanese literature, which Itō believed to be at an impasse because of the limits placed on it by Japanese naturalism. In his work with Joyce, Itō explored the stream of consciousness as an intersection point of both Western and Japanese literary narratives. While Itō believed that *Ulysses*'s use of the stream of consciousness was a radical change in literary technique and style, he also hoped that his own work explicating this technique in Joyce could serve as a similar catalyst for Japanese literature, creating a new literary movement under the banner of what he called *shinshinrishugi bungaku* (Neo-Psychological Literature). In this way, Joyce and his writings came to have both a significant impact on Itō Sei and, through him, subsequent ramifications for Japanese literature.

### *The Stream of Consciousness and Itō Sei's Understanding of Joyce*

Although James Joyce and his works had been cursorily introduced in Japan as early as 1918 through the work of scholar and poet Noguchi Yonejirō, it wasn't until 1929 that Joyce was given serious literary and academic attention. This attention came in the form of Doi Kōchi's article "Joisu no Yurishīzu" (Joyce's *Ulysses*), published in the literary journal *Kaizō* in February 1929. Doi, a Taishō liberal who was a scholar of English and comparative literature at Gakushūin, was particularly interested in exploring the stream of consciousness as it manifested in the interior monologues of characters in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses*. In his article, Doi exalts the meticulous planning behind Joyce's works and the subtlety

with which Joyce masks that planning in his method of literary expression, the stream of consciousness (*ishiki no nagare*), which Doi argues to be apparent in his texts. To Doi, Joyce “implied that if a creator concentrated on his own spirit and was able to exquisitely display the form of the flowing movement of the consciousness, the form of the novel, as well as new forms of style, would be infinite.”<sup>1</sup> Doi’s article and its consideration of Joyce’s works as expressions of the new literary frontier of the stream of consciousness acted as the impetus for Itō Sei’s own interest in Joyce. According to Keiko Kockum, upon reading Doi’s article, Itō subsequently bought a copy of the 1922 publication of *Ulysses* and attempted to read it. He found *Ulysses* difficult to read and instead read Herbert Gorman’s 1924 *James Joyce, His First Forty Years* and other associated essays before attempting to tackle Joyce again.<sup>2</sup>

In June 1930, Yodono Ryūzō, who had recently finished translating Proust’s *Swann’s Way*, suggested that Itō publish a translation of *Ulysses* in the magazine *Shi, genjitsu* (Poems, Reality). Along with Itō, Yodono commissioned two other translators: Nagamatsu Sadamu and Tsujino Hisanori. Translation of *Ulysses* began in July 1930, and was eventually published in book form in two parts: the first in 1931 and the second in 1934, although the translation was completed in 1933. The lengthy delay between parts, according to Kockum, was due to the translators waiting to receive formal publication permission from Joyce himself. According to Kockum, Joyce was in direct contact with Itō, and Joyce’s own letters describe his attempt to have Itō’s article on Joyce translated and published in English.<sup>3</sup> As Joyce writes in a letter to Sylvia Beach in 1931:

Those Japs have been translating essays galore, it seems, without asking leave or paying, out of *Exag* and everywhere. So I had Hiteshi Ito's [Itō Sei] article on me translated into English today and it will probably appear in English in some review here. Ito will be paid, less

---

<sup>1</sup> Doi 1929, p. 47. This concern itself was perhaps an evolution of Doi’s comparative approach to Japanese literature, in particular his 1920 essay “Nihon bungaku no tenkai” (The Evolution of Japanese Literature). In this essay, Doi theorized that Japanese literature was a cyclical evolution of genres, all concerned with the notion of approaching a “true expression” of self.

<sup>2</sup> Kockum 1994, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup> Kockum 1994, pp. 92-93.

Pinker's fee and the cost of translation, but I want the assent of the two Japs in writing to this as a preliminary to negotiations over *Ulysses*.<sup>4</sup>

In particular, Joyce was annoyed with the publishing situation in Japan, where bootleg copies of the English publication of *Ulysses* had appeared to meet with intense demand. Nevertheless, following negotiations with Joyce, the second half of *Ulysses*, *Ulysses II*, was published in 1934 and subsequently banned within 5 days of publication, although as Kockum writes, the translation sold so quickly that it was doubtful that the banning of the book served as anything more than a formality.<sup>5</sup> It was allowed to be republished later, excising the entire Molly Bloom monologue.

