

THE STRUCTURE OF "LOVE" IN THE LITERATURE AND THE LIFE OF JAPAN AND THE WEST

—An Interdisciplinary Analysis
of the Characteristics of Love in Two Cultures—

by Morris J. Augustine

Epigrams

<i>Love in the West</i>		<i>Love in Japan</i>	
Sich hinzugeben ganz und eine Wonne	To give ourselves entirely to each other †	花の色は	Ironically fades
Zu fühlen, die ewig sein muss!	To feel a joy continuing forever †	うつりにけりな	The flower's color;
Ewig!—Ihr Ende wurde Verzweiflung sein,	Eternal love! Picture an end and hesitation †	いたずらに	And I give myself
Nein, kein Ende! kein Ende!—	Spells ruin to love. No! Endless love. †	わが身世にふる	To ceaseless flowing time
(Goethe's <i>Faust</i> and Ono no Komachi's 小野小町, 古今和歌集, II, 113)		ながめせしに	As the long rains fall.

INTRODUCTION

The first point I wish to make is that the present study does not concern literature purely and simply. Rather, it centers on literature but explores a wider area of discourse: the contrasting notions of and attitudes towards love in the Japanese and Western civilizations. The focus and thrust of my investigation can best be understood by means of a few words about how it began in the first place.

When I first arrived in Japan fifteen years ago, I had, only a few years previously, finished four years of graduate studies in Italy. Naturally, without really trying, I learned a great deal—mostly, of course, as a nonparticipating, impartial observer—about the manner in which Italian men and women, both married and single, went about expressing their “love” for one another. When a few years later I arrived in Japan, I was overwhelmed by the contrasting manners in which Italians and Japanese went about expressing their love. Our American mode lay somewhere between these two “foreign” manners of thinking about love, and expressing it. To explain the matter as briefly as possible, the Italians were exuberant and unabashed in expressing their attraction to the opposite sex; whereas the Japanese seemed not to express these feelings at all. Young Italian men, both in their facial expressions and in their tender and flamboyant behavior, expressed—even gloried in—their feelings. By contrast Japanese men’s faces expressed little feeling, and their behavior too, scarcely revealed the love and affection which they were surely feeling in their hearts. Why?

Between the married couples in our Japanese neighborhood as well, there was little or no show of affection—and yet they were in many cases model husbands and wives who did in fact love one another. In the course of fifteen years of research in religion and in literature I have gradually accumulated insights and have pieced together a set of answers. They are of necessity very general, but I believe they rest solidly both on primarily literary and religious texts and on the even more primary source of firsthand observation.

Romantic love between men and women is perhaps the central theme in the story and song of every culture—literate or illiterate. It is no less central in the greatest literary works of both Japan and the West. This of course will surprise no one. Absolutely no theme preoccupies human minds more obsessively. Few if any are more exciting or more beautiful. Absolutely none is more universal. All over the world men and women's bodies—brains, blood, hormones, organs—are alike enough to be transfused and transplanted. Yet "love" is strikingly variegated in the literatures—and in the daily lives—of different civilizations. And nowhere is this more strikingly evident than in the classical literary canons of Japan and the West.

The present effort certainly does not have as its goal a detailed textual study of love in even the major literary works of two civilizations. To begin with, such a study would be impossible; and secondly, such detailed textual studies of love already exist, made by a whole host of competent scholars in the East and West. The aim of the present effort is to catch a different kind of fish; and so the net to be used must have a very wide mesh. I propose to discuss three things.

First, these existent studies of the notion of love—from the love poems of the troubadours to those of Ono no Komachi and Hikaru Genji—will be used to present two contrasting sketches of ten major characteristics of love in the two literatures—replete with examples from the primary sources. I will argue that these two sets of ten characteristics of love constitute, in both civilizations, a single, closely knit, "classical synthesis" which a thousand odd years ago penetrated deeply and pervasively into the general discourse of the two civilizations—and that it is the transformations of these two classical syntheses which can explain, better than anything else, the strikingly different unconscious attitudes and notions about love which I observed on the faces and in the manners of the Italians and the Japanese.

Secondly, I wish to propose a very general but double interpretation of these two pervasive classic rhetorics and discourses of love: 1) how they came to be in the first place, and 2) the role they played in the still wider discourse on the nature of the family and of the proper education of children. I will argue that only by considering these wider social functions of the nature of love can we properly understand the nature of both the literary love rhetoric and the deeper, more unconscious, discursive elements which motivate the day-to-day attitudes and behavior of the Japanese and the Italians—and by

analogy, of every other individual culture.

Thirdly, our two comparative and contrasting sets of ten characteristics of love in literature will, then, serve as a foundation on the basis of which we can ask the question, Why? Why the difference? And why these particular differences? Finally, an introductory word about our method.

Derrida has made much of both "difference", and "différance"¹. Julia Kristeva has supplied some valuable answers with her arguments as to the intertextual nature of all texts². Applied to our subject, this means that "love" presents a familiar face—i. e. is recognizable as possessing certain distinctively Japanese or Western characteristics in any segment of the two canons of literature—because the same favorite "texts", written and unwritten, are continually used. Woven together in many ways, such "texts" constitute the warp and woof of love in any given culture.

Two other literary philosophers who will guide the course of my study are Michel Foucault and Kenneth Burke. The former is indispensable, both because his last work, *Histoire de la Sexualité*³ furnishes a schema vast enough to handle our subject, and because "sexuality" is very closely related to our subject of "love". Foucault applies his own previously developed method of tracing the "archaeology" or "genealogy" of sexuality by examining the various kinds of "pouvoir" or power which historically came together, in a more or less helter-skelter fashion, to constitute an overall, largely unconscious, "atmosphere" or "archive" of dominant notions of what is now known as sexuality⁴. While realizing that there were many economic, familial, governmental, and literary forces at work in the formation of Japanese and Western literary notions of love, we shall examine how two such major "powers" especially—the composite religious worldview of each civilization and the structures of the family systems—were of paramount importance.

Kenneth Burke is important because he has shown how closely related the "rhetoric of religion" is to the rhetoric of literature⁵. And we shall see how closely related, even in today's postreligious world, are the unconscious attitudes and values associated with literary notions of love and the respective religious traditions of Japan and of the West.

It seems both possible and helpful to meld Foucault's categories with those of Kristeva and Burke. The still powerful—though now largely unconscious—"atmospheres" or "archives" out of which modern authors write are still (less and less, but still powerfully) influenced by attitudes formed by Buddhist, Confucian, Christian, and Greco-Roman religious rhetoric and ways of believing and thinking.

In other words, my goal here is to begin to disclose the manner in which the specific worldviews, values, and attitudes of our two cultures have gone together to create two relatively cohesive and coherent, amazingly enduring, notions of love. Our study will, then, sketch the two "geneologies"⁶ of love. It goes without saying that these structures are always dynamic and changing, but it is often unnoticed that they also possess very tough and relatively stable inner cores. And these cores continue to affect not only the

literary geniuses of the two civilizations in the creation of new literature, but the day-to-day actions of people today.

A comparative approach seems best suited towards getting a peek at the complicated contents of our two largely unconscious archives of love notions—and at the larger human dynamic of discourse and intertextual influence which governs them both. Since time is limited we will immediately get down to business.

I. THE MAJOR NOTIONS OF LOVE IN JAPANESE AND WESTERN LITERATURE

The very notion of dealing with such a geographically huge and historically long-lived entity as “the West” may seem at first glance to be ridiculous. And, from most perspectives, perhaps it is. From our comprehensive comparative perspective, however, such a huge entity—vague and fragmented though it surely is—must be used. In order to make it both more useful and more realistic it seems best, in the present context, not to include the vast stretches of Greek and Roman literatures as such, but merely to refer to those portions of them which had deep and lasting effect on the period which we—again, somewhat arbitrarily—term the “classical” period: from roughly the tenth century A. D. in both cultures.

This of course still leaves us with a very heterogeneous field of literary territory. For our purposes here we limit the meaning of “the West” to the area covered not by the Roman empire but approximately that medieval entity known as the Holy Roman Empire. This area of western Europe was kept reasonably unified by both a western Christian worldview and a lingering Islamic threat, even after the Protestant Reformation and the beginnings of the modern national entities. This civilization was of course built on Greco-Roman foundations and was transplanted into the American and Australian colonies without a break in the linguistic or religious continuities—though, to be sure, with continuing evolution.

The best way to begin is to simply present a parallel list of the most important and enduring characteristics of love to be found within the classical literatures of the two civilizations. These characteristics have of course been slowly and painfully isolated during a lengthy period of research and discussion, and the reasons why they and not others were chosen will be unpacked in the course of the presentation. Still, they remain, in the end, merely one scholar’s opinion. Some of them have not been and will not be accepted by others as deserving such prominence. Also, in order to the gain proper focus for our treatment it will be necessary to bracket out of our treatment—for the time being—two obvious and extremely important facets of the broad notions of love in our two civilizations: the great variety and the continual development of notions of love in both cultures.

Regarding the first we cannot be distracted from our real focus—the central, dominant cores of the two love rhetorics—by the expected cacophony of many notions found in both literary and nonliterary sources which contradict elements of these two core lists. We will argue that not only a broad but central rhetoric of love exists and remains dominant in both cultures throughout a thousand years, but that most of the elements of these core characteristics are probably much older, often prehistorical.

It is to be expected that literally everything we say of love in the literature of either Japan or the West can be contradicted by a thousand examples to the contrary. Not only every society but every individual has his or her own, continually changing, idea of what love is. But we will focus on a single bundle of characteristic notions and attitudes which seem to be the most pervasive and central. We will argue that such a core of central notions is still very much alive—though, as we will see, under powerful attack—in the living ethos of contemporary Japanese and Western civilizations. This central tradition in both cultures we will call—at the risk of at first seeming arbitrary—their two “classical syntheses” on love. Thus in the West we remove from our focus the greater part of Greek, Roman, and early medieval literature and focus on the tradition which began with the loose synthesis generally known as Courtly Love in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Similarly, in Japan we will begin with the Golden Age of early Heian literature and argue that notions of and attitudes towards love which began then continued—with many a transformation—up through the time of Zeami, and through the Tokugawa’s Genroku Period, up until the present day. In both cases, of course, an overriding preoccupation which deeply influences our study is the question: Whither tomorrow? Have the unprecedented changes of the twentieth century completely destroyed these syntheses? Maimed them? Or is there just a little more development than in your average century? In our conclusion we address these difficulties directly.

