Japan Review 31 (2017): 141–169

Matrices of Time, Space, and Text: Intertextuality and Trauma in Two 3.11 Narratives

Linda FLORES

This article examines Furukawa Hideo's *Umatachi yo, soredemo hikari wa muku de* (Horses, Horses, in the End the Light Remains Pure) and Kawakami Hiromi's "Kamisama 2011" (God Bless You, 2011), two 3.11 narratives that employ intertextuality to construct radical counter-narratives to trauma. As rewritings of earlier source texts by the respective authors, these intertextual narratives draw the reader into a dynamic relationship with the text, creating a subject position for the reader that is fluid and unsettled. As in the Barthesian "writerly text," the reader becomes engaged not only in the *consumption* of the meaning of the text, but also in the very *production* of meaning. With Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" this occurs primarily through the use of language in the text; with Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* this takes place through the necessary act of assembling the fragmented pieces of the narrative. This article explores how Kawakami and Furukawa employ intertextuality to represent hallmark trauma narratives that also function as counter-narratives to trauma through their engagement of the reader. These intertextual 3.11 narratives serve as examples of the Barthesian "writerly" text but simultaneously disrupt this aspect of Barthes's narrative theory by placing emphasis on how the reader is actively implicated in the production of meaning of the text, and how this is contingent on the shared historical, temporal, and sociocultural experience or knowledge of trauma.

Keywords: Furukawa Hideo, Kawakami Hiromi, Barthes, writerly, counter-narrative, re-writings, Fukushima, literature

3.11 as Ruptured Time

In the six years that have passed since the Great East Japan earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear incident at the Fukushima nuclear power plant, writers, scholars, and critics have continued to debate the meanings surrounding "3.11." Artists and critics from multiple genres—poetry, art, music, prose, fiction, nonfiction, and film—have responded in various ways to the trauma of 3.11, articulating the scale of the disaster and its ongoing aftereffects. In fact, 3.11 is frequently regarded as a turning point, a date that demarcates a pre-11 March 2011 Japan (and arguably the world) from a post-11 March 2011 Japan. Following the disaster, newspapers, journals, and the media conducted surveys on how people's lives

had been altered by the events of 3.11. For example, the April 2012 special edition of the literary journal *Shinchō* 新潮 published responses to a survey that posed the following two questions: "What has the disaster changed for you?" and "What have you read since the disaster?"[1] Numerous well-known writers contributed to the survey, including Tsushima Yūko 津島佑子, Mizumura Minae 水村美苗, Matsuura Rieko 松浦理英子, Ikezawa Natsuki 池澤夏樹, and Yoshimoto Banana よしもとばなな. It elicited a variety of reactions; some, like Matsuura, provocatively claimed that their own worldview had not changed, but that everyday life had changed a great deal. Matsuura further cautioned against the conceit of writers who pronounced that everything had changed simply to demonstrate their own sensibilities and sense of morality.[2] In November 2012 a special edition of *Hihyō kenkyū* 批評研究 was published with the title "*Igo no shisō*" 以後の思想 (The Ideology of Post).[3] The edition consisted of a compilation of interviews, essays, and roundtable discussions by writers, critics, academics, and intellectuals, some of whom queried the very concept of a "post 3.11." Topics included whether it was even possible to speak of a "post 3.11";[4] an exploration of ethics after 3.11;[5] and how the Fukushima incident brought issues regarding Japan's relations with East Asia into greater focus.[6] Although seemingly anachronistic, as made evident by the title of Suh Kyungsik's 徐京植 interview in *Hihyō kenkyū*, "'Igo' ni arawareru 'izen': Fukushima to Higashi Ajia"「以後」に現れる「以前」: フクシマと東アジア, "before" gives rise to the "after." In other words, the temporal disjuncture of 3.11 simultaneously creates both an "after" (*igo*) and a "before" (*izen*).

Nevertheless, alongside these debates, discourse on a "post 3.11" has continued apace. Literature scholar and critic Kimura Saeko 木村朗子 in her study (2013) proclaimed writing after 3.11 as the advent of a new literary genre: "A new literature is flourishing. Just as wartime literature is completely different from postwar literature, through the experience of the Great East Japan earthquake, something has been lost, and something has been born. The veil has been lifted from the eyes of the world, and our sense of values has been renewed."[7]

Kimura's bold declaration suggests that the events of 3.11 and their continuing effects constitute what Piotr Sztompka in his study of cultural trauma has referred to as "traumatogenic change." Sztompka identifies four traits that characterize traumatogenic change. The first, "sudden and rapid" change, refers to changes occurring within a period of time that is relatively short given the nature of the process; the second, "comprehensive" change, refers to wide-ranging changes which affect people's personal or social lives; the third, "radical, deep, fundamental" change, describes change which reaches the core of one's social or personal life or affects universal experiences; the fourth characteristic of traumatogenic change according to Sztompka is "unexpected" change, or change that is shocking, unexpected, or which deals with what he refers to as "an unbelieving mood."[8]

1 *Shinchō*, April 2012, pp. 158–217. Cited in Kimura 2013, pp. 116–19.
2 Matsuura 2012, p. 190.
3 Takahashi H 2012.
4 Yamada 2012.
5 Takahashi J 2012.
6 Suh 2012.
7 Kimura 2013, p. 9. Translations are mine.
8 Sztompka 2004, pp. 158–59.

Taken as a totality, the devastation wrought by the Great East Japan earthquake, the tsunami that followed in its aftermath, and the nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant can clearly be regarded as "sudden, comprehensive, fundamental, and unexpected," fulfilling the conditions Sztompka posits as constitutive of traumatogenic change.[9] The magnitude nine quake destroyed large swathes of northeastern Japan and unleashed a brutal tsunami in its wake. The tsunami waves reached peaks of up to forty meters in places, traveling as far as ten kilometers inland. The waves destroyed seawalls in numerous places along the Tōhoku coastline, even overwhelming refuge stations believed to be entirely secure. Six years after the tsunami, roughly sixteen thousand deaths have been confirmed, with about two thousand five hundred still missing and presumed dead. The tsunami caused a level-7 nuclear meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, releasing radioactive water into the Pacific Ocean, a problem that continues to plague efforts at containing the damage.

Even those who did not experience the disaster firsthand were impacted in some way by the events of 3.11. Powerful visual footage of the disaster was relayed continuously in the media, drawing the nation and indeed the world into the shocking spectacle. Even apart from the tragic loss of life on a massive scale, the continuing effects of the disaster in Japan were far-reaching: devastated towns, displaced residents, widespread anxiety over radioactive contamination, environmental pollution, stringent energy conservation measures, the challenges of reconstruction (and the impossibility of it in many cases), and ever-growing concerns over the dangers associated with nuclear power. Sudden, unexpected, comprehensive, fundamental change occurred with 3.11 in Japan, and its effects persist well into the present day.

Importantly, the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear meltdown at Fukushima had the immediate effect of creating pre-disaster and post-disaster spaces. Around the nuclear power plant at Fukushima exclusion zones and evacuation zones were quickly established. In both Fukushima and Tōhoku certain places were declared *hisaichi* 被災地, or "disaster areas." The scale of the damage was such that following the disaster and in the years to come the media would offer up paired visual images for viewers' comparison and consumption: photos and footage of areas *before* and *after* 3.11. These striking images symbolize the traumatic temporal break of 3.11, signaling Sztompka's "traumatogenic change." The date 3.11 created topographical spaces associated with the disaster, but it also created conceptual and temporal spaces which, like the physical landscape, acquired a pre-disaster and a post-disaster history and identity. This article examines the intersecting matrices of time and space in two intertextual post 3.11 narratives by Kawakami Hiromi 川上弘美 and Furukawa Hideo 古川日出男. Both narratives identify 3.11 as a temporal rupture, a point of "traumatogenic change," characterized by transformations in both modes of writing and reading in the aftermath of the disaster. At the same time, both 2011 texts by Kawakami and Furukawa function as counter-narratives to trauma, engaging the reader in a dynamic relationship with space and time.

9 Sztompka 2004, p. 159. Numerous debates were waged regarding the nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant as "*sōteigai*" 想定外, meaning "unexpected" or "unimaginable." In February 2016 three former executives at the nuclear power company TEPCO (Tokyo Electric Power Company Holdings) were charged with professional negligence in relation to the disaster. For a discussion of the meltdown as *sōteigai*, see Samuels 2013, pp. 35–39.

3.11 First Literary Responses

An oft-repeated chorus among writers in the immediate aftermath of 3.11 was the difficulty of formulating an adequate response to the disaster. Due perhaps to the scale of the disaster, as well as the nature of fiction writing and the publishing world, literary responses to the Great East Japan earthquake by authors of fiction were not immediately forthcoming and did not begin to appear in publication until several months after 3.11. In fact, as Jeffrey Angles has noted in his detailed study of 3.11 poetry, the very first literary responses to the triple disaster came from poets such as Wagō Ryōichi 和合亮一, a well-established poet and native of Fukushima.[10] Wagō was residing in Fukushima when the disaster struck, and he began writing poetry about the disaster during his stay in a camp for evacuees from the affected zones. He published his first poems about 3.11 online through the news and social networking provider Twitter. Through this popular digital medium, Wagō articulated his sentiments about the disaster and about his hometown of Fukushima to a broad audience. Moreover, he was able to convey his poetry with a sense of immediacy that prose fiction simply could not rival. Wagō became an overnight sensation in the world of poetry with his Twitter poems about the disaster, a collection of which was later published in an anthology titled *Shi no tsubute* 詩の礫 (Pebbles of Poetry, 2011). In this manner, poets responded while the crisis was still ongoing, whereas works by their literary counterparts in the world of fiction were several months behind.