Yodono's commission to Itō to begin working on a translation of *Ulysses* coincides with publication of Itō's first major critical essay discussing Joyce. In this article, "Jeimuzu Joisu no metōdo 'ishiki no nagare' ni tsuite" (James Joyce's Method—Regarding the "Stream of Consciousness," June 1930), Itō explicates Joyce vis-à-vis Freud's idea of the unconscious and set against an increasingly distilled narrative of Western literature. He writes that with authors like Flaubert, Henry James and Dostoyevsky having explored the interior of characters, literature is running out of novel approaches to writing. Itō claims that the stream of consciousness has developed as the end result of such a process, as the only path left for literature to follow. He views the stream of consciousness as a technique that originates with Edouard Dujardin, and claims that it is the hallmark of the modern novel, with Joyce one of its main practitioners.

In his definition of the stream of consciousness, Itō was aware of the intervention of Freud and psychoanalysis in Japan in the 1910s, focused mainly around the publication of the journal *Hentai shinri* in 1917. While Itō viewed the Freudian novel as a type of novel with psychoanalysis as its technique of execution, he viewed the stream of consciousness novel not as a genre, but as studies in a technique that could

---

<sup>4</sup> Gilbert 1966, p. 513. Kockum notes that Itō's article is most probably "Jeimuzu Joisu no metōdo 'ishiki no nagare' ni tsuite," discussed later in this piece. Although Joyce mentions his interest in publishing the article, no record of it being accepted for English language publication exists.

<sup>5</sup> Kockum 1994, p. 93.

delve into “the true nature of the unconscious.”<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, Freud’s strong influence on Itō can be seen in his interpretation of Joyce’s approach to the stream of consciousness, which he aligns with a goal of the exploration of inner psychology and the unconscious mind:

What is unique about Joyce’s treatment of the unconscious is that he does not describe unconscious manifestations from the point of view of an objective, consistent theory; rather, he expresses unconscious streams based on subjectivity only; to say it differently, he makes the unconscious purely unconscious, and does not utilize the power of objectivity except to excise the interruptions of other affairs. He makes his expressions flow along the unconscious. Consequently, we can say that what is important is not that the unconscious is his object, but that the unconscious is his means.<sup>7</sup>

Thus, it appears that Itō views the stream of consciousness here specifically as a technique for conveying the nature of the unconscious. As Kawaguchi Kyōichi points out, perhaps Itō did not fully understand the stream of consciousness when he was first writing, as he views *Ulysses* as the epitome of unconscious relation of the unconscious state of mind and appears oblivious to the fact that *Ulysses* was, in fact, a consciously and meticulously planned work on Joyce’s part.<sup>8</sup> Even though Joyce’s intentionality is also specifically mentioned in Doi’s prior article, this lack of awareness of the larger context of *Ulysses* is perhaps indicative of Itō’s larger agenda, which involved viewing *Ulysses* more as an example of method rather than a text on its own terms.

This technical examination of Joyce is further reinforced by Itō’s comparison of him to other authors such as Virginia Woolf and Dorothy Richardson. Itō writes that the stream of consciousness was the author’s consciousness and could be trusted as long as the author was faithful to his own sensations while at the same time possessed sufficient ability in structuring his characters. Furthermore, this technique could enhance, not destroy, the novel provided that the author was talented enough. To support these arguments, he cites

---

<sup>6</sup> *Itō Sei zenshū*, hereafter *ISZS*, 13:113.

<sup>7</sup> *ISZS*, 13:113. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations prepared by myself.

<sup>8</sup> Kawaguchi 2005, p. 104, p. 108.

Woolf's *Jacob's Room* and Richardson's *Interim* as alternative examples of the stream of consciousness style. However, in juxtaposition to Joyce, Itō thinks that Woolf's use of stream of consciousness seems to be too planned, whereas Richardson magnifies its usage such that the story of the novel itself disappears. In essence, Itō believes that the stream of consciousness narrates the work, unlike other previous novels where the author's theme and agenda served as the larger guide for the work.<sup>9</sup>