As to the second facet to be bracketed out of the focus of our attention (the continual development of notions of love), we do not in any way intend, when we bravely state our ten central characteristics, either to ignore or deny the incontrovertible fact that in no two periods were these ten exactly the same. Quite the contrary. Of course they continually changed and developed. But the present context allows only for a passing treatment of the most important of these developments. To do more would distract from our present project: to marshal evidence that a central love ethos did and still does to some extent exist in each of the two civilizations, to comparatively describe these them, and to explore the human dynamic which produced them both. Once such a necessary broad focus is achieved, and the proper conclusions drawn therefrom, there will be time enough, in future treatments, to give the developmental aspect its proper consideration.

Without further ado, then, we will argue that the following double list of ten characteristics gets to the heart of the matter. There is, of course, nothing sacred about these two lists. They are only approximate and deliberately contrasting breakdowns of major

elements. They are stated in this manner simply as a convenient entrée into two love ethos which contain not only ideas but much more subtle values and attitudes. In both cases these elements are largely unconscious until brought to light by comparison with a totally different culture.

Also, it must be carefully noted that this double list is not about some sort of "love in general". Rather, it concerns a sharply focused object: it portrays the central notions of and approaches to passionate romantic (primarily premarital or extramarital) heterosexual love as they appear in the literature and life of Japan and the West during the past thousand years. This focus on literature in order to gain a purchase on a civilization's notions of love also has an important—and perhaps controversial—presupposition. It presumes that a people's literature is in general an accurate reflection of its worldview. It presumes that by studying the literature of a given culture one can gain valid if general insight into its ethos, or values and favorite moods and ways of acting. That is, in literature one can discern typical modes of both thinking about central aspects of life like love and favorite manners by which they are actually carried out.

The following lists then are more than a sketch of love themes found in classical literature written hundreds of years ago. They are also believed to be the best entrée into the two civilization's deepest and most long-lasting nonliterary modes of approaching the romantic and passionate phase of the man-woman relationship. Through them it is possible to go a long way towards disclosing both growth-curves and the suprising amount of continuity in people's ways looking at love.

JAPANESE LOVE

1. Typically, love is the glorious flower of human life
2. Love is "longing" (*koi*, 恋), for an absent lover
3. Neither *koi* nor any other word directly expresses love
4. Love is "to endure-remember" (しのぶ, 忍ぶ—憶ふ)
5. Better than words between lovers is silence—and secrecy
6. The male is dominant, once the woman freely gives her love
7. But the woman's love is stronger, so strong that she is helpless under its spell, "as in a dream" (夢中)
8. The flower of love has four seasons; and ends quickly
9. Passionate love is in the end vain and empty of meaning
10. Love is permeated with the pathos (哀れ) of its fragility

WESTERN LOVE

1. Typically, "real" love is forever.
2. Though a hard master, love ennobles the human heart
3. "True" love has a transcendent or divine dimension
4. Love is not, in essence, physical attraction; it is self-forgetful
5. Love involves a continual struggle between its Ovidian, or physical and ironic, and its Platonic-Christian, or ideal, elements
6. Man-woman love is a first step towards an all-embracing love
7. It is to be verbally expressed, directly to the beloved.
8. It is to be expressed passionately, graphically, insistently
9. Woman is the nobler lover; man learns love as her "servant"
10. Real love is in essence the same before and after marriage

Whereas love is seen in both cultures as basically a positive and extremely important part of human life, the first thing one notes in the above list is the startling contrast. In Japanese literature "love" (*koi*) passes quickly, whereas in the West love is "forever". In the West love should be verbally expressed; in Japan it should not. In the West the woman's love is generally seen as purer, more restrained—in many ways nobler—than the man's; in Japan it is the man's love which is all these things, and more. In the West love itself is pregnant with positive connotations. In its many forms it is the pivotal virtue governing all human relations: the keystone of ideal humanity, not just of man-woman relations. In traditional Japan notions of "love" (*koi*, 恋 or *ai*, 愛) are expressed

in much more negative terms: though seen as surpassingly beautiful, it not only passes quickly but is dangerous and deceptive.

Are these contrasts real? I will maintain that, yes, they are—either consciously or unconsciously—not only pervasively present in the daily life of Japanese and Western people today, they are also clearly visible in the literatures and in the daily lives of both peoples a thousand years ago. The intriguing mystery of this cross-cultural phenomenon is, "Why?" Why is this amazing quality of endurance clearly discernible in a central bundle of strikingly contrasting notions and attitudes regarding love, in spite of many revolutionary changes in every aspect of life and thought? Answering this "Why?" will be one of our major goals.

The next thing we notice is that the above list appears be—and of course is—extremely general in scope. Perhaps it also seems to be—but actually is not—culturally biased in favor of the West. Western love might appear to be painted white and Japanese love grey. But this impression will be dispelled as two truths are gradually disclosed. First, "love" as the word is used in Western society and literature covers an area immensely broader than the young, passionate, romantic love which is the focus of literature everywhere, and also is the focus of this analysis. As we will briefly discuss in the closing remarks, the word "love" (*amor*, *amour*, *liebe*, etc.) in the West has deep religious and familial implications, nuances, and allusions, which cannot really be disassociated purely and simply from the brilliant hues of romantic love. They influence it in very important ways.

Japanese *koi* on the other hand, corresponds very closely with the phenomenon of passionate heterosexual love seen from a more or less purely mundane point of view. Love underpins the religious and familial systems of the West; in Japan it does not. We shall see that Japanese religious and family systems contain every bit as noble, profound, and exalted notions regarding selfless consideration for and service of spouse, children, neighbor, country, and—especially—family (or *ie*, 家). The difference is that these are not linguistically connected with "love", as is the case in the West. Stated simply, the total "pie" of man-woman relations—inside and outside of marriage—is cut very differently in the two civilizations. This has very important results for the manner in which passionate young love is viewed in the two cultures.

The result of these differences is that passionate man-woman love in Japan is treated in a very specialized manner—and so manifests important—relatively negative—aspects of that relationship which receive little attention in its typical treatments within Western literature. Only when the subject of love is seen against the background of the mother-culture's history, family structure, and overall worldview will we gradually but clearly see that all of the riches of the human heart are developed in both civilizations under consideration—and if it is thus in these two very different cultures then surely it is also thus in all or most other cultures as well.

But as we look more carefully at this list we will also note striking similarities.

Literary embodiments of both *koi* and “love” contain sentiments of great tenderness, and self-forgetful consideration for the beloved. On the other hand, both notions are often coupled with cries expressing the pain involved in longing, or unrequited love, in abandonment, in jealousy, and at the suffering caused by the excesses to which passion drives the lover.

Another similarity between the two notions is the schizoid nature of both “love” and *koi*. On the one hand the unadulterated joy and pleasure of sexual union often shows itself in individual poems of both literatures; on the other hand sentiments of the highest self-denying benevolence towards even an unfaithful or unworthy lover also abound. To put the matter differently, in both civilizations love is at one time sheer physical ecstasy, and at another time pure selfless devotion of the heart.

All these similarities and contradictions contained within both notions of love will be examined in greater detail. But one final contradiction, already mentioned, must be clearly underlined before both sets of ten characteristics can be properly explored: each characteristic can be “refuted” with many contradictory examples from both literature and life. This should surprise no one, for each of the twenty characteristics is nothing more than a prevailing current within a veritable sea of contradictory attitudes, values, and notions. Each is simply the strongest among hundreds of often mutually contradictory and countervailing notions and opinions. The amazing endurance of these core characteristics seems to come from each being bonded with the others into a mutually reinforcing whole: an ethos of love.

This dynamic becomes easier to understand when we consider how all of us as individuals in the course of our lives go through a whole gamut of shifting attitudes towards and notions of love. But most of us eventually work through to a more or less coherent and enduring posture as we reach higher stages of maturity. And this stage is one which is more or less consistent with that of our closest neighbors and friends. Love is a social thing and the individual forms his or her mature stance in conjunction with the prevailing views of the culture.

Thus it is that each of the ten characteristics in either culture, can be “refuted” with citations to the contrary of a hundred poems and stories, and still be authentic. One reason is that, for all their endurance and pervasiveness, these characteristics are in their most fundamental nature simply established ways of thinking and acting: *tatema* (建て前). They are cultural forms produced out of notions, attitudes, and procedures which have proven particularly successful—and so are particularly beloved—in handling one of human beings’ most powerful instincts. They do not always work, however, and so many alternative ones are constantly being touted, tried—and usually rejected.

For example, Japanese love poetry, though in general of a relatively pessimistic bent, can be shown to be often marvelously optimistic and lyrical. And Western love is often pessimistic, but the opposite moods are predominant. Women’s love in Japan can be

shown to be as noble or nobler than men's, as Western women can be seen to be painted as selfish, deceitful, and seductive. All this tangle of contradictions can seem to be a refutation of our whole project—especially when seen on the background of the kaleidoscope of continually changing tastes, social conditions, and developments of many kinds. Certainly, there is no reason why one cannot choose to emphasize change rather than endurance. But this in no way nullifies the legitimacy of our project which takes all such change into consideration at every step, while pursuing the nature and causes of characteristics which survive change.

The plain fact remains that the central love ethos sketched above—composed of distinct attitudes, values, and favored notions—can be seen resurfacing so often in both societies and in both literatures as to constitute an important working part of the two civilizations' identities. There are in every civilization more or less prevalent rules as to precisely how men and women are expected to fall in love, mate, and reproduce. Our goal is to use the most beautiful literary expressions of these expectations in Japan and in the West, to explore comparatively the human dynamic regulating how love among these two peoples remains the same while it continually changes.

A. The Central Characteristics of Love in Japanese Literature

Before we begin to look at the vocabulary used to describe heterosexual love in Japanese literature, our first characteristic invites us to take a look at the still larger picture of love as painted in such classics as the *Man'yōshū* (万葉集), the *Genji Monogatari* (源氏物語), the *Kokin Wakashū* (古今和歌集), and the like.