In the months and years that followed 3.11, publications from the world of fiction gradually began to appear in journals, in anthologies, and in book form. Three noteworthy literary projects emerged in the months following the triple disaster, which Roman Rosenbaum refers to as "palliative literature" or "charity writing": *2:46: Aftershocks* (2011), *March Was Made of Yarn* (2012), and *Shaken: Stories for Japan* (2011).[11] Publications such as these represented efforts on the part of writers to utilize their literary talents towards the relief effort, and constituted an important trend in writing about 3.11. Over the past few years the literary world has witnessed an increasing number of publications related to 3.11, especially in the genre of fiction, and 3.11 fiction is becoming more recognized in the academy as well. A recent anthology of essays edited by Barbara Geilhorn and Kristina Iwata-Weickgenannt (2017) includes three chapters relating to 3.11 literature: Jeffrey Angles on 3.11 poetry, which highlights the work of Wagō Ryōichi;[12] Rachel DiNitto on 3.11 fiction by Shigematsu Kiyoshi 重松清 and Taguchi Randy 田口ランディ, which presents these early literary responses to 3.11 as "contending narratives of cultural trauma";[13] and Kimura Saeko's exploration of the theme of "uncanny anxiety" in post Fukushima writing, which examines the work of two transnational writers, Sekiguchi Ryōko 関口涼子 and Tawada Yōko 多和田葉子.[14]

Published in the literary journal *Gunzō* 群像 in June 2011, "Kamisama 2011" 神様 2011 was among the first fictional works to emerge in response to the disaster in the months after 11 March 2011. As the magnitude of the damage of 3.11 became apparent,

10 Angles 2014. See also Wagō and Angles 2011; Angles 2017a; and Angles 2017b.
11 Rosenbaum 2014. *March Was Made of Yarn* (Luke and Karashima 2012) is the English translation of *Soredemo sangatsu wa, mata* (Tanikawa 2012).
12 Angles 2017a.
13 DiNitto 2017.
14 Kimura 2017.

writers such as Kawakami Hiromi were presented with a fundamental challenge: they felt an ethical compulsion to write, but at the same time faced the difficulty of doing so. After 3.11 Furukawa Hideo experienced a similar struggle, and his novel (Furukawa 2011) is a testament to this very dilemma. Trauma fiction is frequently characterized by a crisis of representation: how to represent in words that which defies explanation. Kawakami approached this dilemma by rewriting an earlier story from her oeuvre titled "Kamisama" 神様 (God Bless You, 1993). The resulting "Kamisama 2011" is an intertextual piece of fiction that invites comparisons between the two texts. In *Horses, Horses* Furukawa also made reference to his earlier *Seikazoku* 聖家族 (The Holy Family, 2008), and incorporated elements of his previous work into his post 3.11 novel. It is not only the act of writing, however, that confronts this existential challenge after 3.11. As I will argue below, Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" and Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* provocatively suggest that the very practice of reading has been altered by the events of 3.11. The following section addresses the issue of reading after 3.11, drawing on examples from poetry.

Reading After 3.11

In the wake of 3.11, Ikezawa Natsuki, author and winner of the Akutagawa Prize and other prestigious literary awards, turned to nonfiction to express his sentiments. An established writer long concerned with environmental issues and nuclear power, Ikezawa defines 3.11 as a critical turning point for Japan and the literary world. In 2011, he published a collection of essays detailing his reflections on the disaster and its impact on society under the title *Haru o urandari wa shinai*: *Shinsai o megutte kangaeta koto* 春を恨んだりはしない: 震災をめぐって考えたこと (I Don't Reproach the Spring: Thoughts on the Disaster). For the title of this publication, Ikezawa took his inspiration from the opening line of the poem "Parting with a View" (Pożegnanie widoku, 1993) by the Polish poet Wisława Szymborska, winner of the 1996 Nobel Prize in Literature. The first two stanzas of Szymborska's poem read:

> I don't reproach the spring
> for starting up again.
> I can't blame it
> for doing what it must
> year after year.
>
> I know that my grief
> will not stop the green.
> The grass blade may bend
> but only in the wind.[15]

Szymborska penned "Parting with a View" following the death of her husband, and the poem can be read as a lamentation on a passing and the impossibility of adequately capturing one's grief in words. As Charity Scribner writes in her analysis of the poem: "Since traumatic loss always extends beyond us, the terms generated to represent it remain

15 The poem was originally published in Polish in 1993. The translation above is from Szymborska 2000, pp. 240–41.

inadequate, unmasterable, unbearably light."[16] This representation of the trauma of losing a loved one articulates not only an outpouring of grief, but also a transformation in the very form that outpouring takes: words themselves are fundamentally altered by the traumatic experience. In *Haru o urandari wa shinai*, Ikezawa reveals how Szymborska's "Parting with a View" acquired new shades of meaning for him in the wake of 3.11: "This spring in Japan, no matter how much everyone is grieving, the leaves and the cherry blossoms have still bloomed. Even though we do not reproach the spring, it is nevertheless a futile spring where we have lost something important. Our perspective when viewing the cherry blossoms is somehow meaningless."[17] Szymborska's "Parting with a View," read prior to 3.11 by Ikezawa as an expression of grief for the loss of a spouse, adopts a very different nuance in the aftermath of 3.11.[18] For Ikezawa and the post 3.11 reader, the meaning of the poem is effectively transformed by the experience of traumatic events.

Numano Mitsuyoshi 沼野充義 has argued that the reception of a work of literature can fundamentally change in the wake of traumatic experiences such as the Great East Japan earthquake and the Fukushima incident. He asserts that there are many literary works written before the disaster that have since come to possess separate connotations. Numano cites Ikezawa Natsuki's "Sakura no shi: Nihen" 桜の詩: 二篇 (Two Poems on Cherry Blossoms, 2011) to illustrate his point.[19] The two poems by Ikezawa are titled "Nayuta no umi" 那由他の海 (The Deep, Deep Sea) and "Kotoshi bakari wa" 今年ばかりは (This Year Alone). The poems were written before the disaster for a cherry blossom viewing event that was scheduled to take place during the final weeks of March, the peak season for cherry blossoms. The event was cancelled due to 3.11, and the poems were subsequently published in the June edition of *Shinchō* in 2011, just a few months after 3.11. Numano refers specifically to the first stanza of the second poem, "Kotoshi bakari wa," but the poem in its entirety reads as below:

> 目を閉じて、/心しずかに、/想像してください――/この桜がすべて灰色だったら、と。
>
> 昔、ある詩人がそう言いました。/大事な人が亡くなった次の春も/桜ははなやかに咲く。/でも、共に見る人はいない。/それならばいっそ、/山いっぱいの、喪服の色の桜を！
>
> 深草の野辺の桜し心あらば今年ばかりは墨染めに咲け
>
> 古今集です。

16 Scribner 1999, p. 321.
17 Ikezawa and Washio 2011, p. 18. Translation is mine.
18 See also Numano 2013, pp. 164–65.
19 Numano 2012, p. 368.

> Me o tojite, /kokoro shizuka ni, /sōzō shite kudasai—/kono sakura ga subete haiiro dattara, to.
>
> Mukashi, aru shijin ga sō iimashita. /daiji na hito ga naku natta tsugi no haru mo/ sakura wa hanayaka ni saku. /demo, tomo ni miru hito wa inai. /sore naraba isso, / yama ippai no, mofuku no iro no sakura o!
>
> Fukakusa no/nobe no sakura shi/kokoro araba/kotoshi bakari wa/sumizome ni sake
>
> *Kokinshū* desu.[20]
> (Ikezawa Natsuki, "Kotoshi bakari wa" in "Sakura no shi: Nihen")

The English translation is as follows:

> Close your eyes, /quiet your heart/and imagine—/if all these cherry blossoms were grey.
>
> In ancient times, a poet said this./The spring after a loved one died/the cherry blossoms still bloom brilliantly./But, there is no one to view them with./And so, more than ever/ Let us see a mountain full of cherry blossoms the color of mourning dress!
>
> *If you can sense then/cherry blossoms of the Fukakusa fields/this spring alone/pray, bloom a pale grey!*
> From the *Kokinshū*.

At the end of "Kotoshi bakari wa," Ikezawa includes Poem 832, a lamentation poem written during the Heian period included in the "Mourning" section of the *Kokinshū*. Attributed to Kamutsuke no Mineo 上野岑雄, Poem 832 was composed following the death of the Horikawa 堀川 Chancellor;[21] an earlier poem was also written after the chancellor's remains were interred near Mount Fukakusa 深草山. The final line of Poem 832 includes a reference to *sumizome* 墨染め, a type of cherry blossom whose petals appear whitish and pale grey—the color of a monk's robe— at first bloom before turning a pink hue. The poem implores the cherry blossoms to reflect the grief at the Horikawa Chancellor's passing in the very color of their bloom. Ikezawa's poem "Kotoshi bakari wa" expresses both the irony of beauty in times of sorrow (seasonal cherry blossoms in resplendent bloom irrespective of one's personal tribulations) and the poet's own perspective as tainted by grief (in the grey appearance of the cherry blossoms). According to Numano, a post 3.11 reading of "Kotoshi bakari wa" transforms the meaning of the poem: after 3.11 the poem signifies the sense of dissonance conveyed by the cherry blossoms in bloom following the devastation of 3.11.[22] Ikezawa and Numano both articulate the view that, irrespective of the context in which a work of poetry was written, the act of reading it can be fundamentally altered by a traumatic

20 Ikezawa 2011, p. 89. The translations of both Ikezawa's poem and Poem 832 from the *Kokinshū* are my own.
21 Shirane 2012, p. 109.
22 Numano 2012, pp. 368–69.

event. Here, author and critic alike identify preexisting works of literature in an attempt to make sense of the world after the disaster. This signals an important shift in focus from the *production* of literature to the *reception* of literature, highlighting the role of readers and their response to the work.

Trauma and Temporality

The above examples of reading poetry by Wislawa Szymborska and Ikezawa Natsuki illustrate how 3.11 signifies for many a violent temporal rupture. Time is a salient topic within the field of trauma studies. Cathy Caruth has argued, for example, that trauma does not obey the laws of temporality; she defines trauma as an experience that was never fully realized in the first instance, that then returns to haunt the traumatized victim in the form of repetitions, nightmares, and/or compulsive behavior.[23] Trauma is inherently anachronistic, as events that belong to the past can return in the present as "hauntings." Referring to trauma as an "unclaimed experience," Caruth points out that sufferers "return" to trauma, with the past infringing upon the present, often in violent form.