Ultimately, it is apparent that, even within the scope of works that utilize the stream of consciousness, Itō viewed Joyce as the best practitioner of the technique. What is only suggested in Itō's early comparison of Joyce, Woolf and Richardson is elaborated upon in another article, "Riarizumu toshite no bungaku" (Literature as Realism), published later in 1930. Here, Itō writes about Joyce's use of the stream of consciousness as heralding a new type of realism by comparing Joyce once again to Woolf and Richardson:

Essentially, Joyce's works including and following *Ulysses*, if focusing on the story or theme, are not perfect as novels. That is an established fact. As novels, Woolf's works and Richardson's works are deserving of being called perfect. However, in regards to things we should "learn" from an author, Joyce's works have much more of them. This is because Joyce experiments and presents us with a linguistic realism that is far more advanced than Woolf and Richardson. The perfection of the novel that we see in Woolf and Richardson, other authors can also pursue it. However, as long as we are concerned with experiments in attempting to create realism through language or in attempting to make language an expressive function, Joyce's experimentation is important.<sup>10</sup>

Instead of examining Joyce's works for their holistic literary value, Itō views Joyce as working with language, and believes that it is through language that Joyce perfects his realistic technique. Thus, as opposed to Woolf and Richardson's conventionally perfect novels, Joyce's use of language in his writing makes it experimental, realistic and, hence, imperfect. Itō emphasizes that Joyce's technique, or his "experimentation," is the focal

---

<sup>9</sup> *ISZS* 13:113-114.

<sup>10</sup> *ISZS* 13:132.

point of *Ulysses* as well as subsequent texts.

Itō's interest in Joyce's ingenuity with language and the stream of consciousness reflects Itō's own belief that Joyce's writing served as a novel innovation among novel innovations already present within the field of Western literature. In a 1931 article, "Purūsuto to Joisu no bungaku hōhō" (The Literary Methods of Proust and Joyce), Itō compares the writing styles of Proust and Joyce. Itō feels that Joyce's technique, bound in the present-time depiction of reality, is superior to Proust's recollections, which Itō thinks are too shrouded in Proust's subjectivity itself. In his comparison of Proust and Joyce, Itō points to Joyce's technique as pushing the limits of Edouard Dujardin's internal monologue and the depiction of reality. After providing an extensive quotation from *Ulysses*, he writes:

Individually, we see a very different type of expressive method, one type of violent realism. As Joyce's method, what is particularly remarkable is that he achieves as much realistic description as is possible in prose technique. His unique method is one of internal monologue, developed from what is hinted at in Edouard Dujardin's work *Les Lauriers sont coupés*.<sup>11</sup>

Pointing to Proust, Itō castigates him for being unable to fully combine the pursuit of external reality with the exploration of internal reality, and instead notes Joyce's deft ability to do so. He continues:

At this time when the true path of the novel as art is in psychological description and the detailed pursuit of reality occurring in the field of the psyche is considered necessary, the fact that Joyce's novels, while taking in all of reality as the present-time chaos that it is, are advancing new and detailed descriptive methods of the psyche is quite interesting.<sup>12</sup>

In particular, Itō's indication of Joyce's success as opposed to Proust parallels to his exaltation of Joyce over Woolf and Richardson. Itō once again emphasizes Joyce's depiction of "imperfection" and "chaos" as the reasons why Joyce is perhaps the superior writer. It appears that Itō was interested in Joyce's techniques of

---

<sup>11</sup> *ISZS* 13:64.

<sup>12</sup> *ISZS* 13:64.

depicting reality because of the onslaught of both external and internal reality that Joyce brought upon the reader at the same time.<sup>13</sup> In this way, Itō hoped that Joyce's use of the stream of consciousness would serve as an example that would push past Woolf and Richardson's duplicable perfections and Proust's nostalgic recollections.

In particular, Itō's comparison of Proust and Joyce emphasizes the dependence of Itō's ideal of the depiction of reality on the stream of consciousness: to Itō, to truly depict reality was to depict reality as it was being experienced, without the veil of "recollection" or "nostalgia," both key themes in Proust's work. As Itō writes:

However, the method that Joyce uses, "the stream of consciousness," records simultaneously to a certain extent external reality and internal psychological reality, or rather, a certain action or object and the latent order of its reflection in the psyche. ... In Proust's works, if the author does not intervene the novel materializes, but in Joyce, as long as the author is not located in the works, the works do not materialize. The complicated expressions of the psychology of the modern person cannot be measured from the outside, and those detailed expressions are only possible in the interior. Perhaps today's realism should be advanced once again, this time instead starting from Joyce.<sup>14</sup>