1. The first of our ten characteristics is properly love as the flower of adult life: that particularly rich and complex positive quality of love in the Japanese classics. This may be called both a naturalistic and a religious picture of passionate man-woman love. In a civilization where the human being's oneness with nature lies at the very center of its worldview, the belief that love is "natural" has deep religious connotations. In both its myths and teachings the native animistic religious system—only loosely called *Shinto* (神道) since it originally has so many different gods, myths, and forms—teaches that human beings form a living continuum with not only the fauna and flora but with the mountains and fertile plains which support them. And everywhere male and female love is beautiful, strong, and fertile.

Not only do the gods inhabit mountains and valleys; the very mountains and their stones are "alive". The *Kojiki* (古事記)—that amalgam of myth and history which served Japan in the same unifying and identity-bestowing capacity that the Hebrew Bible did for the ancient Jews—begins with Izanami and Izanagi and their love-making. This highly ritualistic creation—myth teaches that their mountains and rice bearing valleys were born of the same divine parents as their emperor, and themselves—born of a loving union wherein the male was completely dominant.

It is not surprising then that the wonder of man-woman love kept the same sacred mystery in literature which it manifested in that first divine pairing⁷². Nor should it come as a surprise to see mirrored in the greatest love stories and poetry the same cycle of magnificent flowering, fruitfulness, withering, and death observed year after year on those brotherly mountains and in those sisterly fields.

河の上の	いつ藻の花の	何時も何時も	来ませわが	背子時じけめやも	
Kawa no ue no			Like the duckweed flowers		
Itsumo no hana no			Always trailing in the river		
Itsumo itsumo			My lover, always coming back		
Kimase waga			Could never come		
Seko toki jikemeyamo			In the wrong season.		(<i>Man'yoshu</i> , IV, 491)

In the *Genji Monogatari* the rich and complex panorama of love as the heartbeat of nature is revealed. Hikaru Genji is not only the man par excellence; he is the perfect divinely ordained prince, who only by accident and not by birth and desert fails to become the emperor—as his father and son were. And as son and father of divinely endowed sons of the goddess Ameratesu, an emperor in every way but name, he is also the perfect lover.

Genji's prowess and prerogatives as a lover are nowhere more brilliantly portrayed, perhaps, than when the heat of his royal love drives him into karmic excess. But this excess must be, and in time is, duly atoned for. Even though he bestows his all-too-fertile love in places where taboos are strongest—in the bed of his imperial father's wife Fujitsubo⁸³, and on the barely adolescent Murasaki whom he has brazenly kidnaped and adopted⁸⁴—he resolutely bears the karmic repercussions⁸⁵ and regains the favor of the gods during his exile in Suma and Akashi.

The positive element of love, deeply embedded in Japanese culture, is seen most clearly perhaps in the impeccable grace, the splendor of dress, the perfection of the poetry, scents, and manners which accompany the courtship and lovemaking of "the Shining Prince". Just as the cherry blossoms of spring symbolize the marvelous beauty by which nature opens its cycle of fertility, so Genji's polished accomplishments symbolize the ideals of Japanese love. Genji's power over women is tempered by his gentle consideration and his responsibility both for his amorous adventures and for the women who one after another fall under the spell of his charms.

We will note below how the poems of the *Kokinshu* too reflect the same exultant mood of glorying in the wonders of new found love—even while anticipating the more sinister side of the coin of love as, like the flowers of spring, it leads inexorably through summer towards fall and the death of winter.

But there is another reason why the *Kokinshu* deserves our attention. Ki no Tsurayuki's Preface to this first and greatest of the anthologies compiled at the emperor's com-

mand shows clearly that such literary expressions of the human heart are intended to be more than mere nice sentiments and clever words. Rather, such words are born directly out of the human heart. As such, they express a civilization's deepest perceptions of the nature of love. Hence, there is no better source to which we can turn for an accurate mirror of the ways of the human heart as it was, and still is, understood by the Japanese.

The seeds of Japanese poetry lie in the human heart and grow into leaves of ten thousand words. Many things happen to the people of this world, and all that they think and feel is given expression in description of things they see and hear. When we hear the warbling of the mountain thrush in the blossoms or the voice of the frog in the water, we know every living being has its song¹⁰.

There can be no clearer expression of the manner in which the animistic worldview of early Japan—which unites men and women and all their feelings with the whole of nature—enters directly into the moods, the emotions, and the very poetics of its literature. According to this view literature is in its essence simply the outpouring "in ten thousand words" of the abundance of nature's beauty. The poet, in intimate union with the rest of a divine and living nature, hears, sees, and otherwise experiences. Then he translates it all into words of truth.

Though the notion of love in Japanese literature is clearly positive in the manner sketched here, that is only one side of it. In the other characteristics we begin to see how thoroughly saturated it is with sadness, even grief, that such magnificent feelings last only an instant and can lead to so much loneliness and despair.

The analysis of the next four of our ten characteristics must begin with a close look at the words chosen to express love. It is a good place to begin, because the manner in which this vocabulary divides itself and highlights the major categories and aspects of man-woman love could scarcely be more different than the way words for love are chosen and emphasized in the West. The next four of our ten characteristics are bound up with this linguistic aspect.

2. The oldest and most pervasive word for passionate male-female love is *koi* (恋) or "longing". A good example of the ubiquitous "love as longing" motif running throughout the length and breadth of Japanese literature is found at its very beginning: in the *Man'yōshū*. Almost every poem in Book Four—the section set aside for love poems—clearly expresses love as longing. I give as an example Princess Nukata's beautiful and lonely poem of longing-love for her Lord:

君待つと わが恋をれば	わが屋戸の	すだれ動かし	秋の風吹く
Kimi <i>matsu</i> to		Waiting for my lord,	
waga <i>koi</i> woreba		I sit here longing	
waga yado no		While the reed screen	
sudare ugokashi		Which shades my door	
Aki no kaze fuku.		Rattles in the autumn winds.	

Following closely behind “koi” are a number of allied words like *shinofu* (しのぶ), or “admiring”, *shinobu* (しのぶ), “yearning”, “remembering”, or “enduring”, *omou* (思ふ), or “to think lovingly on”, *matsu* (待つ), or “to wait for”, *uruwashi* (麗し), “graceful”, or “lovely”, and *utsukushi* (美し), “beautiful”, and the like.

“Longing” or *koi*—as well as most of the other words just listed—implies by its very nature that the lover is absent. Love in any society’s literature sings the plaints of separated lovers longing for each other—but in classical Japan it is the central and definitive perspective. A part of the reason is, as we shall see below in 4., the delicate sense of *enryo* (遠慮) (“restraint-endurance”) and *しのぶ* (“longing” or “enduring”) which typically prevents lovers from expressing their feelings verbally in face-to-face encounter.

3. None of these various words used to express passionate man-woman love do so directly and unequivocally. A striking characteristic of them all is that they convey their tender and passionate message in an indirect and at least partially ambivalent manner. *Koi* and its verb form, *kou* is often used to express longing for someone’s absent village, or for beautiful autumn colors fondly remembered. Sometimes these evocations are intricate. The above-mentioned verb, *shinofu* or “admire”—whether or not its object is a lover—also carries the connotation of the cognate word, *shinobu* “bearing up under” or “enduring”¹¹. This important notion will be discussed more fully below under 4. It would seem that the ancient Japanese were so partial to the notion that love involved secretly enduring rather than revealing and giving expression to their feelings of love that they gave it many different shades of meaning, any one of which has the ability of indirectly evoking an “epiphany” of love. *Shinofu*’s first connotation was that loving someone or something involved a restrained enduring or bearing up in silent wonder under the attraction of the desirable thing. Nakanishi cites the example of the *Man’yōshū*’s poem of Princess Nukada (I, 16) expressing her “admiration” (*shinofu* of the colored leaves on the fall mountainside:

秋山の 木の葉を見ては 黄葉をば 取りてそ <u>しのぶ</u>	
Akiyama no	Gazing on the leaves
Ki no ha wo mite wa	Of the trees in the fall mountains
Momichi wo ba	I pluck a yellow leaf
Torite so <i>shinofu</i>	And stand in silent admiration

Here the primary connotation is clearly and simply that of admiration and is expressed by *shinofu*. But a second element enters when the admiration and restraint have as their object a lover. Then it is accompanied with a strong added connotation usually expressed by the cognate *shinobu*, that of not openly—especially in the initial stages—expressing one’s love in words, even in the form of a love poem sent to an absent lover. Still further, even after love had been mutually acknowledged and even consummated, their love is still restrained in that ideally it is not expressed openly and in words.

4. In addition to the notions of longing which *kou* expresses, the fourth nuance which is absolutely central to the Japanese literary themes of love, is in fact the mixture of "enduring" and "yearning expressed in the word", *shinobu* (しのぶ: 忍ぶ—偲ぶ). This nuance of "enduring" is itself a very complex notion—at least from the Western point of view. It includes of course the enduring of the absence of the beloved.

Just as *shinobu* can refer to any kind of "enduring" or "longing"; so the words for "remembering", "thinking about", and the like can refer to any object at all. One understands an expression of love only indirectly and delicately as it were, from the context. Going back much earlier than the poem above, to the fifth century reign of the Emperor Ingyo (允恭天皇), we read in the *Kojiki* (III, 122) and also in the *Man'yoshu* (XIII, 3263) a poem which commemorates Japan's first recorded double suicide by lovers. There we find essentially the same sentiments of "longing", "yearning", and "remembering" for an absent lover which we saw in the previous example. And clearly these sentiments are worlds apart from "love" (*ai*) as it has come to be known in Japan since the Meiji era.