Trauma theorist and psychoanalyst Robert D. Stolorow has poignantly suggested that "trauma destroys time," emphasizing the role of temporality in traumatic events.[24] He argues that traumatized subjects find themselves violently wrenched from the shared structures of temporal reality. As such, they occupy a different time: "Because trauma so profoundly modifies the universal or shared structure of temporality, the traumatized person quite literally lives in another kind of reality, an experiential world felt to be incommensurable with those of others."[25] If, as Stolorow and other trauma theorists have contended, "trauma destroys time," how is this manifested in the trauma fiction of 3.11? How does trauma fiction, and intertextual trauma fiction in particular, articulate this temporal dissonance? Can it also function to re-engage the traumatized subject within the structures of communal temporality?

Trauma, Intertextuality, and the "Writerly Text"

Most critics trace the term "intertextuality" to the work of Julia Kristeva in the 1960s. In an essay titled "Word, Dialogue and Novel," Kristeva wrote that any text is "a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another."[26] In developing this theory of intertextuality, Kristeva drew inspiration from Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogic criticism, which regarded texts as complex sites of interaction and discourse. Roland Barthes was profoundly influenced by the work of both Kristeva and Bakhtin in developing his own theory of intertextuality. Characteristically poststructuralist in his approach, Barthes argued that all texts were inherently intertextual: no text is completely bounded in terms of meaning, and all texts should be open to a plurality of interpretations. Literary works can therefore be regarded as open-ended entities, as arbiters of multiple meanings, rather than a singular meaning. In his seminal work *S/Z*, Barthes divides texts

23 Caruth 1996, p. 4.
24 Stolorow 2011, p. 54.
25 Stolorow 2015.
26 Kristeva 1986, p. 37.

into two categories: "readerly" and "writerly."[27] According to Barthes, the majority of texts are "readerly"; they tend to unfold in a conventional manner and follow a linear narrative structure. In such works meaning can be regarded as stable, and the reader principally functions as a conduit or receptacle for the information conveyed. "Writerly" texts, on the other hand, allow the reader agency outside of the text. They generally do not adhere to conventional narrative forms, and their meaning is neither fixed nor stable. Whereas in a "readerly" text the reader operates as the passive recipient of the information presented in the narrative, in a "writerly" text, they assume an active role and participate in the production of meaning. Barthes proposes the "writerly" text as an ideal: "Why is the writerly our value? Because the goal of literary work (of literature as work) is to make the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text."[28]

In his 1968 essay, "The Death of the Author," Barthes argued against the preeminence of authors as sole arbiters of meaning in the production of their work.[29] For Barthes, the displacement of the author was necessary in order to liberate the text from its existence as a bounded system of meanings. He wrote, "To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing."[30] In signaling the "Death of the Author," Barthes opens the text to a potentially infinite number of interpretations. He maintained that the text should exist as a "multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash."[31] Barthes advocated polysemic readings of texts, but in order for this to be actualized, the author, a historically, culturally, and psychologically bounded figure, first had to be deposed. Barthes even went so far as to state that "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author."[32] But are the two in fact mutually exclusive categories? Two active, though not necessarily competing, forces are at work in Barthes's essay: the act of writing and the act of reading. Barthes's essay suggests that the personal, historical, and arguably cultural specificity of the author necessarily forecloses polysemic interpretations of texts, and it is for this reason that he advocates the displacement of the author in the act of reading. Barthes's essay, which itself engenders a multiplicity of possible readings of a text, demands a sacrifice—the death of the author and, importantly, of the textual reading that a consideration of the author as an historical figure might itself engender. What if one possible set of meanings could be attached to the Text with Author at the precise moment of its production, and other possible meanings beyond that singular moment?

The discipline of trauma studies recognizes the importance of preserving the historical, sociocultural, and temporal situatedness of texts. Indeed, within the context of historical trauma and trauma fiction, one can even argue that there is an ethical imperative to do so. As the previous examples of poetry by Wislawa Szymborska, Kamutsuke no Mineo, and Ikezawa Natsuki illustrate, a text might elicit one system of meanings with a consideration

27 Barthes 1974. Barthes employs the French terms "*lisible*" and "*scriptible*" for "readerly" and "writerly" respectively. See the discussion of Barthes's readerly and writerly texts in Allen 2011, pp. 74–86.
28 Barthes 1974, p. 4.
29 Barthes 1977. Note that Barthes distinguishes between the "work" and the "text" in his writing. See Allen 2011, p. 69.
30 Barthes 1977, p. 147.
31 Barthes 1977, p. 146.
32 Barthes 1977, p. 148.

of the author who produced it, but that need not necessarily exclude future interpretations of the poem. Here I argue that Barthes' notion of a "writerly" text, and its concomitant polysemic interpretive meanings, can be maintained without completely displacing the author and the context of the production of the work. Through a consideration of intertextuality and Barthes's "writerly text," the dynamic nature of textual readings can be brought to the fore.

In intertextual fiction—especially works that draw on an earlier source text written by the same author—intertextuality poses a fundamental challenge to the Barthesian "Death of the Author." The intertextual novel generally derives meaning primarily or at least in part in relation to its literary antecedent. Accordingly, with the intertextual novel, the author cannot be "dead," as the text always already contains traces of the author inscribed within it. Moreover, possessing knowledge of a text as a rewritten version gives the reader access to particular meanings that might otherwise remain unavailable to them. As John McLeod has aptly noted of intertextual narratives that are rewritten versions of a work from an author's preexisting oeuvre, "A re-writing often implicates the reader as an *active agent* in determining the meanings made possible by the dialogue between the source-text and its re-writing."[33] Anne Whitehead also highlights the role of the reader in an intertextual novel: "The intertextual novel constructs itself around the gap between the source text and its rewriting, and depends on the reader to assemble the pieces and complete the story."[34]

"Kamisama 2011" and *Horses, Horses, in the End the Light Remains Pure* as Intertextual Narratives

In this article, intertextual fiction is defined as a work that invites comparisons (in the case of rewritings, this is usually between the source text and the rewritten version), constructs a dialogue between the two texts and provokes reconsideration of either work, or in some cases, of an event such as 3.11.[35] Both Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* and Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" can be linked to preexisting texts by their respective authors. Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* makes overt reference to the source text, the author's earlier work *Seikazoku*, whereas Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" is a rewritten version of the author's short story "Kamisama." As "writerly texts" and intertextual narratives, both 3.11 works certainly *invite*, and arguably even *demand*, reader response. What results is a dynamic mode of reading, one that encourages readers to establish their own unique relationship to the text.

In his analysis of the source texts and rewritten works by both Furukawa and Kawakami, Jinno Toshifumi 陣野俊史 refers to this practice of rewriting a story from the authors' ouevres as a "completely new method for addressing the nuclear incident."[36] Jinno further argues that for the author the act of rewriting a work is a particularly brazen move, as it suggests that their writings are not necessarily finished works, subject as they are to future revision. This implies that texts are not closed, bounded systems of meaning; rather, they are open to multiple interpretations, as Barthes has argued. Similarly, in *Kawakami Hiromi o yomu* 川上弘美を読む (Reading Kawakami Hiromi), Matsumoto Katsuya

33 McLeod 2000, p. 168. See also McLeod's extensive discussion on the rewritings of English literary classics in McLeod 2000, pp. 139–71.
34 Whitehead 2004, p. 93.
35 See McLeod 2000, p. 168.
36 Jinno 2011a, p. 107.

松本和也 evaluates Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" in the context of her earlier work, "Kamisama," and uses the expression "*nijū utsushi*" 二重写し, or "double exposure," to refer to Kawakami's rewritten version of her earlier story.[37] This "double exposure" method can be regarded as a form of textual layering as the meanings associated with the rewritten text are derived partially from the source text. According to this, the rewritten text does not supplant the source text, but instead exists alongside it. Takahashi Gen'ichirō 高橋源一郎 refers to "Kamisama 2011" as a "*rimeiku*" リメイク, or a "remaking" of her 1993 story, "Kamisama." He further argues that Kawakami has created a narrative in which the two worlds portrayed in "Kamisama" and "Kamisama 2011" essentially coexist in the same place.[38]

These comments by Jinno, Matsumoto, and Takahashi underscore the importance of evaluating the 2011 fictional works by Furukawa and Kawakami as intertextual narratives and as rewritten versions of previously authored texts. The following section will explore the practice of textual layering in "Kamisama 2011" through a detailed analysis of the altered use of language in the 2011 story in comparison to its source text, "Kamisama." A subsequent section on Furukawa's work will similarly examine how the layering of the two novels, *Horses, Horses* and *Seikazoku*, results in a journey across textual space that transcends boundaries of time and geography. Both texts by Kawakami and Furukawa simultaneously represent the trauma of 3.11 and construct counter-narratives to trauma through their intertextual layering.

"Kamisama" (1993) and "Kamisama 2011" (2011)

Kawakami's original 1993 story, "Kamisama," can be interpreted as a reflection on the lack of communal ties and traditions in modern society. Fairly simplistic in terms of plot, it is the story of a bear that has recently moved into an apartment in the same complex as the unnamed human protagonist. The bear comes across as somewhat old-fashioned to the protagonist, offering traditional "moving-in noodles" and packets of postcards as presents to his new neighbors, a gesture that is less common in modern times. Despite the apparent differences between the old-fashioned bear and the human protagonist, they sense a common bond between them. The bear invites the protagonist on an outing, and together they walk to the river, stopping to rest on the riverbank. They encounter a young boy fishing with two adults, and the boy pulls at the bear's fur, then kicks and punches him playfully. Unperturbed by the boy's behavior, the bear darts into the river and deftly catches a fish. He fillets and salts it on the spot to present as a gift to the protagonist when they return home. The two enjoy a picnic lunch and return home to their respective apartments. The protagonist declares his outing with the bear an altogether pleasant excursion. This delightfully unassuming story of two characters—one bear, one human—on a day out together decries the erosion of traditional customs in modern society. "Kamisama" also demonstrates the lack of connections (*kizuna*) between people in modern times.[39] How then did Kawakami modify the 2011 version of her story "Kamisama" to represent life in post Fukushima Japan?