Itō's statement here may appear to parallel the statements of Doi and earlier writers, as well as contradict his own earlier statements regarding the lack of planning in Joyce. However, it is important to understand, once again, the temporal aspect of Itō's consideration of both Proust and Joyce, which serves to reconcile both arguments. Recollection of the past placed Proust in an external position to the action that was taking place, even though the work purported itself to be autobiographical in scope. On the other hand, even though Joyce's works were not overtly autobiographical, Itō believed that Joyce's use of the stream of consciousness method illustrated a way of overcoming the boundaries imposed by literature and consequently opening the

---

<sup>13</sup> Itō would clarify and emphasize this aspect of the stream of consciousness in a January 1931 essay, "Hōhō toshite no 'ishiki no nagare'" (The Stream of Consciousness as Method), where Itō emphasized the "synchronicity" (*dōjiteki hatsugen*) of the stream of consciousness and compared it to an orchestra.

<sup>14</sup> *ISZS* 13:65.

exploration of the interior psychology of characters. Itō viewed the stream of consciousness technique as an embodiment of the author himself. Thus, although he did not concern himself with the intentionality of Joyce like Doi and others, Itō found Joyce's presence in the work through the stream of consciousness. To Itō, Joyce lived in his characters in the present moment and, through their stream of consciousness, was able to further explore their internal psychology, as well as his own, to an extent that Proust would not be able to accomplish. Thus, Itō views Joyce's presence in his works as manifest not in his deliberacy and planning, but rather through his use of stream of consciousness, which Itō believes should be the fundamental technique for the examination of realism and psychology.

### *The Potential of Japanese Literature*

Itō's concern over the stream of consciousness as a novel technique is indicative of concerns that he had not only over the state of Western literature, but of Japanese literature as well. In another article published in June 1930, "Bungaku ryōiki no idō" (The Movement of the Domain of Literature), Itō parallels the increasing concerns over psychology in Western literature with those in Japanese literature. Specifically, Itō discusses the rise of Proletarian literature and "methods of description based in film," as well as the renewed emphasis that they have made on psychological description. Furthermore, he derides what he perceives as the dominant literary paradigm of Japanese naturalism, which he feels has become reduced to depending only on the innate ability of authors blind to new innovations in film and literature.<sup>15</sup> In particular, Itō describes his concerns regarding the onslaught of film and its depictive ability. Itō feels that this belief in the intrinsic ability of authors and the lack of desire to explore new methods of writing would lead to the inability of literature to be as evocative as film. Itō instead argues that literature as a whole should seize upon

---

<sup>15</sup> *ISZS* 13:45. In his discussion of film-based descriptive methods, Itō is perhaps referring to the *shinkankaku-ha* movement (Neo-Sensationism), of which authors like Kawabata Yasunari and Yokomitsu Riichi were major players.

the new emphasis on psychology and to reinvigorate literature through exploration of consciousness.<sup>16</sup> Itō points to literature's ability to explore the internal psychology of characters as a quality that makes literature better than film. The timing of this article with "Jeimuzu Joisu no metōdo 'ishiki no nagare' ni tsuite" and its insistence on the stream of consciousness as a specific method for dealing with the unconscious mind implies that Itō ultimately views the stream of consciousness as the new method for exploring the consciousness.

The stream of consciousness technique was attractive to Itō as a solution to a bind in which he perceived Japanese literature to be stuck during the 1930s. To Itō, Japanese naturalism and its aim of realistic depiction were stunted by the form of what had come to be called the autobiographical "I-novel." The I-novel form confined the mimetic desire of Japanese naturalism within the confines of the subjectivity of the narrator: the reader was aware only of what the author intentionally chose to make important. As a result, by the 1930s, as Itō lamented, skill as a naturalist author was bound in the ability to write the I-novel, and the overt inability to separate the two was leading to a sense of entrapment on the part of authors.<sup>17</sup> Itō was also concerned with several abortive attempts to overcome this impasse, the most recent of which was *shinkankaku-ha* (Neo-Sensationism), a literary movement developed in the 1920s that was concerned with subjective perception and the emphasis on subjectivity as a type of camera lens, overtly influenced by Western film and film theory. In particular, Itō felt that *shinkankaku-ha* was a "dead movement," and in a separate 1931 essay, "Kyō no bungaku to shinkankaku-ha undō" (Today's Literature and the Neo-Sensationalist Movement) accused the movement of being too diffuse to have been able to push forward any sort of real literary agenda.<sup>18</sup>

Itō, on a larger scale, was concerned with what he viewed as a common deficiency of literature,

---

<sup>16</sup> Kockum 1994, p. 97.