The imperial Prince Karu no Miko, because he became the lover of his full sister Karu no Iratsume, was denied the throne, and later exiled. The text says that after he "longed for his lover with an unbearable longing" (後亦恋ひ堪へずて) she came to him, and before they died together he sang this song,

あが <u>思</u> う妻	ありと言はばこそ	家にも行かめ	国をも <u>偲</u> はめ	
Aga omou tsuma		My beloved wife		
ari to ihaba kosoni		Only if they say you are there		
le ni mo ikame		Would I return to my home		
Kuni wo mo <i>shinohame</i>		Would I "yearn for" my native land.		(III, 122)

In spite of this ambivalence all of the above words well express all the aspects of that phenomenon which is denoted by "love" in the West. Hence, for convenience sake we will refer to it as "love"—even while showing how different, and how alike, the two notions are. All of the words denoting love connote one or another aspect of a whole complex of feelings which embrace the same general emotional territory which young, passionate, romantic, and usually pre- or extramarital "love" covers in the West. Consider the following example from the *Man'yoshu*, which uses another verb to express "enduring" the pain of yearning:

言清く	いたくもな言ひそ	一日だに	君いし無くは	<u>痛</u> きかも	
Koto kiyoku		Do not speak to me			
Itakumo naiiso		With all your pretty words,			
Hitohi dani		Just one day			
Kimi ishi naku wa		Without you, my Lord			
<i>Taegataki</i> kamo		Is painfully hard to bear			(IV, 537)

This kind of *shinobu ai* (偲愛) is seen very frequently. The first poem of the *Man'yōshū's* section devoted to love (Book IV) illustrates the coincidence of longing and enduring. Even though the vocabulary is different, the meaning is clearly the same as described above. It was sent by the wife of the Emperor Nintoku, but "wife" in a polygamous system is a relatively ambiguous term.

一日こそ 人も待ちよき	長き日を	かくのみ待たば	ありかつましじ
Hito hi koso		To wait for a single day	
Hito mo machi yoki		Any man can manage.	
Nagaki hi wo		But throughout these many days	
Kaku nomi <i>mataba</i>		To wait for you...	
Ari katsu <i>mashiji</i>		I cannot endure it.	(IV, 484)

Typically, then, one sees a subtle confluence of notions of intense beauty, of enduring, loneliness, and praise: all combining to express love. Either persons (lovers or otherwise as the above example shows) or things (like the autumn leaves above) described by words like *utsukushi* and *uruhashi* can be the object of verbs like *koi*, *shinobu*, and their synonyms. The *Man'yōshū* and almost every subsequent collection of love poetry are filled with this kind of language and sentiment.

The most striking examples of love as *shinobu* express an enduring of the absence of the lover; but they also carry the connotation of "enduring" his or her presence as well. That is, the passionate and wonderful sentiments of love felt in the presence of the beloved are best restrained or endured, rather than expressed. Emotions of love felt in the presence of the beloved—or the satisfied and grateful love felt after love is fulfilled in union—are to be "endured" in this special manner. That is, they are not to be expressed in words. "Love" or *koi* in Japan, as we will see, seems bound up to an amazing degree with secrecy and silence of many kinds.

This notion of the "enduring" quality of love has continued to develop throughout a thousand years of Japanese literature. It is interesting to note that someone as recent as Mishima expressed his admiration for the notion expressed in the medieval samurai work, the *Hagakure* (葉隠れ), that "the ultimate love is the secret love... to die of love without uttering the beloved's name"¹².

Nakanishi in the work cited above very penetratingly analyses the whole complex of the relations between love and "enduring" in the following manner.

It was praise [*shinofu*] which expressed this kind of longing. This act of praising actually depended on a kind of suppression of one's feelings of love. But does not this kind of suppressing only make love all the more unmistakable? If we call "love" such a feeling of longing, then the praise of the object of such love reaches its fulfillment by means of an initial suppression of love. This was the mode of being of our love. (9)

As we have already noted, this notion is closely bound up with the central Japanese

social virtue of *enryo*, or "restraint". The result is that, in Japanese literature as well as life, love is not having to say, "I love you". The idea is that if love is strong enough, words are both inadequate and unnecessary. The above quotation from the *Hagakure* is a fine example of the extreme lengths to which these notions of enduring restraint have been taken in the course of its development, especially when Zen Buddhism and the Samurai spirit gave them new impetus and meaning.

It is easy to see that these first five characteristics are very closely bound up with one another; so closely, in fact, that they amount to a single integrated outlook on love, one so deeply engrained in the Japanese cultural identity as to be largely subconscious and spontaneous, rarely if ever averted to on the conscious level. As a result, it is extremely difficult even for the Japanese themselves to bring it into the light of conscious analysis, except perhaps by means of the kind of cross-cultural analysis which we are attempting here. It would seem likely that this complex of notions, attitudes, and approaches to love is the result of a primordial prehistoric shaping of love which experience and the Japanese language gave to it long before the first Japanese story or poem got written down. It remains today deeply engrained in the subconscious of today's Japan.

5. It is worth noting in more detail how all five of these characteristics seem to revolve around the axis of secrecy and silence. One of the important reasons why love in the Heian period and earlier, was typically for an absent lover is simply because, in fact, the lover was absent most of the time. Typically, the man visited the house, and bed, of his lover—or even of his legal consort or mistress—at night and left before dawn. This was the system known as "commuter's marriage", or *kayoikon* (通い婚). These comings and goings could scarcely have been unknown to the parents or guardian of the woman. In fact they were very often eagerly cultivated and sought after, for this was the normal way in which marriage was arranged. In fact, three such meetings constituted marriage and, then it would seem, the need for secrecy would end. In fact, however, the need for secrecy often continued. This was the case because of the particularly lenient manner in which various degrees and kinds of polygamy—and love affairs of many kinds on the parts of both men and women, married and unmarried—were tolerated in the aristocratic and courtly strata of Japanese society¹³. In this context silence and secrecy were simply prudence.

But the Western mind is not satisfied to cease inquiry at this point. Being culturally conditioned to very different expectations, it still asks the question "Why?" Why should these many loves be kept secret if they were sanctioned by both law and custom? One good reason is, of course, jealousy. Another is that faithfulness remained proper in degrees which varied from very strict to mere formality, as a *tatemaie*. And why is love not to be expressed in words, even to the beloved? Japanese love poetry is filled with the agonies of keeping secret the love burning fiercely in the body and mind of the lover. Once again, Why?

Actually, upon further thought, this is not so strange. Typically, young love in the West begins in the same manner: burning love afraid to reveal itself for fear of rejection, ridicule, or rivalry. The institutions of courtship differ from culture to culture, but naturally there is great deal of secrecy in every culture's romance. Whether from shyness, shame, or desire to be alone with each other, lovers hide their love and their loving. They conceal the depth and power of their emotions from the public gaze.

Thus love everywhere has an element of endured longing when the lover is absent and often wordless communication of love when in others' presence. Japanese modes may seem to Western people to exaggerate this aspect, but it is a perfectly natural reflection of long established institutions of courtship and marriage, and of the worldviews which support and reflect them.

Now we arrive at a second cluster of love notions which evince a very different kind of standpoint, tone, and meaning. The last three in particular have to do with more deliberate, refined, and rationalized literary aspects of love. Nevertheless, they too are easily visible in the everyday notions of contemporary Japanese people's treatments of love.

6. The first of this second group of five characteristics is so clearly seen both within and outside of literature that it needs little explanation: the male is superior to the female in the love relation. He is, even before marriage, literally her "lord" (*shūjin*, 主人).

Typically, the woman waits; the man initiates the relationship. Even after the love relation has reached full flower, it is still the man who decides when and how. Even in contemporary society both lover and wife still wait. They rarely question the man's midnight comings and goings—with friends, business associates, or lovers.

The *Genji Monogatari* is surely the text in which to study the last half of our ten Japanese love characteristics. The "Shining Genji"—along with his somewhat more historical counterpart, Ariwara no Narihira—has been the archetypal lover in Japan for almost a thousand years. His loves were wondrously numerous and variegated. He kept a main wife (*kita no kata*, 北の方) and a large number of official consorts and lovers all under the same roof of his Rokujo palace. And in addition there were many more informal liaisons with women on the outside.

In this aristocratic world, relatively free from either financial worries or the cares and fears of office, love—quickly flowering and often just as quickly fading—could and did become one of life's primary entertainments and preoccupations. It is no wonder then that it reached the status and subtlety of a fine art—and to some degree it became the ideal of Japanese of all classes even in the modern period, now that they they have become educated enough to learn of it and adapt it to their own time and circumstances. The large number of wives, consorts, and lovers permitted—indeed expected—of a great prince or lord does not imply that in the author Murasaki's day the male lover had no obligations to his women. In addition to the very serious obligation he had to his main wife—the mother of the heirs to his "house" or family—every nobleman, and by extension

in later eras, every decent man, was bound by serious rules of politeness, consideration, and delicacy in his relations with all his lovers. And these naturally increased in seriousness according to the rank of the woman as well as the man. Herein is constituted one of the major elements of Japanese love literature: the lover's worth as a human being as well as the degree of their elegance and sensitivity were determined by the refinement with which all of the rules of courtship were obeyed. And central to this major element is the man's role as the unquestioned master in almost every phase of the man-woman relationship.

But the truth is that—as might be expected—this matter is not simple at all. And again the case of Genji serves as a good model to help us understand. He was the "Shining Prince". As Shirane points out, this almost palpable aura was a special mark of divine predilection¹⁴). Being the son and father of an emperor—who would himself have inherited his father's throne had not nasty court politics prevented it—Genji's astounding beauty, taste, and bearing showed him to have inherited the divine grace of the imperial descendant of the Sun Goddess Ameratesu.

Not only in Japan but in China—Japan's half-model, half-rival—as well, the legends of great princes included descriptions of their great prowess, passion, and potency as lovers. First as males and secondly as archetypal males, it was their destiny and prerogative, not only to rule their lovers as lords and masters, but to seduce, induce, or simply seize, any female who strongly captured their fancy. These qualities and prerogatives hung over Genji as a part of his "radiance". In other words, Genji's superlative skills as a master lover, together with the general elegance and consideration with which his love affairs were carried out, are a very important part of his portrait as a Japanese prince—and slowly they became, in the course of centuries, the ideal of the Japanese male in general, each on his own level of wealth and sophistication.

This is not to imply, however, that the woman did not (does not) have her own strengths and prerogatives, and her own manner of influencing the course of love. In fact, Japanese literature, especially the Genji Monogatari, shows clearly that the woman's officially passive and submissive role can mask initiatives and inventiveness in love every bit as competent—and (unofficially) sanctioned—as those in the West.

7. The qualities of a woman's love in Japanese society are as striking as those of the man. To begin with, though she is portrayed as the passive, weak, and unstable one, it is her love which is seen as the more intense and enduring. Typically, it lasts until death, or at least until hopelessness drives her to accept another's attentions.