37 Matsumoto 2013, p. 42.
38 Takahashi 2011, p. 541.
39 Tokita 2015, p. 7.

"Kamisama 2011," Kawakami's reworked version of her 1993 story, is very nearly identical to the original version, "Kamisama." The main characters are the same; the plot is the same; the setting is the same; the language is largely unchanged. The two main characters remain a bear and a human who live in the same apartment complex. The bear has moved in relatively recently, and again, seems to be more mindful of cultural customs and traditions than most people. The protagonist and the bear go out for a walk and a picnic and then return home. Similar to the original story written in 1993, the post 3.11 version implies that the nuclear disaster at Fukushima has resulted in a further erosion of the already disintegrating connections between people in the modern world.[40] Tokita Tamaki argues that "Kamisama 2011" constitutes a step towards Japan's recovery from 3.11, "guiding . . . readers to accept what has already happened and move forward, living in harmony with nature, so that their homeland can be passed onto future generations without further damage."[41]

How does one read an intertextual narrative such as Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011," as a rewriting of her earlier work, "Kamisama"? A line-by-line analysis of passages from both works reveals the extent to which the two narratives are similar, but also highlights the significant differences between them. In *Shisha no koe, seija no kotoba: Bungaku de tou genpatsu no Nihon*, Komori Yōichi 小森陽一 (2014) scrutinizes passages from both texts by Kawakami, emphasizing the modifications the author made to the original text in her 2011 version.[42] To illustrate those changes, Komori quotes a passage from the original "Kamisama," immediately followed by the altered version of the same passage in "Kamisama 2011." Below I include both passages in Japanese: the first passage is taken from "Kamisama"; the second from "Kamisama 2011." Following this, I quote the English translations for both the 1993 version and the 2011 version. The modifications made to the text are highlighted in the second passages in both the original Japanese and in the English translation.

Opening passage of "Kamisama" (1993) in Japanese:
くまにさそわれて散歩に出る。川原に行くのである。歩いて二十分ほどのところにある川原である。春先に、鴫(しぎ)を見るために、行ったことはあったが、暑い季節にこうして弁当まで持っていくのは初めてである。散歩というよりハイキングといったほうがいいかもしれない。[43]

Opening passage of "Kamisama 2011" (2011) in Japanese with emphasis from Komori:
くまにさそわれて散歩に出る。川原に行くのである。歩いて二十分ほどのところにある川原である。春先に、鴫(しぎ)を見るために、**防護服をつけて**行ったことはあったが、暑い季節にこうして**ふつうの服を着て肌を出し**、弁当まで持っていくのは、**「あのこと」以来**初めてである。散歩というよりハイキングといった方がいいかもしれない。[44]

40 Tokita 2015, p. 8.
41 Tokita 2015, p. 10.
42 Komori 2014, pp. 79–80.
43 Kawakami 2011b, p. 109.
44 Komori 2014, pp. 79–80. Passage is from Kawakami 2011a, p. 104.

> Opening passage of "Kamisama" (1993) in English:
> The bear invited me to go for a walk to the river, about twenty minutes away. I had taken that road once before in the early spring to see the snipes, but this was the first time I had gone in hot weather, and carrying a box lunch to boot. It would be a bit of a trek, somewhere between a hike and a stroll.[45]
>
> Opening passage of "Kamisama 2011" (2011) in English (with emphasis from Komori in bold):
> The bear invited me to go for a walk to the river, about twenty minutes away. I had taken that road once before in the early spring to see the snipes, but **then I had worn protective clothing**; now it was hot, and for the first time **since the "incident" I would be clad in normal clothes that exposed the skin**, and carrying a box lunch to boot. It would be a bit of a trek, somewhere between a hike and a stroll.[46]

Komori carefully examines the use of language in Kawakami's 2011 story, and argues that it demonstrates an implicit understanding between the reader and the text. This is manifested primarily in two ways: first, through the insertion of key vocabulary relevant to a post Fukushima audience; and second, through the use of language which demonstrates a shared understanding among the readership. Both characteristics rely upon shared information structures, knowledge that exists within particular contexts and without which understanding is not possible.

To begin with, Komori highlights the use of the term *bōgofuku* 防護服 (protective clothing) in the first few lines of "Kamisama 2011"; the radical imposition of this term upon the 1993 narrative structure operates as a form of textual violence symbolizing the nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. Komori indicates that, although the text never overtly mentions radioactive emissions, radioactive particles, or even radiation, the mere inclusion of *bōgofuku* is itself revealing. He points out that until 3.11, *bōgofuku* was a specialized term only used among those who worked with nuclear power; after 3.11, the repetition of the term in the news and mass media rendered it familiar to the general public.[47] "Protective clothing," he further suggests, is then juxtaposed to "*futsū no fuku o kite hada o dashi*" ふつうの服を着て肌を出し (normal clothes that exposed the skin). According to Komori, once the reader has been made aware of this initial juxtaposition, others naturally fall into line: "*kawara*" 川原 (river bed) signals an exceedingly ordinary space contaminated by emissions from the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant; "*harusaki*" 春先 (beginning of spring) represents the normal start of spring that becomes directly linked to 3.11.[48] In his study of post 3.11 literature, Rosenbaum classifies the product of Kawakami's juxtapositions as "horrendous": "By giving us two 'almost' identical versions of the same story—one written prior to and another post-3.11—she suggests that

45 Kawakami 2012f, p. 48.
46 Kawakami 2012d, p. 37. All translations from Kawakami Hiromi's stories are taken from the Goossen and Shibata translation in *March Was Made of Yarn*. Goossen and Shibata translate the title "Kamisama 2011" as "God Bless You, 2011." I have added emphasis in bold to reflect the changes to the passage as indicated by Komori in Komori 2014, pp. 79–80.
47 Komori 2014, pp. 80–81.
48 Komori 2014, p. 81.

even our traditional narratives have become distorted by the deep psychological scars of the disaster."[49] Both Rosenbaum and Komori concur that Kawakami's subtle transformations of language between "Kamisama" and "Kamisama 2011" reveal the gravity and depth of the changes brought about by 3.11. These subtleties of language resonate in a particular way to a post 3.11 readership with collective knowledge or experiences of the events.

With respect to the use of language in "Kamisama 2011," Komori draws particular attention to the term *ano koto* あのこと (translated as the "incident" in the English version). Tokita renders *ano koto* as "that thing," arguing, "Kawakami prefers to refer to nuclear incidents as 'that thing' as though to avoid placing the full blame on those who operated the power plant (by calling them *genpatsu jiko*, or 'nuclear accidents,' for example). This shows Kawakami's willingness to accept some of the blame as a member of society who used electricity derived from nuclear power without questioning its safety."[50] However, Komori does not attribute the ambiguous use of *ano koto* to a displacement of responsibility for the nuclear meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. Instead, he argues that *ano koto* signals a "shared understanding" (*kyōtsū rikai* 共通理解) between the speaker and the listener (author and reader, or perhaps text and reader): "That 'incident' is made to function as a site of meaning in which that 'incident' already cannot be thought of as anything other than the Fukushima incident after '3.11.'"[51] Komori suggests that this "shared understanding" is forged through the juxtaposition of terms that underscore the transformations in life *before* and *after* 3.11, linked together by *ano koto*. He refers to this as a "*torinitī*" トリニティー or "*sanmi ittai*" 三位一体—a "trinity" that is formed through the triangulation of the expressions *bōgofuku*, *futsū no fuku o kite hada o dashi*, and *ano koto*.[52] This involves labor on the part of the reader, who must construct and derive meaning from this triangular relationship. In this Barthesian "writerly" text, the reader locates *ano koto* as the fulcrum on which the changes in life since 3.11 hinge: the protagonist of "Kamisama 2011" inhabits a world where "protective clothing" is rendered necessary following the "incident," and where wearing "normal clothing that exposed the skin" can be classified as extraordinary behavior. Komori's argument can be extended to include not only the phrase *ano koto*, but also a range of other expressions referring to 3.11 in "Kamisama 2011" and other texts, both fiction and nonfiction. These include *ano hi* あの日 (that day) and *ano hi irai* あの日以来 (since that day).[53] Komori identifies a proliferation of works published after 3.11 suggesting a *before* and *after* the event. The August edition of the journal *Subaru* すばる contained an article titled "'3.11' *to* '*sono go*' *no shōsetsu*"「3·11」と「その後」の小説 ('3.11' and novels 'After' 3.11) in which Jinno Toshifumi suggested that the meanings associated with previously completed novels had been transformed.[54] Literary scholar Kitada Sachie in her comments on literature and feminist criticism after 3.11 refers to "Kamisama 2011" as an important turning point; she argues that life had changed markedly since *ano*

49 Rosenbaum 2014, p. 105.
50 Tokita 2015, p. 10.
51 Komori 2014, p. 81.
52 Komori 2014, pp. 82–83.
53 The numerous publications, both fiction and nonfiction, which refer to 3.11 employing the expressions *ano hi* or *ano koto* are a testament to this. Many news stories and television programs commemorating the sixth anniversary of 3.11 also used *ano hi* in their titles.
54 Jinno 2011b.

ato あのあと (after the incident), and that people had to negotiate a way forward through these unusual times.[55]

Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" reveals these changes through subtleties in the language. In linguistic terms, demonstratives, referred to in Japanese as *ko-so-a-do* こそあど words such as *kono* この, *sono* その, *ano* あの, and *dono* どの (this, that, that one over there, and which one), are used when there is either an identifiable referent or a shared experience. Sakoda Kumiko defines the two major functions of Japanese demonstratives as deictic and anaphoric: "The deictic demonstratives point out referents directly, while the anaphoric demonstratives are used in the discourse."[56] Sakoda argues that in anaphoric use, the "*so*-series" (*sono*, *sore*, and *soko*) terms suggest that knowledge of the information or the experience in question is not shared. On the other hand, when used anaphorically, "*a*-series" terms (*ano*, *are*, and *asoko*) "are used to indicate that the speaker thinks that the referent (i.e. hearer) shares the experience or mutual knowledge."[57]

Linguistics scholar Kuno Susumu's research on demonstratives clearly delineates the anaphoric functions of the *a*-series and the *so*-series in particular:

> (i). The *a*-series is used for referring to something (at a distance either in time or space) that the speaker knows both he and the hearer know personally or have shared experience in.
>
> (ii). The *so*-series is used for referring to something that is not known personally to either the speaker or the hearer or has not been a shared experience between them.[58]

Hence, according to Kuno, anaphorically, the "*a*-series" of demonstratives is only used when both speaker and listener are aware of the referent. With respect to the "*a*-series," linguistics scholar Kuroda Shigeyuki 黒田成幸 emphasizes that it is used to represent knowledge acquired through direct experience.[59] Building on Kuno's argument on the "*a*-series," Florian Coulmas adds that the speaker "has reason to believe that such is the case."[60] That is, the presentation of the text presumes the reader's knowledge of a thing, or in the case of 3.11, an event.