<sup>17</sup> It is interesting to note that the term "I-novel" was a retroactive invention of the 1920s and 1930s, invented to classify the dominant form of novels that had developed from the 1890s onwards. It is perhaps the development of the label of "I-novel" itself that was the restricting factor that led to the impasse that Itō perceived in Japanese naturalism during the 1930s, as other scholars like Tomi Suzuki have argued.

<sup>18</sup> *ISZS* 13.

including *shinkankaku-ha* literature: its inability to truly depict reality, even though this was the supposed goal of all these movements. In a 1931 essay, “Bungaku ni tsuite” (On Literature), he writes:

When one looks at literary works that are called “new” today, it ought to be said that, because they do nothing more than create and depict an illusion of reality, in truth Japanese literature still shows no clear technical progress. What we expect in a true new literature is not that it should intentionally do us the kindness of turning reality into an illusion and re-depicting it. [We should examine] How deeply it enters into the fine walls of literature, how minutely, how exactly it expresses a conscious reality; that is to say, the correct pursuit level of reality uses method and technique as its system, and nothing other than the work is its result.<sup>19</sup>

Instead of past paradigms of literature, where reality was found in how closely the completed work could approximate the illusion of reality, Itō advocated the pursuit of reality in the technique of depiction itself. The stream of consciousness became Itō’s method to explore what he defined as true reality, where the subjectivity of the author would be dictated by the technique used in the execution of the depiction of reality. This idea worked contrary to what Itō saw in Japanese naturalism and even in *shinkankaku-ha*, where the subjectivity of the author would dictate the progression of the novel. By focusing on the stream of consciousness as a concrete technique for the depiction of reality, Itō overcame the vague definitions of depiction of reality proposed by naturalism and *shinkankaku-ha*, which were bound in the subjectivity of the author.

Ultimately, Itō wished to expand this use of the stream of consciousness to overcome the limitations placed on Japanese literature and eventually develop a new type of literature. He expresses these wishes at the end of “Bungaku ni tsuite” when he calls for a new art which breaks completely with all past paradigms:

From this new domain and its corresponding connections, a new literature must develop. Among the new artists in our country now, those who can truly depict this form and spirit as independent, or those

---

<sup>19</sup> *ISZS* 13:16.

who can connect and construct direct form and spirit without passing through this mixed field of impression and emotion are barely one or two; furthermore, the new art that will be made from today on cannot be anticipated by the domains of form and spirit or their corresponding connections, even when considering the old domain.<sup>20</sup>

This call for a new Japanese literature based in a new style makes the point of emphasizing the “independence” of form and spirit vis-à-vis the old domain of naturalism. In a later essay, “Nihon bungaku no tokushukei to gaikoku bungaku” (The Particular Form of Japanese Literature and Foreign Literature), published in 1932, Itō would continue to espouse the idea of a new literature that was not just based on new types of writing, but specifically changes that would “follow along the lines of development of foreign literature.”<sup>21</sup> It is here that Itō envisions the stream of consciousness playing a major part in the conception of new Japanese literature, based not in the old domains, but instead in new forms of literary technique that could be found in Western literature.

Itō’s work with Joyce was perhaps not fairly received by the Japanese literary world. Although many critics and intellectual figures were excited at the joint translation of *Ulysses* that appeared, many of them disagreed with much of Itō’s fundamental thinking regarding Joyce. In particular, most famous among Itō’s critics was the cultural critic Kobayashi Hideo, who fundamentally disagreed with Itō’s view of the allure of Joyce as solely a technical one. Kobayashi criticized Itō’s writings for not fully considering the socio-political underpinnings of *Ulysses*; in particular, Kobayashi felt that Itō had been too caught up in the style of *Ulysses*, which Kobayashi argued had already been seen in other French symbolists, and overlooked the social and political framework upon which Joyce had constructed *Ulysses*.<sup>22</sup> In discussing the style of *Ulysses*, it seems that Kobayashi was concerned with the linguistic turns and plays that populated *Ulysses*, rather than the use of interior monologue or the stream of consciousness. He was joined in his criticism by

---

<sup>20</sup> *ISZS* 13:50.