Further, the woman is seen as being of so passionate a nature that, once love is unleashed, she is completely overwhelmed. In a favorite image the woman is an "drifting boat" (*ukifune*, 浮き舟) and her love is a "floating bridge of dreams" (*yume no ukihashi*, 夢の浮き橋) caught up in the raging waters of her own and the male's passion. Once she is swept away in the tide it is she who must wait for the visits of her lover. She

is powerless. Her love becomes her world, and all else a dream. But in fact it is her love which is the dream, and she lives in this dream continually. She was then and is today thought to be "lost in a dream" (*muchū*, 夢中).

In the *Genji Monogatari* these themes occur often, nowhere more clearly than in the story of the girl whose name is Ukifune: "Drifting Boat". As she prepares to commit suicide after her lovers drive her into hopeless entanglements, she offers this poem:

たち花の	小鳩の色は	変らじを	この浮き舟ぞ	ゆくへ知られぬ
Tachibana no			The colors	
Kojima no iro wa			On the little Island of Orange trees	
Kawaraji wo			Will not greatly change,	
Kono ukifune zo			But where shall change lead me,	
Yukue shirarenu			A boat adrift in the water?	

(Ch. 51, of the *Genji Monogatari*, cf. p. 591 of Seidenstecker's translation)

Ono no Komachi expresses this woe of women as no one else:

わびぬれば	身をうき草の	ねをたえて	さそう水あらば	いなんとぞ思ふ
Wabi nureba		My lonely body		
Mi wo ukikusa no		Like a floating weed		
Ne wo taete		Severed in its roots:		
Sasou mizu araba		Whenever a current intices		
Inan to zo omou		It yields without resistance.		

(One no Komachi, *Kokinshu*, XVIII, 938)

But the woman in love is not to be lightly toyed with. She is dangerous. Surely the most striking manifestation of the strength and passion of a woman's love in Japanese literature is the recurrent image of the woman driven mad by despair and jealousy after losing her lover. Genji's Lady Rokujo is the archetype of a whole type of love literature which can be seen in every genre from poetry, to the novel, to the Noh play. The power and depth of this archetypal woman's love transforms her into a veritable demon, and as such she often enters into her rival's soul and takes possession of it, driving it into insanity and death. The consuming ferocity of rejected woman's jealousy and hatred is well known in every culture. Nowhere is it portrayed with more power and vividness than in the class of Noh plays (*Kyojomonon*, 狂女物) which often deals with this subject.

8. Love in Japanese literature is closely related to the four seasons. Like all else alive in nature, it has its budding, its flowering, its maturity, its withering, and—inevitably—its death. All of its most powerful and beautiful images take their characteristic qualities, tones, and moods from these seasons, and from places and things associated with them. So all-pervasive is this quality that it provides the very structure of the *Kokinshu*'s five books of love poems.

The initial stages of love are filled with images of early spring: the first real reve-

lations of mutual love are typically portrayed with evocations of spring flowers in full bloom. Although the work's five sections portray five—not four—stages to the trajectory of love—its first hints, its initial revelations, its maturation, its fading, and its death—each of these stages are beautifully evoked with the help of images from the appropriate season. Love's fading and end are highlighted with pictures of dry grass, snow, and the evanescence of the dew drop.

In the books of love poems the classic pattern of Japanese courtly love appears: the books open with poems on the first glimpses of the beloved and move on to love after meeting, fear of the loss of love, and the sadness and, ultimately, resignation that come with the end of the love affair¹⁵.

Concerning this same connection between love and the seasons in the *Genji*, Norma Field says, "What we must not overlook, however, is the extent to which *Genji*'s metamorphosis into an erotic god... is governed by the calendar"¹⁶.

9. The dark side of this seasonal characteristic of love is that, inevitably, all love, however beautiful, noble, or powerful in its flower, is doomed, even from its inception, to a wintry end. And when it is gone there is nothing left at all. Hence love is portrayed as being ultimately an empty, passing, and meaningless passion. All of these elements come together in the Buddhist notion of "transience" (*mujo* 無常), which unquestionably helped to form them—first in China and then in Japan. Not only love but literally everything animate and inanimate passes away in the end and leaves not a trace. It is interesting to note how Japan's two major religious traditions dovetail in perfect harmony here. The native Shinto notions and myths of man's essential oneness with nature—and nature's seasonal rhythms—supports and is supported by the Buddhist notion that all things are passing. We will see below that a third tradition, the Confucian one, is not less important.

A good example in the *Genji* of this quickly passing quality of love is well-expressed in another poem by Ukifune,

袖触み	人こそ見えぬ	花の香の	それかと匂ふ	春の明けぼの
Sode fure shi			Only the sleeve of his garment,	
Hito koso mienu			Himself I no longer see.	
Hana no ka no			Ah, the perfume of the flower	
Sore ka to nioufu			Is it the fragrance of that sleeve	
Haru no akebono			In this early Spring dawn?	(Ch. 53, Seidenstecker, 1076)

Not only do each of *Genji*'s beautiful lovers die early of broken hearts or leave the world for monasteries, *Genji* himself does the latter before he dies. Although this is in essence a tale of the magnificence of love, its rhetoric brings it all not just to

a sad end, but to a feeling of the bitterness at the vanity of even the most glorious of romances. This is nowhere more sharply expressed than where Genji bids good-by to the dying Murasaki, the woman who held his love the longest. She has just compared her own love and death to dew. He answers,

ややもせば 消えをあらそう 露の世に おくれ先だつ 程へずもがな

Yaya mo seba	The drops of dew struggle	
Kie wo arasou	To quickly disappear	
Tsuyu no yu ni	In this dew-like world.	
Okure sakidatsu	May the drop which goes first	
Hodo hezu mogana	Not go too long before the last.	(IV, 491)

Likewise, the poems of Ono no Komachi in the *Kokinshu* furnish perhaps the best example.

いろみえて うつろふものは 世の中の 人の心の 花にぞありける

Iro miede	The color fades,	
Utsurofu mono wa	The fickle thing;	
Yo no naka no	In this floating world	
Hitono kokoro no	A person's heart	
Hana nizo ari keru	Is like the flower	(XV, 787)

Below, in Part II, we will examine in more detail the crucial role which religious worldviews played in the formation and preservation of the love notions of both Japan and the West. There can scarcely be a better illustration of this than that seen in the coincidence of Buddhist transience and the ubiquity of the theme that love inevitably and completely vanishes without a trace. It is not just like a dream. It is a dream. But these religious views were not imposed artificially, from without, as it were. They represent a culture's deepest possible insights into the real nature of things. That is why even today most of the restraints, moods, attitudes, and values which were expressed in religious terms are still largely in place. They still represent the wisdom of experience as to how the older generation can best hand on to the next the wisdom by which the turbulent stream of love can best be safely negotiated. Men and women have not changed in any essential manner, and the favored restraints and proprieties which worked well in the past still by and large work today—with considerable freedom added on account of economic, political, and medical gains.

10. Arising out of numbers 8 and 9—and powerfully pervading every aspect of love in Japan—is the feeling or emotion of *aware* (哀れ): pathos in the face of love's intense beauty and quick transience. Motoori Norinaga, in his *Genji Monogatari tama no Ogushi*, makes this sense of *aware* the center of Japanese aesthetics, and the center of *aware* to be love: "Nothing is felt more deeply by the human heart than love.

Therefore, *aware* is experienced particularly profoundly, indeed unendurably, most often in love¹⁷⁾. Love is, for all its brilliance and power (like life itself) an illusion, a "floating bridge of dreams"¹⁸⁾.

Perhaps nowhere can one better see both the pathos of love and the intertextual unity of the Japanese love ethos over hundreds of years than in the Noh plays of Zeami. Japanese history's—or its legends'—two most famous love stories illustrate both the unity of the ten characteristics we have described and their apparently indelible hold on the people's imagination.

The first of these archetypal love stories is that of the playboy Narihira and his childhood sweetheart, turned gentle and long suffering wife, Aritsune's daughter. Even though her new husband soon takes another lover over the mountain in the neighboring village she shows no slacking in her devotion. As a result, he in his guilt suspects she too has a lover. But he has his own cruelty brought vibrantly to his consciousness when he hides to spy on her goings on and finds that she is only worried that he, presumably on his way home from his lover's house, may be hurt in the storm that is brewing.

The Noh play *Itsutsu* sees her ghost hundreds of years later, still laying flowers by the well curb on which as children they marked and compared their height. The Meiji novelist Higuchi Ichiro also drew on the same story to make popular the phrase, *takekurabe* (丈比べ) "comparing our height".

At the end of the Noh play, the first five lines quote the famous poem of the young lovers recalling their childhood. Then comes the conclusion with the woman's ghost merging into that of Narihira's in the moonlight, gently paying homage to that long dead love which somehow still lives.

筒井筒	Tsutsu izutsu,	Ah the well curb!
筒井筒	Tsutsu izutsu,	The well curb!
井筒にかけし	Izutsu ni kakeshi...	On the well curb...
まろが丈	Maro ga take,	Once we marked our height.
生ひにけらしな	Oinikerashi na	But I've grown taller since I saw you last...
老いにけるぞや	Oinikeru zo ya	I've grown old, so many years have passed.
さながら見みえし	Sanagara mimieshi...	My reflection in his clothes [which she wears]
冠直衣は...	Kammurinoshi wa...	Makes me no longer myself...
業平の面影	Narihira no omokage	I am... Narihira's image
見ればなつかしや	Mireba natsukashi ya	Reflected there, his image reawakens all my love
亡婦はく霊の姿は	Bofu hakurei no sugata wa	The spirit dressed in robes her lover wore
しほめる花の	Shibomeru hana no	Fades from sight, the wilted flower's color
色なうて匂ひ	Ironoute nioi...	Gone, but its fragrance lingers on... ¹⁹⁾

B. The Central Characteristics of Love in Western Literature

During the past several decades—in fact, for a century—Western notions of love have become very popular in Japan. Today, notions of *ai* (愛), which have little to do with

Japan's original categories, have come to occupy a central place both in literature and within the average Japanese person's mind and heart. These notions, as Nakanishi also notes²⁰⁾, are largely both new and Western. Unfortunately, especially since the war, the vast majority of notions of Western love have come from the worst possible source: second-rate American movies, songs, and television programs, and Japanese T. V. commercials.