Curiously, in Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011," the expression *ano koto* is used to refer to the meltdown at the nuclear power plant at Fukushima, yet it occurs in the opening lines of the narrative, without explicit mention of what is being referred to. There is no prior discussion of the nuclear incident at Fukushima, nor is there a physical object to which the demonstrative *ano* refers. It follows, then, that this "anaphoric" function of demonstratives is "regulated by the locus of a reference object in the universe of knowable objects, with a speaker and a hearer pivot."[61] *Ano* therefore operates as a pivot, a point of

55 Kitada 2012, p. 113. Cited in Komori 2014, pp. 74–75.
56 Sakoda 2016, pp. 137–38.
57 Sakoda 2016, p. 138.
58 Kuno 1973, p. 290.
59 Kuroda 1979.
60 Coulmas 1982, p. 215.
61 Coulmas 1982, p. 215. See also Kuno 1973.

mutual understanding that binds readers across both textual space ("Kamisama" [1993] and "Kamisama 2011" [2011]) and across time (pre 3.11 and post 3.11).

Here I argue that the anaphoric usage of *ano* (as in *ano hi* or *ano koto*) has several implications: (1) it suggests that 3.11 exists as shared knowledge within the public realm; (2) it creates a sense of psychological distance, effectively placing a "safety buffer" between the reader and the disaster; and (3) it invites the reader in, implying a sense of intimacy or familiarity.

Shared knowledge operates on multiple levels. First of all, "Kamisama 2011" is an inherently intertextual piece of literature; the repetition of part of the title, "Kamisama," in the 2011 piece further underscores this point. "Kamisama 2011" is premised on a shared body of knowledge, in this case, a work from the author's existing oeuvre. In addition, the usage of the demonstrative *ano* also implies shared knowledge of 3.11 in general, and of the nuclear meltdown at Fukushima in particular. Although "Kamisama 2011" does not necessarily center on a shared personal experience of the earthquake or the tsunami per se, the use of *ano* in "Kamisama 2011" binds the speaker and listener (here: author/text and reader) through shared knowledge or experience of the referent. Because of this shared knowledge, overt mention of 3.11 is ubiquitous. Indeed, as Coulmas's work suggests, this anaphoric usage of *ano* implies that the speaker believes that it is not necessary to provide a referent.

The second function of the term *ano* in "Kamisama 2011" is applicable more broadly in discourse since 3.11. It suggests both a shared understanding as well as a reluctance to directly mention the traumatic events of 3.11. Instead of referring to "11 March, 2011," "3.11," or "Fukushima," *ano koto* and *ano hi* are sufficient for meaningful communication among those with shared knowledge of the incident. Hence, for those located within these communal structures of knowledge, "3.11" can be referred to in relatively ambiguous terms, and this creates a critical distance between the event and those with shared knowledge of the event (text and reader). To put it another way, the use of *ano* imparts a psychological buffer between the reader and the disaster. At the same time, it enables discussion of the traumatic event without overt mention of it.

In its third function, *ano* operates as an invitation to readers, ushering them into the community of shared knowledge and/or experience. In other words, *ano* is inclusive; it forges a community defined not simply by national identity (the Japanese people), firsthand experience of the disaster, or shared knowledge of the disaster. *Ano* also invites the reader to consider other nuclear incidents in addition to Fukushima, due to the inherently ambiguous nature of the demonstrative. In fact, '*ano koto*' could be used to refer to nuclear incidents before or after 3.11, including Chernobyl, for example. It has the potential to embrace broader meanings for the community of readers who share a common concern for nuclear issues. Indeed, it creates a community defined even more broadly—by the readership itself. In Kawakami's rewritten version of her 1993 story, the reader and the text are linked by these complex textual nuances and subtleties of language.

While on the surface the two narratives appear more similar than different, the changes that Kawakami makes to the text clearly demonstrate that life *after* 2011 is fundamentally different from life *before* 2011. The alterations to the text signal a new, post Fukushima Japan in which everything, including the quotidian aspects of life, such as going for a walk or one's attire, have been subtly but fundamentally transformed. On the formal level of the text, these alterations can also be regarded as a kind of textual violence: Kawakami's 1993

"Kamisama," the story that launched her literary career, has been symbolically defaced. The fact that the two stories, "Kamisama" and "Kamisama 2011," were printed side by side with the author's afterword in three separate publications, *Gunzō*, *Soredemo sangatsu wa, mata*, and the English translation of *Soredemo sangatsu wa, mata*, *March Was Made of Yarn*, means that the reader has no choice but to draw comparisons between the two narratives. The reader's movement between the two stories need not rely only on their memory of the source text, "Kamisama"; the reader can move spatially as well as temporally between the texts, as access to the source narrative is immediate. Significantly, the intertextual narrative alone does not accomplish the work of building connections and creating meaning; this can only be achieved through the intervention of the reader. The intertextual narrative functions as an intermediary, connecting the reader, text, and arguably the author into a triangular relationship wherein each performs a crucial role. In "Kamisama 2011" the reader is charged with the responsibility of bridging between the source text and the rewriting.

Furukawa Hideo's *Seikazoku* (2008) and *Horses, Horses, in the End the Light Remains Pure* (2011)

Furukawa has won high accolades in the literary world in recent years, including the Noma Prize for New Writers and the 2015 Yomiuri Prize for Literature. Furukawa's *Seikazoku* 聖家族 is set in the Tōhoku region and even incorporates the Tōhoku dialect into the text. It tells the story of the Inuzuka 狗塚 family alongside the history of the region. There are three siblings in the Inuzuka family, two brothers, Gyūichirō 牛一郎 and Yōjirō 羊二郎, and a sister Kanaria カナリア, but the narrative focuses mainly on the exploits of the two brothers. The narrative recounts history in multiple ways, including conversations with and letters from the grandmother, and imagined conversations between the two Inuzuka brothers. Like its literary successor, *Horses, Horses*, *Seikazoku* follows two primary trajectories: space and time. It traces the spatial geography of Tōhoku, wandering throughout the region, but it also tracks a seven-hundred-year historical time span, offering an "alternative history" of Tōhoku. The narrative is told in nonlinear fashion, mingling at times past, present, and future. It also charts the temporal journey from the Sengoku era to the Meiji Restoration, and on to the Pacific War, calling into question the very existence of a singular narrative of history.

The protagonist of *Horses, Horses* is based on the author Furukawa himself, and specters of his literary past can be located throughout the novel. *Horses, Horses* is intertextual in the strictest sense of the term as it is "haunted" by *Seikazoku*; in fact, *Horses, Horses* can be regarded as a sequel of sorts to Furukawa's 2008 "mega-novel." His 2011 novel documents the centripetal journey of the author/protagonist as he travels to the disaster zone of Fukushima together with his colleagues.

In the aftermath of the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, the protagonist describes the difficulty he faced trying to write in the aftermath of 3.11, combined with the compulsion to articulate his sentiments. The protagonist is repeatedly haunted by a voice that presents him with three simple imperatives: travel to Fukushima, witness the spectacle, and write about his experiences. Unable to ignore the voice and its multiple directives, he travels by car with colleagues from his publishing company to the heart of the disaster zone in Fukushima. What is the impetus for this seemingly self-destructive pilgrimage? Kawamura Minato 川村湊 initially speculates that the journey is perhaps motivated by heroism, a simple desire to stand apart

from the crowd, or excessive love for one's hometown; he then proposes that it may be fueled by a desire to become irradiated, to endure suffering together with the people of Fukushima, implying a nihilistic desire on the part of the protagonist.[62]

Horses, Horses stubbornly resists simple categorization into one particular genre of writing. Similar to the violence evident at the structural level in "Kamisama 2011" as a modified version of the source text, "Kamisama," Furukawa's novel *Horses, Horses* is fragmented, disjointed, even broken. As described by the translator Douglas Slaymaker in his afterword to the novel, *Horses, Horses* is perhaps best classified as "a sort of memoir, sort of fiction, sort of essay, something of a road trip; it can be chaotic and overwhelming."[63] Furukawa's 2011 novel is a literary mélange of sorts, and as Kawamura points out, "This documentary work which revolves around the nuclear disaster zone of Hamadōri in Fukushima prefecture unfolds as a curious 'dialogue' between the author and a character from the author's literary world."[64] Kawamura's use of the term *taiwa* 対話 (dialogue) to describe Furukawa's 2011 novel about Fukushima appropriately highlights the intertextual nature of *Horses, Horses*. The intermingling of genres in the text prompts Kawamura to interrogate the genre of the work itself: "Is this a novel or a tale? Or perhaps, it is the daydream of a novelist who goes to the horrible site of the nuclear-quake disaster, an absurd fictional space that blends the world of reality with the world of imagination, hallucinated by a radiation-afflicted mind."[65]

The anachronistic appearance of a character from *Seikazoku* in *Horses, Horses* also characterizes the novel as a piece of intertextual fiction. During the journey to Fukushima, the protagonist discovers that one of the main characters from *Seikazoku*, the older brother Gyūichirō, has mysteriously appeared as a passenger in the back seat of his rental car. Elements of magical realism are clearly at work here; Gyūichirō suddenly appears out of nowhere, and yet his presence is unquestioned by the protagonist. This can be attributed in part to the nature of the post 3.11 text in the hands of Furukawa, where the unexpected, the unbelievable, has already taken place. After all, how extraordinary is the supernatural presence of Gyūichirō when compared to the devastation of the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear meltdown at Fukushima? The introduction of Gyūichirō into Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* is significant for several reasons. First of all, the anachronistic appearance of a character from the author's canon of works juxtaposes a pre 3.11 world with a post 3.11 world. The fact that the setting for *Seikazoku* is also the Tōhoku region further underscores this point. Second, the sense of magical realism that Gyūichirō's appearance imparts to the narrative psychologically prepares the reader for what follows in the protagonist's journey to the disaster zone. In other words, throughout the novel our sense of normalcy is continually and consistently disrupted. When the protagonist of *Horses, Horses* arrives at Fukushima, he is surprised to find the scene relatively quiet, with little visible damage. He encounters the animals that have been abandoned after the evacuation, and ruminates on the history of horses in the Fukushima region as well as the history of the region itself.