<sup>21</sup> *ISZS* 13:206.

<sup>22</sup> Kawaguchi 2005, p. 114.

Haruyama Yukio, coincidentally Itō's tutor in modernism, who wrote that Itō had misunderstood *Ulysses* as a novel on a fundamental level, having been too caught up in his explications of the stream of consciousness.<sup>23</sup> Although Itō would proceed to argue with both Haruyama and Kobayashi in subsequent articles throughout the early 1930s, it is important to consider what Haruyama and Kobayashi do not discuss in their criticism. Both Haruyama and Kobayashi appear to overlook the more fundamental agenda that Itō undertakes in writing about the stream of consciousness. While their criticisms of Itō's approach to Joyce were valid, both Haruyama and Kobayashi appeared blind to Itō's concerns over the impasse of Japanese literature. In particular, Kockum points out that this may have been because the state of the literary field was not conducive to considering new styles of literature.<sup>24</sup> As Itō was more concerned with using the stream of consciousness in its position as a technique to fundamentally revitalize Japanese literature, the criticisms of Haruyama and Kobayashi of Itō's ignorance in considering Joyce's works on more levels, however applicable, appear to have missed their mark.

Ultimately, the results of Itō's project to incorporate the stream of consciousness as the catalyst for a new type of Japanese literature were mixed. Although Itō's translation of *Ulysses* was highly popular and influential, causing even authors like Tanizaki Jun'ichirō to grudgingly admit that he had read the translation and was influenced by it, Itō's own writings on Joyce earned him severe criticism from other intellectuals at the time. Itō was interested in exploring Joyce's use of the stream of consciousness as a technique to surpass the blocks that had been placed on Japanese literature by the restrictions of naturalism and the I-novel. He hoped that the stream of consciousness would provide an alternative method to depict reality, as well as capture a sense of inner psychology that both fulfilled and surpassed the literary goals of the naturalist novel. In this way, Itō desired to use the stream of consciousness as a radical new technique to create a completely new type of novel, just as he felt that Joyce's works were completely different and novel compared to even his

---

<sup>23</sup> Kockum 1994, p. 101.

<sup>24</sup> Kockum 1994, p. 101.

contemporaries. Albeit subsequent criticism would turn Itō away from Joyce and towards other Western authors such as Lawrence and Greene, it is clear that Itō's belief in the stream of consciousness as a technique that had the potential to revolutionize both Japanese and Western literatures was at least partially realized.

## Reference List

- Itō, Sei 伊藤整. *Itō Sei zenshū* 伊藤整全集. 24 vols. Shinchōsha, 1972-1974.
- Gilbert, Stuart, ed. *Letters of James Joyce*. 3 vols. Faber and Faber, 1957-1966.
- Kawaguchi, Kyōichi 川口喬一. *Shōwa shonen no Yurishizu* 昭和初年の『ユリシーズ』. Misuzu Shobō, 2005.
- Keene, Donald. *Dawn to the West. Dawn to the West: A History of Japanese Literature*, v. 3. Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Kockum, Keiko. *Itō Sei: Self-Analysis and the Modern Japanese Novel*. Institute of Oriental Languages, 1994.
- Nihon bungaku kenkyū shiryō kankōkai 日本文学研究資料刊行会, ed. *Itō Sei Takeda Taijun* 伊藤整・武田泰淳. *Nihon bungaku kenkyū shiryō sōsho* 日本文学研究資料叢書. Yūseidō, 1984.
- Nosaka, Yukihiro 野坂幸弘. *Itō Sei ron* 伊藤整論. Sōbunsha Shuppan, 1995.
- Sasaki, Tōru 佐々木冬流, ed. *Itō Sei kenkyū —shinshinrishugi bungaku no tenmatsu—* 伊藤整研究 —新心理主義文学の顛末—. Sōbunsha Shuppan, 1995.
- Sone, Hiroyoshi 曾根博義, ed. *Itō Sei* 伊藤整. Shinchōsha, 1995.
- Suzuki, Tomi. *Narrating the Self: Fictions of Japanese Modernity*. Stanford University Press, 1996.