Such pictures of Western love, arising chiefly from the profit motive rather than any desire to accurately reflect real attitudes and values, have caused thinkers like Ito Sei to observe that contemporary Western-based Japanese notions of love are a dangerous form of untruth, since they reflect only the sentimental surface and not the values which support traditional Western love²¹⁾.

This distortion of love notions from sheer motives of profit has not taken place just in Japan. The Western countries themselves are victims of their own advertisement and entertainment industries' perversion of love. Hence it seems salutary to look backwards and search for more original and fundamental notions. The list offered here, like the Japanese one above, simply enumerates the chief elements of a single relatively cohesive complex which has endured for a thousand years. Of course it was continually changing and developing from its beginning. And today the whole complex may very well be in the process of disappearing. When looked at comparatively, however, it becomes evident that its influence remains vigorous. The following list of ten is, of course, by no means exhaustive. But it does, I believe, disclose the core of a coherent complex of ideas, values, and attitudes regarding love.

1. The first characteristic of Western literature's conception of love is the notion that ideal love between noble men and women endures until death. In the typical, passionate man-woman romantic love, sung in the poems of the masters down through the centuries, this optimistic and confident assurance appears and reappears clearly and continually—in sharp contrast to the emphasis on the transience of Japanese love. Of course the quickly passing quality of a great portion of passionate love affairs is also often portrayed. But such love is not the norm. It is not the focus of attention.

The roots of the bias that true love is eternal is very deep. It goes back at least as far Plato's *Symposium*. Physical love of beautiful bodies, declares Diotima, Socrates' ancient instructress, is to be seen as a good and noble school wherein men and women slowly climb the first step up the ladder of human wisdom and universal love. The young adult's love, nurtured at first in the school of the ecstatic fleshly attraction of beautiful bodies—be it hetero- or homosexual—is normally and in various degrees purified and enlightened as it climbs love's ladder toward love's ultimate object.

The person is drawn out of selfishness and blindness as he or she ascends from the love of physical beauty and pleasure, to the moral, the intellectual, and eventually to eternal beauty itself. Plato quotes Socrates explaining his old instructress' portrayal of the vision at the top of love's stairway:

The man who has been guided thus far in the mysteries of love, and who has directed his thoughts towards examples of beauty in due and orderly succession, will suddenly have revealed to him as he approaches the end of his initiation a beauty whose nature is marvelous indeed, the final goal, Socrates, of all his previous efforts. This beauty is first of all eternal; it neither comes into being nor passes away, neither waxes nor wanes; next, it is not beautiful in part and ugly in part, nor beautiful at one time and ugly at another... he will see it as absolute, existing alone with itself, unique, eternal, and all other beautiful things as partaking of it...²²⁾

This notion that love is by its very notion eternal since its ultimate object is nothing less than the eternal union of the One, the True, and the Beautiful was of course affirmed and strengthened by Christian notions. The two dovetailed nicely into one another and served as a foundation for basic notions of all kinds of Western love for nearly two millennia. The ironic fact is, however, that—if divorce-rates are any indication—the real living fact of love in Japan and the West is the exact opposite of their literary *tatemaes*. Marital love in Japan seems by far the more enduring. The brevity of many, perhaps most, love affairs, their danger and pain, are of course daily noted in numberless stories, songs, and poems in the West. The very interesting difference from Japan, however, is that by and large these negative sides are seen as aberrations from the essentially positive native ideal of love. In Japan, it would seem, the opposite view is stronger.

2. The second characteristic is the conviction that love is a positive and educatory emotion. It leads men and women both in its joys and in its often extremely painful demands on an essentially selfish human nature, towards an unfolding of their highest potentialities. In the "Song of Songs" of the Hebrew Bible, and in such literary works as Spenser's *Fairie Queene* and Shakespeare's love dramas (both the tragedies and the comedies), on up through the novels of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, love is seen as basically a positive educatory passion, even though often it is a cruel taskmaster. In love both men and women are tried as if by fire, and the superior human being emerges better for the experience.

In Dante's *Divine Comedy* we see the essential rhetoric of this characteristic laid bare. The poet's adolescent crush on the beautiful nine year old Beatrice not only lasts into old age but is seen to be an initiatory exercise leading the human heart towards the perfection of love in the presence of perfect beauty.

Se quanto infino a qui di lei si dice
fosse conchiuso tutto in una loda,
poco sarebbe a fornir questa vice...

If all said of her here
Were included in a single song of praise
It would surely fail my present purpose...

Dal primo giorno ch'io vidi il suo viso
in questa vita, infino a questa vista,
non m'e il sequire al mio cantar preciso

From the first day I saw her face
In this life, until the present
My song has followed a single path;

ma or convien che mio sequir desista
 piu retro a sua bellezza, poetando,
 come all' ultimo suo ciascuno artista.

But now its proper that my labors cease
 Their pursuit of her beauty; as all artists
 Cease in the presence of Ultimate Beauty.

(Paradiso, XXX, 16-18, 28-34)

3. A third notion is that this violent and most beautiful of human emotions is in one way or another not just a positive but positively holy experience: either in the sense that it is transcendent or in that it somehow puts the lover in touch with the divine.

Sincere lovers' selfless gift of body and life to each other is often seen as the very presence of God in the hearts of the lovers. For, "God is love, and he who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him". (I Jn. IV, 16) In spite of later centuries' antifleshy bias, the attitudes towards sex and sexual love revealed in the myth of God's having made Adam and Eve for one another—and that this love between man and woman was the central symbol by which God's love was revealed for the human race in general and his Chosen People in particular—gave man-woman love a providential dimension, and an unsurpassed importance.

As often as not, this "holy" element is all but hidden in the best love poetry. Sometimes, of course, it is entirely absent, or even cynically rejected. But it is usually there in one form or another. It comes to the surface with special clarity in Donne's poem, "Exstasie"

We owe them [our bodies] thanks, because they thus,
 Did us, to us, at first convey,
 Yielded their forces, sense, to us,
 Nor are dross to us, but allay...
 So soul into the soul may flow,
 Though it to body first repair.
 As our blood labours to beget
 spirits, as like souls as it can,
 Because such fingers need to knit
 That subtle knot, which makes us man...
 Else a great prince in prison lies. (lines 53-68)

Donne's point is basically the platonic one (seen via Ficino's new interpretations of the newly rediscovered texts of Plato). This was placed in a Christian context: physical love leads us to the highest love and so is sacred and to be revered—otherwise love's noblest "Prince", the deeper love of two human spirits, never escapes its bodily prison. So beloved was this notion that love has a transcendent, providential dimension that the Christian ages canonized Plato's thinking in this regards, even while they were busily burying other "pagan" poets' ironic notions to the contrary. It reappeared, transformed, in Puritan, and again in Romantic literature.

4. The next facet of Western love follows from and is contained in this transcendent one: Purely sexual love, without a selfless mutual giving of the whole selves of the lovers,

is not true love. This facet is by no means always universal and unambiguous. Although an authentic and important part of Western literary love, it must be balanced by the following element.

5. Love involves a creative tension between its sexual and its more spiritual elements. Ovid's ironical reduction of love to natural appetites, and of lovers to slaves of these drives, never left the Western cultural archive, even after Christianity managed to push out most other pagan notions. In the Dark Ages which followed the collapse of the Roman Empire it was the Christian monks themselves, copying Ovid's and similar authors' works, who preserved these pre-Christian classics on love. This vital link has had immeasurable influence on subsequent Western notions of love. The influence of these works continually reappears. So this ironic, or more realistic, element too must be weighed into the balance.

Thus throughout the Western literary tradition, there continually appear the arched eyebrow and ironic smirk at the notion that love is anything other than a brute carnal passion, and one which often enslaves and humiliates rather than exalts its victims. Another aspect of this same element appears in the unequivocal admission by the handsome rake that it is the glories of physical pleasure and passion which he seeks. This element is clearly visible in the following section of the medieval *Romance of the Rose*. This important work, like Andre Capellanus' *De Arte Honestae Amandi* draws heavily on Ovid, while at the same time taking care to cast its portrayal of the pleasures of the flesh within broadly spiritual parameters. The following quote from the former work reveals an unabashed glorying in very down-to-earth forms of love.

<p>Les queroles ja remenoient, car tuit le plosor s'en aloient o lor amies ombroier soz ces arbres por donoier. Dex! com menoient bone vie! Fox est qui n'a de tel envie! Qui autel vie avoir porroit, de meillor bien se souffreroit, qu'il n'est nus graindres paradis d'aovir amie a son devis</p>	<p>They were already quitting their caroling, For most were flying away With their lady friends To make love beneath the trees. God! What a wonderful life! A fool is he who would not of that be envious. He who could have that kind of life Would have no need for higher good, There is no greater paradise than to have one's lover as one desires. (1289-98)²⁸⁾</p>
--	--

Typical lovers and typical love poets—in spite of the blatant contradiction (whoever said love was logical?) between this and the previously described notions—know the persuasiveness of this kind of rhetoric. Yet it is never enough. Always in the end both lovers and poets labor to convince themselves, their partners, and/or their readers, that love is more than this. The battle seen waged in *Romance of the Rose* between the poetic praise of intercourse and orgasm and the higher forms of human love is as old—and apparently as broad—as the species. It remained to serve the function of an important

contrapuntal element in the interior battle involved in everyone's love: love is always a war between the purely physical desire for sexual pleasure and union and the desire to selflessly forget one's own desires and serve the beloved.

6. The sixth and seventh elements of the typical Western literary notion of love are seen already clearly in the "Song of Songs" and continually reappear thereafter. The first of these is that love, if it is real and sincere, must be expressed in words, and directly to the beloved, in face-to-face encounter. One may almost pick at random among any one of the West's best poets of almost any age to find this ubiquitous attitude and its moods and tones. These characteristics also have very deep roots, going back the better part of three millennia. The former—the revelling in verbal confession of love and the latter, the passionate, vivid, and sometimes analytical mode of this confession—go back to the Hebrew rather than to the Greco-Roman civilizations.

We have already noted that its first root is in the Adamic myth. In Genesis we see God creating first Adam—his masterwork whom he loved as his own son—and then, as a helper, Eve. Man-woman love is clearly considered from this beginning as a central part of God's plan. Men and women exist for one another's help and at least after their departure from paradise, their love is God's chosen means of continuing the human race.