62 Kawamura 2013, p. 34.
63 Slaymaker 2016, p. 141.
64 Kawamura 2013, p. 36.
65 Kawamura 2013, p. 36.

What results from this combination of literary elements is a novel emblematic of the disjointed character of the experience of trauma. Furukawa's novel bears the hallmarks of trauma fiction: it does not follow a conventional linear narrative structure; it does not obey the laws of temporality; it constantly shifts narrative focus. Just as the events that unfolded in the wake of 3.11 were disjointed and confusing, so too is the novel. In this way, the novel mimics the very structure and form of traumatic events.

Central to this embodiment of trauma is the novel's portrayal of time. The novel describes the temporal disjuncture that followed 3.11, referring to it with the expression *kamikakushi no jikan* 神隠しの時間, or "spirited-away time":[66]

> I experienced one day as though it was a week. Or three days that felt like a month. This is how "spirited-away time" works. I was not the only one that lost all sense of days of the week, I was not the only one for whom the dates of the calendar disappeared. (Everyone I was talking with seemed to be experiencing the same thing).[67]

The narrator conveys this sense of being "out of time" during the aftermath of 3.11 not only through the content of his words, but also through the very form of the narrative. Within the space of several pages, the reader travels temporally through discontinuous time: 11 April, 9 April, 10 April, 27 March, 13 March, then to the day of the Great East Japan earthquake, 11 March 2011.

> This takes us back to two Sundays before March 27. On March 13 I received a writing request from the press agency. Now I was still fully wrapped up within the "spirited-away time," and even though dates and days had been hijacked, if I go back over it now I can get it in order enough to talk about it. I will lay it out carefully.[68]

Later in the text the narrator continues to express disbelief at having been thwarted by time: "The turnover of the months took me by surprise. May? Was it already May? I have no recollection of encountering the end of April. Thus the fact of, the reality of, the twelfth of *May*, shocked the hell out of me."[69] The protagonist refers to "calendar days expanding and changing," as though the mathematical certitude of something as seemingly fixed as the length of a day, week, month, or even year has been called into question. *Horses, Horses* suggests that time itself is unreliable, as trauma has fundamentally disrupted the flow of temporality. The reader too shares this communal sense of disorientation with the protagonist and with other readers as the text leaves the reader searching for narrative cohesion or logic. The practice of reading is thus transformed into an act of assemblage, rearranging the disparate pieces of the narrative. Without a clear narrative focus or a coherent sense of time, only one thing remains constant: Fukushima and the centripetal journey to the heart of the disaster zone.

66 Slaymaker and Takenaka's translation of *kamikakushi no jikan* is "spirited-away time."
67 Furukawa 2016, p. 6. All translations of Furukawa's text are by Slaymaker and Takenaka.
68 Furukawa 2016, p. 17.
69 Furukawa 2016, p. 107.

With Fukushima as a target destination, the protagonist embarks on numerous literary excursions along the way: dialogues with Gyūichirō from *Seikazoku*; historical accounts of the Warring States period; memories of the protagonist's childhood; histories of horses in the Sōma 相馬 region; and self-authored poetry on 9.11, to name a few. In this meandering text, the reader cannot help but become a bit lost. Without a central, unifying plot as a compass to guide the way in this "writerly" text, the reader is tasked with the act of bringing together the seemingly disparate elements of the novel. The fact that the only consistent and reliable trajectory in the narrative is that of the protagonist's (and reader's) movement ever nearer to the center of the Fukushima disaster zone adds the aspect of spatial movement to discourse. This is significant, as although issues of time are frequently discussed in discourse on trauma fiction, issues of space are seldom at the heart of discourse.[70]

In fact, whereas time itself is the site of rupture, it is space—both geographical and textual space—that offers a counter-narrative to the trauma of 3.11. The text transports the reader on a journey that they cannot themselves take: towards the center of the disaster. As readers trace this literary geography, they are also traveling through the space of the text, or the in-between spaces of the text. Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* simultaneously charts a journey through several distinct but inter-related types of space: geographical space (from the outside of the disaster zone to the center of the zone), conceptual space (from a post 3.11 reality to a pre 3.11 reality), and textual space (from *Seikazoku* to *Horses Horses*). Whereas Kawakami Hiromi's "Kamisama 2011" focuses on the *time* of the disaster, pinpointing 3.11 as a turning point through references to *ano hi* or *ano koto*, Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* instead emphasizes the *space* of the disaster. The protagonist not only feels compelled to go to Fukushima of his own volition, he is *ordered* to go there by a mysterious, unnamed voice: "'Go.' There was the voice. 'You must go there. Inside the concentric circles.' What is this feeling?"[71]

This emphasis on geographical and corporeal space is even reflected in the language employed in the text. In particular, there is the directive the protagonist hears issued repeatedly by a disembodied voice telling him to "Go there." The original Japanese text reads: "*Soko e ike*" *to*「そこへ行け」と.[72] In fact, the informal imperative *soko e ike* occurs several times throughout the text. Although in Furukawa's novel *Horses, Horses*, the protagonist is a native of Fukushima, the narrative implies that while he may possess knowledge of the Fukushima that existed *before* 3.11, he does not know of the Fukushima that exists *after* 3.11. Hence, when the voice commands the protagonist, "*Soko e ike*," "*soko*" indicates a post 3.11 Fukushima that has been transformed in ways that the protagonist cannot yet fully comprehend.

The protagonist emphasizes the status of Fukushima as *soko* (there, not here), a place that is effectively "othered" through its status as the site of the nuclear meltdown. Fukushima, he suggests, is being excluded from Japan proper; as the disaster zone, the zone of exclusion, *soko* signals its status as an abject site: "*Fukushima*—no matter how you spell it—was being locked out. People have been chased outside those circles, but it's all such

70 Anne Whitehead examines the work of Geoffrey Hartman on landscape in relation to trauma theory and memory. See Whitehead 2003. Marinella Rodi-Risberg investigates how trauma is enacted and represented through textual, geographical, and corporeal space. See Rodi-Risberg 2010.

71 Furukawa 2016, p. 25.

72 Furukawa 2011, p. 5.

an empty fiction. 'Beyond the prefectural border?' Can one truly escape by leaving the prefecture?"[73]

Even when the protagonist reaches the disaster zone of Fukushima, his target destination, the novel offers no sense of closure: "And at this point my essay ends, and begins."[74] Caught up in these endless cycles of repetition, the reader too is unable to escape from the confusion of the text. Stolorow, in his explication of how "trauma destroys time," argues: "In the region of trauma, all duration or stretching along collapses; past becomes present, and future loses all meaning other than endless repetition."[75] Given the temporal disruptions to Furukawa's novel *Horses, Horses,* spatial movement constitutes an attempt by the protagonist to escape from so-called "spirited-away time." Despite this, however, the novel does not *end* so much as *continue*, demonstrating the inherent difficulty or perhaps impossibility in transcending the fractured time of trauma.

In fact, the protagonist of *Horses, Horses* expresses his reluctance to employ 3.11 as a marker of time: "I oppose calling this current catastrophe of Japan, officially known as the Great East Japan Earthquake, '3.11.' [. . .] because the nuclear accident is ongoing, even after. Indeed, things got much worse after March 11. I know that people desire commemorative phrases, I get that."[76] His resistance represents the fact that "3.11" cannot be regarded as a traumatic event that can be historicized; its after-effects are ongoing, and the trauma is *now*. Despite his inherent reluctance in principle to attribute "3.11" as a moniker for the triple disaster, the protagonist concedes, "This was all before 3.11. Before 99 percent of Americans knew that a place called 'Fukushima' even existed. And then the event occurred in the afternoon of March 11, Japan time, and Japan came to own 3.11."[77]

As the earlier discussion on reading before and after 3.11 has shown, literary works can acquire new shades of meaning in the aftermath of a traumatic event. The protagonist of Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* illustrates this with an anecdote about attending a concert in support of disaster victims held on 9 April 2011, just under a month after the earthquake. He describes how the concert helped those after the trauma as it represented a return to the quotidian, to the "everyday" aspects of life: "Just what everyone wanted. To have music come back into everyday life like this, or perhaps to have an *everyday* in which music came back like this, is what everyone wanted. And my friends delivered a concert in tune with that desire."[78] These musician friends of the protagonist expressed their concern at playing a particular song, written several years before, that mentioned "radioactive rain":
"In this world," he began the song, "with twisted bodies we're gonna keep running,"

73 Furukawa 2016, pp. 24–25.
74 Furukawa 2016, p. 140.
75 Stolorow 2011, p. 55.
76 Furukawa 2016, p. 110.
77 Furukawa 2016, p. 111.
78 Furukawa 2016, p. 10.

Pelted by radioactive rain
We're gonna keep dancing
To the beat of this rain that does not stop
To the dance beat that does not stop
And again
Crank it up a notch[79]

Knowing that the protagonist is from Fukushima, the band debated whether or not to play the song: "'But you know, Furukawa-san, he was so troubled because he knew you were going to be here today. K was worried about playing this song in your presence; he was worried about the appropriateness of singing this with you in the audience.'"[80] Despite the protagonist's professed resistance to "naming" 3.11 in the same way that the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and other sites in America have become known globally in common parlance as "9.11," the musician's comments illustrate that since 3.11, something has profoundly changed. At the concert, the song brings the protagonist to tears, and performing it produces a visceral reaction in the lead singer: "The emotions were concentrated in my friend's body; you could see him shudder, could see the axis of existence, a staff of life, could see that his entire body and being was in the song."[81] Here, for both performer and audience alike, the song has acquired a profoundly different meaning from the time of its original production.