This favorable view of man-woman love prepared the way for an even more sanguine view in the great love song called the "Song of Songs". It became a part of the canon of first the Hebrew and then the Christian Scripture because passionate, fleshly man-woman love—already was looked very favorably upon as part of God's plan—came to be seen as a central metaphor for the spiritual love which God had for mankind, especially his Chosen People, and which he passionately desired should be returned to him in kind. Thus the Western civilization has as a central element of its religion and worldview the glory of detailed and passionate outpourings of love as found in this ancient, very fleshly, nuptial love song, in the form of a face-to-face dialogue, with a chorus.

Bride: Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth.

Your love is more delightful than wine;

delicate is the fragrance of your perfume,

your name is an oil poured out,

and that is why the maidens love you...

we shall praise your love above wine;

how right it is to love you...

My beloved is a sachet of myrrh

lying between my breasts

My beloved is a cluster of henna

flowers among the vines of Engedi.

Bridegroom: How beautiful you are, my love,

how beautiful you are!

Your eyes are like doves...

As a lily among the thistles,

so is my love among the maidens.

Bride: Feed me with raisin cakes,
 restore me with apples,
 for I am sick with love.
 His left arm is under my head,
 his right embraces me...

Bridegroom:

... Your lips are a scarlet thread
 and your words enchanting,
 Your cheeks, behind your veil,
 are halves of pomegranate...
 Your two breasts are two fawns...
 You are wholly beautiful, my love,
 and without a blemish...
 You ravish my heart...
 What spells lie in your love,...
 Your lips, my promised one,
 distill wild honey...
 She is a garden enclosed...

Bride: Let my Beloved come into his garden,
 let him taste its rarest fruits. (Song of Songs, section I, 1-IV, 16), Jerusalem Bible

One sees in Shakespeare, essentially the same compulsion to confess face-to-face and in words all of the many modalities of the feelings of the loving heart, and nowhere more nicely than in his Sonnets:

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
 Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
 Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
 And summer's lease hath all too short a date... (Sonnet xviii)

7. The next element is really not separable from the previous one. The mode of this exaltation in verbal, face-to-face declarations of love is very often an almost compulsive delight in explicit and graphic description. This includes overt praise of the bodily attractions of the beloved, as well as detailed confessions of the interior feelings and emotions felt by the lover. Western love in all its dimensions, contrary to love in Japan, is exultantly worn openly, like a badge of heroism—and, like heroism, its every aspect is painted in vivid colors. The "Song of Songs" is the archetype of this characteristic, but Donne's "The Good Morrow" shows some of the same vividness.

I wonder, by my troth, what thou and I
 Did, till we loved? Were we not weaned till then?...
 If ever any beauty I did see,
 Which I desired, and got, 'twas but a dream of thee...
 For love, all love of other sights controls,
 And makes one little room an everywhere...

Donne glories in painting both the interior and exterior—or bedroom—aspects of love in glowing, passionate, colors. Often his poetry rivals the “Song of Songs” in intensity and vividness of detail. Robert Herrick gives us similar descriptions in a light and facetious mode,

Whenas in silks my Julia goes
Then, then, methinks, how sweetly flows
That liquefaction of her clothes.

Next, when I cast mine eyes, and see
That brave vibration, each way free,
O, how that glittering taketh me!

This vividness is of course visible both in poetic and prose love literature—up until the contemporary novels and poetry, where the line between vivid literary confession and distinctly unliterary pornography becomes an indistinguishable razor’s edge.

8. The next characteristic of Western love—not noticeable, perhaps, except through comparison with other cultures—is that real love is seen to be essentially the same both before and after—and even outside of—marriage. It is seen to be a quality or state—naturally, a platonically substantial thing—of the mind or heart which changes only accidentally from the passionate to the cooler, more affectionate emotion after marriage but retains its original essence. In Japan, generally speaking at least, *koi* is not used to describe married love, and *aijo* (愛情, the normal word for married love), is not used for romantic love.

Not that ordinary man-woman love in the West was by any means always seen as essentially leading to or even connected with marriage. Though in fact it very often is seen in this manner it is often seen in a quite opposite light, as in the famous loves of the knights for ladies married, more often than not, to some one else.

Nevertheless, the influence of the Christian worldview—in which God ordained that men and women should be companions to one another and that their attraction for one another lead to marriage and the bearing and rearing of children—became increasingly influential from the beginning of the tenth century when Charlemagne’s consolidations came to be felt. In spite of much resistance and views to the contrary, history seems fairly clear in supporting this view, which slowly came to prevail—both in everyday life and in literature²⁴).

It is generally known, for example, that love in Shakespeare’s dramas is generally oriented to marriage. One need only think, for example, of *Romeo and Juliet*, of *Hamlet*, and of comedies such as *A Midsummer-Night’s Dream*, and the like.

Elizabeth Barret Browning’s famous poem to her husband shows—among practically all the other elements listed above—aptly both the essential sameness of married and un-

married love and the presumption that love and marriage have an essential link.

How do I love thee? Let me count the ways.
 I love thee to the depth and breadth and height
 My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight
 For the ends of Being and ideal Grace.
 I love thee to the level of every day's
 Most quiet need, by sun and candlelight.
 I love thee freely as men strive for right;
 I love thee with the passion put to use
 In my old griefs, and with my childhood's faith.
 I love thee with a love I seemed to lose
 With my lost saints—I love thee with the breath,
 Smiles, tears of all my life!—and, if God choose,
 I shall but love thee better after death.

9. The ninth characteristic of Western love that the woman is the nobler partner in the love relation—may be said to be derived from the main elements of that complex of attitudes, images, and practices now known as "courtly love". The literature on the nature and formation of this courtly love is voluminous²⁵.

This major new growth in the whole Western concept of love originated with the troubadours of southern France or Provence in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but its various elements which it added to the existing complex—especially the exalted role of woman in the love relation—have been continually developing since that time, down to the present day. Most scholars today agree that "courtly love" is not nearly so clearly definable a phenomenon as was first believed when it first began to be talked about less than a century ago. This is not the place to enter into such arguments. Suffice it to say that "courtly love"—as it developed, spread throughout western Europe, and developed in various directions in subsequent times and places—took on a great number of forms, ranging from farcical, only thinly veiled celebrations of sexual exploits, to the most idealistic union of physical and religious love.

The heart of courtly love may be said to be the exaltation of the woman over the man in the love relation. She is the lady and patron and he, her servant. She is the beautiful and strong teacher of pure and noble love; he, the unworthy pupil filled with dross which the fires of noble love must burn away. This being so, overwhelmed by the fire of providential love, he pledges his whole life in loyal service to her and to the love she inspired within him. He is determined to do and suffer whatever she and love demand because he trusts that such love, obeyed with deep sincerity and with all the sacrifice and restraint which it entails, will lead him into the full development of his potential as knight, a gentleman, and a human being. This is clear in the quotations which appear above in number 8.

Being born of the knightly poet-singers in the princely courts of Provence, this new

mode of understanding love was at first essentially aristocratic and artistic to its core. It spread rapidly throughout the courts of France, Germany, and Italy. The rhetoric of love tales in Spenser's "The Fairie Queene" and those of Arthur's Round Table, are oriented in this direction. Developments of this mode continued from Cavalcanti, and Dante in their "sweet new style" (*dolce stil nuove*) and Petrarch to the golden age of English love poetry in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Naturally, this new exaltation of the woman did not automatically do away with her age-old domination by the male, especially in marriage. This male domination was the predominant mode in both Greek and Roman civilizations and, in one form or another, continued after their demise. In fact, the very knights who wrote the most exalted praise of their ladies usually ruled their own wives with an iron hand.

As, over centuries, feudalism slowly turned into democracy—and as first the merchant class and then a broad middle class came to dominate the aristocracy and take over the reins of both power and art—the whole of Western civilization came to adopt the love rhetoric of its former aristocratic masters. The exalted notion that love is a divine fire and that love of a "lady" or a "gentleman" is a great uplifting and transforming passion not only spread but underwent considerable development.

The problem of the precise sources, the exact nature, and developmental curve from "courtly love" to romantic love and beyond is difficult and controverted. The related problem of how, from these medieval sources, the romantic novel of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries developed is equally complex and controversial. A full discussion of these issues is out of place here, but in general I agree with scholars like Jacqueline Sarsby (*Romantic Love and Society: Its Place in the Modern World*²⁶) that it was the rise of the propertied middle class, especially after the industrial revolution, which made possible the birth of romantic love—and, even more importantly, the notion that marriage should be based on it.

Scholars as diverse as Friedrich Engels (*The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*)²⁷ and Edward Shorter, (*The Making of the Modern Family*)²⁸, and Lawrence Stone (*The Family, Sex and Marriage in England: 1500-1800*)²⁹ agree that without the economic, social, and political revolutions of this era, neither the notion of love nor the family as we know it could have developed. What is not made clear in such studies, however, is that these middle-class people, and the writers who mirrored them in their literature, drew upon the courtly love tradition and upon the Christian worldview, whose notion of love did not essentially change in its new Protestant incarnation. They did not essentially alter the form and ethos of these earlier notions of love so much as build on them. The Japanese early middle-class writers such as Chikamatsu and Saikaku drew in a similar manner upon the Heian notions. And, as in the West, though they modified them greatly they also preserved intact the central core of love's discourse. The ten characteristics of love described above were not only pre-

served but in many ways augmented and enhanced, during their development from the 16th through the 19th centuries.

Finally, regarding the courtly love tradition, I would argue—against Denis de Rougemont (*L'Amour et L'Occident*) and C. S. Lewis (*The Allegory of Love*) and with Irving Singer, A. J. Smith, and Maurice Valency—that the major thrust of the courtly love tradition (both within and outside of literature) runs with, and not against, the general Christian rhetoric of the era—this in spite of strong tendencies in the other direction.

10. In the West, both in literature and in life, both among religious believers and among secularized people, love is generally believed to remain essentially the same thing in its essence, from the first ecstatic emotions of romantic love before or outside of marriage, until its cool, affectionate manifestations between couples in their declining years. Love is love.