Conclusion

Recent studies of the construction of memory after 9.11 prove instructive for understanding the role of intertextuality in both Kawakami Hiromi's "Kamisama 2011" and Furukawa Hideo's *Horses, Horses*.[82] In a study of post 9.11 theater, Ilka Saal argues that, "trauma work entails not only the mending of physical and psychic wounds, but also the reconstruction of narrative structures."[83] Both "Kamisama 2011" and *Horses, Horses* represent the devastation wrought by the trauma of 3.11 not only through their content, but also through their narrative structure. "Kamisama 2011" can be regarded as a violated version of the original text, "Kamisama," structurally altered to reflect the realities in a new, post 3.11 Japan in which radiation screenings, protective clothing, and specialized terms such as cesium have come to constitute the "new normal." In *Horses, Horses* the narrative itself is in ruins: it is fragmented, disjointed, and out of order. Arguably, reading this type of trauma narrative is itself a profoundly unsettling act. The text does not provide a compass to guide the reader through the act of reading; instead, they must navigate through the frequently rocky terrain of the text, meandering through various literary styles and genres (stream of consciousness, historical narrative, poetry). In their study of literary and visual arts related to the trauma of the Holocaust, Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub examine how fragmentation in testimony emphasizes the importance of the listener: "When the trauma fragments, on the contrary,

79 Furukawa 2016, p. 11.
80 Furukawa 2016, p. 12.
81 Furukawa 2016, p. 11.
82 Although the two events, 9.11 and 3.11, are not directly comparable, it is noteworthy that after 3.11 some Japanese writers turned to 9.11 as a point of reference for thinking about traumatic events.
83 Saal 2010, p. 353.

accelerate, threaten to get too intense, too tumultuous and out of hand, he has to reign them in, to modulate their flow. And he has to see and hear beyond trauma fragments, to wider circles of reflections."[84] Felman and Laub argue that the fragmented nature of testimony creates an intimate bond between the traumatized subject and the listener; the listener becomes emotionally invested in the experience. In a similar vein, when evaluating "Kamisama 2011" and Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* as trauma narratives, reading similarly becomes an act of reassembling pieces of a puzzle, of forging connections, and of locating and producing meaning through those very acts.

Importantly, in "Kamisama 2011" and Furukawa's *Horses, Horses*, the formidable task of creating a counter-narrative to trauma does not simply fall to the author. When encountering these texts the reader is interpolated in the act of piecing together the fragments of trauma narratives, and thereby becomes an active agent, a subject participating in the production of meaning in the world post 3.11. The protagonist of Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* describes his struggle to formulate a literary response to the events of 3.11:

> Every time there was a strong aftershock, I would revise.
>
> The aftershocks left no options. A clear voice: "Revise completely and thoroughly."
>
> Same voice as that earlier voice that said: "Go there." So I followed the voice, waited for some things to fall into place, and started writing this. When the flow of things gets stopped up, sometimes you have to devise a way through. So I fashioned one.[85]

In their respective studies of Japanese fiction on 3.11, Kimura Saeko and Komori Yōichi both cite writer Don DeLillo's essays on 9.11, in which he argues for the importance of a response in the wake of disasters. As DeLillo suggests, there is arguably an ethical imperative for the reader to construct a counter-narrative to, or perhaps *from*, the "rubble" of the disaster.[86] Reading Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* and Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011" not only as intertextual "trauma narratives" but also as intertextual "trauma counter-narratives," it becomes evident that in the Barthesian "writerly" text, not only the author/text, but also the reader is required in the task of "devising a way through" trauma.

As previously discussed, most intertextual fiction is reflexive in nature, hearkening back to a preexisting trauma that continues to haunt the narrative in the present. Contrary to this norm, "Kamisama 2011" and *Horses, Horses* both contain traces of a *pre-traumatic past* in their present narratives. Undoubtedly, in both narratives the trauma exists not as a specter of the past haunting the present, but rather as a seemingly eternal present. With intertextual narratives, commonly the rewritten version destabilizes meanings associated with the preexisting narrative. In the case of both Furukawa's *Horses, Horses* and Kawakami's "Kamisama 2011," however, the source text is destabilized through the rewritten version, but the rewritten version is also profoundly *destabilizing*. That is, the rewritten texts identify a post 3.11, post-Fukushima reality that suggests an unsettling and uncertain

84 Felman and Laub 1992, p. 71.
85 Furukawa 2016, p. 8.
86 DeLillo 2001.

future. As scholars reflecting on the meanings associated with a "post 3.11" have indicated, declaring an "after" simultaneously creates a "before." A "post 3.11" creates a "pre 3.11," and what the 2011 texts by Kawakami and Furukawa highlight are the transformations in our way of looking at the world *before* and *after* 3.11. Unlike other intertextual works of trauma fiction, in these two works trauma does not constitute an historical event to be revisited or reworked; instead the trauma is *here* and *now*.

REFERENCES

Alexander 2012

Jeffrey C. Alexander. *Trauma: A Social Theory*. Polity, 2012.

Alexander et al. 2004

Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ron Eyerman, Bernard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka. *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. University of California Press, 2004.

Allen 2011

Graham Allen. *Intertextuality*. Second edition. Routledge, 2011.

Angles 2014

Jeffrey Angles. "These Things Here and Now: Poetry in the Wake of 3/11." In *When the Tsunami Came to Shore: Culture and Disaster in Japan*, ed. Roy Starrs. Koninklijke Brill NV, 2014, pp. 113–38.

Angles 2017a

Jeffrey Angles. "Poetry in an Era of Nuclear Power: Three Poetic Responses to Fukushima." In Geilhorn and Iwata-Weickgenannt 2017, pp. 144–61.

Angles 2017b

Jeffrey Angles. *These Things Here and Now: Poetic Responses to the March 11, 2011 Disasters*. Josai University Educational Corporation University Press, 2017.

Bakhtin 1981

M. M. Bakhtin. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holoquist, ed. M. Holoquist. University of Texas Press, 1981.

Barthes 1974

Roland Barthes. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. Hill and Wang, 1974.

Barthes 1977

Roland Barthes. *Image-Music-Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. Fontana, 1977.

Caruth 1995

Cathy Caruth, ed. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Caruth 1996

Cathy Caruth. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Caruth 2013

Cathy Caruth. *Literature in the Ashes of History*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013.

Coulmas 1982
Florian Coulmas. "Some Remarks on Japanese Deictics." In *Here and There: Cross-linguistic Studies on Deixis and Demonstration*, eds. Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1982, pp. 209–22.
DeLillo 2001
Don DeLillo. "In the Ruins of the Future: Reflections on Terror and Loss in the Shadow of September." *Harper's* (December 2001), pp. 33–40.
DiNitto 2017
Rachel DiNitto. "Literature Maps Disaster: The Contending Narratives of 3.11 Fiction." In Geilhorn and Iwata-Weickgenannt 2017, pp. 21–38.
Felman and Laub 1992
Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, MD. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History*. Routledge, 1992.
Furukawa 2008
Furukawa Hideo 古川日出男. *Seikazoku* 聖家族. Shūeisha, 2008.
Furukawa 2011
Furukawa Hideo. *Umatachi yo, soredemo hikari wa muku de* 馬たちよ、それでも光は無垢で. Shinchōsha, 2011.
Furukawa 2016
Hideo Furukawa. *Horses, Horses, in the End the Light Remains Pure: A Tale That Begins with Fukushima*, trans. Douglas Slaymaker and Akiko Takenaka. Columbia University Press, 2016.
Geilhorn and Iwata-Weickgenannt 2017
Barbara Geilhorn and Kristina Iwata-Weickgenannt, eds. *Fukushima and the Arts: Negotiating Nuclear Disaster*. Routledge, 2017.
Hoji et al. 2003
Hajime Hoji, Satoshi Kinsui, Yukinori Takubo, and Ayumi Ueyama. "The Demonstratives in Modern Japanese." In *Functional Structure(s), Form and Interpretation: Perspectives from East Asian Languages*, eds. Yen-hui Audrey Li and Andrew Simpson, pp. 97–128. Routledge, 2003.
Ikezawa 2011
Ikezawa Natsuki 池澤夏樹. "Sakura no shi: Nihen" 桜の詩: 二篇. *Shinchō* 新潮 (June 2011), pp. 87–89.
Ikezawa and Washio 2011
Ikezawa Natsuki and Washio Kazuhiko 鷲尾和彦 (photography). *Haru o urandari wa shinai: Shinsai o megutte kangaeta koto* 春を恨んだりはしない: 震災をめぐって考えたこと. Chūō Kōron Shinsha, 2011.
Ishii 2015
Ishii Masami 石井正己. "Watashitachi wa bungaku o tsutaerareru ka: Higashi Nihon daishinsai go no bungaku kenkyū kara (Tokushū: Toki o koete tsutaeru)" 私たちは文学を伝えられるか: 東日本大震災後の文学研究から (特集: 時を超えて伝える). *Nihon bungaku* 日本文学 64, no. 5 (May 2015), pp. 2–10.
Jinno 2011a
Jinno Toshifumi 陣野俊史. *Sekaishi no naka no Fukushima: Nagasaki kara sekai e* 世界史の中のフクシマ: ナガサキから世界へ. Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 2011.

Jinno 2011b
Jinno Toshifumi. "'3.11' to 'sono go' no shōsetsu" 「3・11」と「その後」の小説. *Subaru* すばる (August 2011), pp. 248–60.
Kaplan 2013
Carola M. Kaplan. "'Sudden Holes in Space and Time': Trauma, Dissociation, and the Precariousness of Everyday Life." *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 33, no. 5 (2013): 467–78.
Kawakami 2011a
Kawakami Hiromi 川上弘美. "Kamisama 2011" 神様 2011. *Gunzō* 群像 (June 2011), pp. 104–108.
Kawakami 2011b
Kawakami Hiromi. "Kamisama" 神様. *Gunzō* (June 2011), pp. 109–12.
Kawakami 2011c
Kawakami Hiromi. "Atogaki" あとがき. *Gunzō* (June 2011), pp. 113–14.
Kawakami 2012a
Kawakami Hiromi. "Kamisama" 神様. In Tanikawa 2012.
Kawakami 2012b
Kawakami Hiromi. "Kamisama 2011" 神様 2011. In Tanikawa 2012.
Kawakami 2012c
Kawakami Hiromi. "Atogaki あとがき. In Tanikawa 2012.
Kawakami 2012d
Hiromi Kawakami. "God Bless You, 2011." Trans. Ted Goossen and Motoyuki Shibata. In Luke and Karashima 2014, pp. 37–44.
Kawakami 2012e
Hiromi Kawakami. "Postscript." Trans. Ted Goossen and Motoyuki Shibata. In eds. Luke and Karashima 2014, pp. 44–48.
Kawakami 2012f
Hiromi Kawakami. "Kamisama." Trans. Ted Goossen and Motoyuki Shibata. In eds. Luke and Karashima 2014, pp. 48–53.
Kawamura 2013
Kawamura Minato 川村湊. *Shinsai: Genpatsu bungakuron*. 震災: 原発文学論. Impact Shuppankai, 2013.
Kimoto 2012
Takeshi Kimoto. "Post-3/11 Literature: Two Writers from Fukushima." *World Literature Today* (2012), pp. 14–18.
Kimura 2013
Kimura Saeko 木村朗子. *Shinsaigo bungakuron: Atarashii Nihon bungaku no tame ni* 震災後文学論: 新しい日本文学のために. Seidosha, 2013.
Kimura 2017
Saeko Kimura. "Uncanny Anxiety: Literature after Fukushima." In eds. Geilhorn and Iwata-Weickgenannt, pp. 74–89.
Kitada 2012
Kitada Sachie 北田幸恵. "Ihen o ikiru: 3.11 'Fukushima' igo no josei bungaku 異変を生きる: 3・11〈フクシマ〉以後の女性文学." In Nihon Bungaku Kyōkai Shin Feminizumu Hihyō no Kai 2012, pp. 106–118.

Komori 2014

Komori Yōichi 小森陽一. *Shisha no koe, seija no kotoba: Bungaku de tou genpatsu no Nihon* 死者の声、生者の言葉: 文学で問う原発の日本. Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 2014.

Kristeva 1986

Julia Kristeva. *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Columbia University Press, 1986.

Kuno 1973

Susumu Kuno. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. MIT Press, 1973.

Kuroda 1979

Kuroda Shigeyuki 黒田成幸. "(Ko), so, a ni tsuite" (コ)・ソ・アについて. In *Shijishi* 指示詞, eds. Kinsui Satoshi 金水敏 and Takubo Yukinori 田窪行則. Hitsuji Shobō, 1979, pp. 91–104.

Luke and Karashima 2012

Elmer Luke and David James Karashima, eds. *March Was Made of Yarn: Writers Respond to Japan's Earthquake and Tsunami*. Harvill Secker, 2012.

Matsumoto 2013

Matsumoto Katsuya 松本和也. *Kawakami Hiromi o yomu* 川上弘美を読む. Suiseisha, 2013.

Matsuura 2012

Matsuura Rieko 松浦理英子. "Kawatte inai to omou" 変わっていないと思う. *Shinchō* 新潮 (April 2012), pp. 190–91.

McLeod 2000

John McLeod. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester University Press, 2000.

Michimata 2011

Michimata Tsutomu 道又力, ed. *12 no okurimono: Higashi Nihon daishinsai shien Iwate-ken zaijū sakka jisen tanpen shōsetsu* 12の贈り物: 東日本大震災支援 岩手県在住作家自選短編小説. Araemishi, 2011.

Nihon Bungaku Kyōkai Shin Feminizumu Hihyō no Kai 2012

Nihon Bungaku Kyōkai Shin Feminizumu Hihyō no Kai 日本文学協会 新・フェミニズム批評の会, ed. "*3.11 Fukushima*" *igo no feminizumu: Datsu genpatsu to atarashii sekai e* 〈3・11フクシマ〉以後のフェミニズム: 脱原発と新しい世界へ. Ochanomizu Shobō, 2012.

Numano 2012

Numano Mitsuyoshi 沼野充義. *Sekai wa bungaku de dekite iru*: *Taiwa de manabu "sekai bungaku" renzoku kōgi* 世界は文学でできている: 対話で学ぶ〈世界文学〉連続講義. Kōbunsha, 2012.

Numano 2013

Mitsuyoshi Numano. "Shifting Borders in Contemporary Japanese Literature: Toward a Third Vision." In *Approaches to World Literature*, ed. Joachim Küpper. Akademie Verlag, 2013, pp. 147–66.

Rodi-Risberg 2010

Marinella Rodi-Risberg. "Writing Trauma, Writing Time and Space: Jane Smiley's *A Thousand Acres* and the *Lear* Group of Father-Daughter Incest Narratives." PhD dissertation, University of Vaasa, 2010.

Rosenbaum 2014

Roman Rosenbaum. "Post 3/11 Literature in Japan." In Starrs 2014, pp. 91–112.

Saal 2010
Ilka Saal. "'It's About Us!': Violence and Narrative Memory in Post 9/11 American Theater." *Arcadia* 45, no. 2 (2010), pp. 353–73.
Sakoda 2016
Kumiko Sakoda. "Errors and Learning Strategies by Learners of Japanese as a Second Language." In *Handbook of Japanese Applied Linguistics*, ed. Masahiko Minami. Walter de Gruyter, 2016, pp. 129–50.
Samuels 2013
Richard J. Samuels. *3.11: Disaster and Change in Japan*. Cornell University Press, 2013.
Scribner 1999
Charity Scribner. "Parting With a View: Wislawa Szymborska and the Work of Mourning." *The Polish Review* 44, no. 3 (1999), pp. 311–28.
Shirane 2012
Haruo Shirane. *Traditional Japanese Literature: An Anthology, Beginnings to 1600*. Abridged edition. Columbia University Press, 2012.
Slaymaker 2016
Douglas Slaymaker. "Translator's Afterword." In *Horses, Horses, in the End the Light Remains Pure: A Tale That Begins with Fukushima*, Hideo Furukawa, trans. Douglas Slaymaker and Akiko Takenaka. Columbia University Press, 2016, pp. 141–47.
Starrs 2014
Roy Starrs, ed. *When the Tsunami Came to Shore: Culture and Disaster in Japan*. Koninklijke Brill NV, 2014.
Stolorow 2011
Robert D. Stolorow. *World, Affectivity, Trauma: Heidegger and Post-Cartesian Psychoanalysis*. Routledge, 2011.
Stolorow 2015
Robert D. Stolorow. "Trauma Destroys Time." Blog. *Psychology Today*, 2015. https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/feeling-relating-existing/201510/trauma-destroys-time.
Suh 2012
Suh Kyungsik 徐京植. "'Igo' ni arawareru 'izen': Fukushima to Higashi Ajia (Intabyū)" 「以後」に現れる「以前」: フクシマと東アジア（インタビュー）. *Hihyō kenkyū* 批評研究 1 (2012), pp. 4–15.
Szymborska 2000
Wislawa Szymborksa. *Poems New and Collected: 1957–1997*. Trans. Stanislaw Baranczak and Clare Cavanagh. Roundhouse Publishing, 2000.
Sztompka 2004
Piotr Sztompka. "The Trauma of Social Change: A Case of Postcommunist Societies." In *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*, eds. Jeffrey C. Alexander et al. University of California Press, 2004, pp. 155–95.
Takahashi 2011
Takahashi Gen'ichirō 高橋源一郎. "Bokura no bunshō kyōshitsu dai nana kai" ぼくらの文章教室第7回. *Shōsetsu torippā* 小説トリッパー, Fall 2011, pp. 530–54.
Takahashi H 2012
Takahashi Hiroyuki 高橋宏幸, ed. *Igo no shishō* 以後の思想 (special issue, *Hihyō kenkyū* 1 [2012]).

Takahashi J 2012
Takahashi Jun'ichi 高橋順一. "3.11 igo no 'rinri' no kanōsei: Adoruno ni sokushitsutsu" 3・11 以後の〈倫理〉の可能性: アドルノに即しつつ. *Hihyō kenkyū* 1 (2012), pp. 16–37.
Tanikawa 2012
Tanikawa Shuntarō 谷川俊太郎, ed. *Soredemo sangatsu wa, mata* それでも三月は、また. Kōdansha, 2012.
Tokita 2015
Tamaki Tokita. "The Post-3/11 Quest for True Kizuna: *Shi no Tsubute* by Wagō Ryōichi and *Kamisama 2011* by Kawakami Hiromi." *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 13:7 (February 2015), pp. 1–13.
Tsujimura 2007
Natsuko Tsujimura. *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics: Second Edition*. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
Wagō and Angles 2011
Ryōichi Wagō and Jeffrey Angles. "Pebbles of Poetry: The Tōhoku Earthquake and Tsunami: *Shi no tsubute: Tōhoku no jishin to tsunami*" 詩の礫: 東北の地震と津波. *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 9:29:4 (19 July, 2011).
Whitehead 2003
Anne Whitehead. "Geoffrey Hartman and the Ethics of Place: Landscape, Memory, Trauma." *European Journal of English Studies* 7, no. 3 (2003), pp. 275–92.
Whitehead 2004
Anne Whitehead. *Trauma Fiction*. Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
Yamada 2012
Yamada Hiroaki 山田広昭. "Posuto 3.11 o kataru koto wa kanō ka: 'Jigo-sei' o megutte ポスト3・11を語ることは可能か:「事後性」をめぐって. *Hihyō kenkyū* 1 (2012), pp. 38–52.
Yano 2012
Yano Yutaka 矢野優, ed. "Hyaku nen hozon daitokushū: Shinsai wa anata no 'nani' o kaemashita ka? Shinsaigo, anata wa 'nani' o yomimashita ka?" 100年保存大特集: 震災はあなたの〈何〉を変えましたか？ 震災後、あなたは〈何〉を読みましたか？ *Shinchō* 新潮 (April 2012), pp. 158–217.