Of course, the feelings and passionate accompaniments change drastically. But the essence of love is generally not believed to lie in these emotional trappings. Rather, the core of love is thought to lie in a deeper act of self-forgetful benevolent gift of self to the beloved. Whether in the poems of Dante or Petrarch, in dramas of Shakespeare such as "Romeo and Juliet," in the novels of Jane Austen, or in the non-literary day-to-day presumption is pervasive in the West, the ideal of love between men and women is that it is much deeper than mere emotion which, should it lead to a marriage enduring for decades, still does not change in its essential nature. Shakespeare's Sonnet 116 is perhaps at once the clearest and most beautiful expression of this notion of love.

Let me not to the marriage of true minds
 Admit impediments. Love is not love
 Which alters when it alteration finds,
 Or bends with the remover to remove:
 Oh, no! it is an ever-fixed mark,
 That looks on tempests and is never shaken:
 It is the star to every wandering bark,
 Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.
 Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
 Within his bending sickle's compass come;
 Love alters not with his brief hours and weeks,
 But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
 If this be error and upon me proved,
 I never writ, nor no man ever loved.

Whether or not this "marriage of true minds" is taken to refer to an actual marital vow or bond, the meaning is the same. "True" or noble—mature—human beings' love remains essentially unaltered during the changes which time, marital status, or even a partner's fickleness or "alteration" may happen to test it with.

The fact is that this poem can serve well as a summation of most if not all of the above noted ten characteristics of the western love ethos. Love is forever; it is "not Time's fool," but "bears it out even to the edge of doom". It is not merely the ecstasy of physical passion, which alters when "rosy lips and cheeks" fade when caught in Time's nor does it exclude the ecstasy of physical longing. The tension between passionate physical desire and this mystical and permanent mutual gift of two selves sets up a continuing struggle which educates the human heart and becomes "the star to every wondering bark" on the sea of human life.

II. INTERPRETING THE CLASSIC LOVE SYNTHESSES: THEIR ORIGINS AND VERY DIFFERENT RHETORICAL STRUCTURES

It is evident that these two "classic syntheses" concerning love in Japan and in the West contrast with one another at many points. Also, neither Japanese nor Westerners live in the Middle Ages. Both of our notions of love have been under continual development—often in positively revolutionary manners. Nevertheless, it seems to me that these two classical syntheses, extremely ephemeral though they seem, are also extremely tough. We love them. It is not so much the ideas that we love, nor even the day-to-day loving actions they point to. We love the beautiful ideals which define love, and the values respecting family, marriage, child rearing, and love which this complex of love notions enfolds and implies. It is this difficult matter to which we must now give our attention. What are the major cultural sources for these two very different but nevertheless powerful notions of love? To the degree that we can shed real light on this question we will also be shedding light on a number of other even more fundamental questions. Looking comparatively at the sources of two civilizations' love ethos can be of considerable help in understanding not only our own and the other's literatures, but the processes whereby both literatures form and influence their civilizations.

A. Religion and the "Genealogy" of the Two Classic Syntheses

All of the above characteristics of love seem to lead us in one direction: towards the asking of the key questions: "Why?" and "How?" Why and how did these core-characteristics of love in two civilizations take the form we have seen them take? Among the many influences which helped to form, support, and preserve these two classical syntheses, which, if any, are the most decisive? Or, in the context of Foucault's ideas, which of the many economic, political, familial, religious, and other kinds of powers (*pouvoirs*) were the most influential in providing the dominant tones, attitudes, and values found within the two classic syntheses?

By finding at least partial answers to these questions we will, in the process, not only

more adequately understand both modes of loving; we will also grasp more comprehensively the wider phenomenon of the human dynamics of civilized love in general.

There are, of course, many powerful influences involved: the languages themselves, previous Japanese literature, Chinese/Greco-Roman literary models, the social systems—especially, as we will note later, the family systems—and others. But it seems fairly certain that the most decisive force in both cases has been the religious worldviews. In both cases there was in operation not one but a set of confluent religious systems which went together to create the forms of knowledge taken to be ultimate in the two civilizations for over a thousand years. In both cases a marriage between relatively absolutist governments and religious systems produced the kind civil unity and epistemological stability which allowed great literature to take the form which it took—and which it maintained for a millennium.

That stability is now dissolved in both cultures. Its place has been taken by the diversity and freedom made possible by democracy in government, mass education, and—relatively speaking at least—mass middle-class affluence. These very revolutionary changes in intellectual, social, and economic climates explain in large part the revolutionary changes in the notions, values, and attitudes respecting love. And yet the favored old complexes are by no means dead. The most difficult question in this regard is whether or not they will continue to perdure in the foreseeable future.

The cost of the old unions of certain religious systems and successive political systems was, from the modern point of view, very high in terms of human and intellectual freedom. These marriages of "church and state" have almost vanished today, and new marriages—between democratic governments and worldviews based on science—have taken their places. And during the past century the favorite attitudes, values, and notions concerning love seem to maintain—in spite of unprecedented change—their old identities deep in the conscious and subconscious identities of the two peoples. One of our goals is to assess both the changes and the remaining identities. The focus of our attention is to note the manner and the extent to which the literary syntheses of the *ancient regimes* have been destroyed by this new marriage—which came into existence roughly a century ago.

The Western complex of Greco-Roman, Hebrew, and Christian religious worldviews, values, and attitudes clearly stamp, in a very fundamental and formative manner, every one of the ten "western" characteristics listed above. In exactly the same manner, a similar complex formed by native animistic Shinto, Buddhist, and Confucian patterns form the framework of the discursive edifice of love in the rhetoric of Japanese literature. But to properly understand the influence of religion we must have a properly nuanced idea of the social or cultural roles which religious systems play in every society.

According to the penetrating analysis of the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, religious systems symbolically express and reinforce a given society's most beloved attitudes, moods,

values, and ways of doing things⁸⁰). Geertz describes how religions are both “models of” a given culture’s favorite ways of doing things (as well as of its favorite attitudes, moods, and predispositions) and “models for” the reproduction of these same successful and beloved modes, manners, and ethical modes of seeing and doing things. In a word, religion is a kind of symbolic mode of handing on a people’s ethos. Understood as such a symbolic action system, Geertz defines religion as, “A system of symbols which acts to establish powerful, pervasive, and long lasting moods and motivations in men by formulating conceptions of a general order of existence and clothing these conceptions with such an aura of factuality that the moods and motivations seem uniquely realistic”⁸¹).

The literary critic Kenneth Burke follows this line of thought to its logical conclusion. In his *Rhetoric of Religion* he builds up a convincing argument that any given religion is in essence a rhetorical action system, one which uses both teachings and worldviews to move people’s attitudes and actions in a given way. Looked at in this manner, Burke argues, the rhetoric of religion and the rhetoric of literature are, far from being opposites, both examples of major forms of “language acts” which both express and defend favorite, dominant ideas and attitudes. William H. Rueckert, in his *Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations*,⁸² argues that this inclusion of religion alongside literature in his grand scheme of human rhetoric represents the final stage of Burke’s fifty years of work as a critic and philosopher of literature. He says,

Poetry, the poet, and the critic are privileged in Burke’s dramatistic poetics. I stress this point because of Burke’s choice of what is privileged later in *The Rhetoric of Religion*, where he shifts from poetry to theology, and because of his tendency after 1961 to abandon the privileging of any special class of language acts and to move the privileging to much broader, more inclusive grounds.

In fact Burke argues that poetic and religious discourse draw from the same reservoir of the mother civilization’s ideas, customs, and cultural perspectives. Their essences are very different, but both use their own kind of symbolic discourse as rhetorical action systems which move people at the deepest level, the level of fundamental attitudes and values. Traditionally, these two very different kinds of symbolic rhetorical systems reinforce one another. Only in recent history have they come into basic confrontation.

Thus the ideas of Geertz, Burke, Foucault, and—I should add, Kristeva’s notions of intertextuality⁸³—come together to give us the perspective necessary to understand the mystery of the dynamic by which literary notions of love in our two civilizations were formed. That is to say, the literary rhetoric of works like the *Genji Monogatari* and the *Divina Commedia* on the one hand, and the religious rhetoric of systems like Buddhism and Christianity on the other, should be seen as two major discursive forces, or Kristevan “texts”. Neither the forms and images of poetry nor those of religion were imposed from outside of their civilizations, as it were: by poets or religious teachers. Rather they

were, or came from, within. They were expressions, largely by the people, of the people's own deepest preferences. They are both two distinct expressions, sometime opposing one another, but usually confirming a people's attitudes and values respecting centrally important personal and social realities, such as love.

Poets' love poems were beautiful because they expressed the peoples' tastes and preferred modes. Similarly, religious systems came to be believed as true because they were found to express and affirm values and attitudes which people deemed most proper. When expressed symbolically and artistically, these two symbolic action systems are two people's favorite manners of looking at not only love but a whole array of other central human functions. Now let us see how this theory can be applied concretely to the two classical synthetic notions of love.

"True" love in Western literature was seen as eternal and educatory: humanly transformative, and maturative: a positive thing, to be proudly proclaimed in words, and facial expressions, directly to the lover. And of course every lover wants his or her love to be "true" or "real", and every poet wants to portray the most beautiful love, which naturally is real, and not inauthentic, love. But how can two civilizations treat passionate, young, romantic love in such contrasting—almost opposite—manners? How can the West's seemingly impossibly idealistic and unrealistic picture of love be called real—especially when seen in the light of Japanese literature's relatively negative treatment? In other words, once again, what are the reasons for such contrasting understandings of basically the same human phenomenon?

There are two important and related answers to these questions. The first has to do with religious discourse as such; the second with the deeper question of how societies develop the necessary discourse and rhetoric—the necessary knowledge—to protect absolutely necessary social institutions like love, marriage, family, and sound education of children. The former question of how religion influences literature is actually a function of the latter one: the beauty of literature and the truth of religion are bound up at the deepest level with the preferred, day-to-day modes of life and action, or as Geertz, puts it, "powerful, pervasive, and longlasting moods and motivations"⁸⁴). It seems this is true—in its own way—of literature too, in the following manner. A poem's or story's beauty surely has to do with sounds and other formal elements, but these elements must always be fitted into appropriate meaning patterns. And the propriety of any idea or emotion is ultimately rooted deeply in a people's ethos. As Burke points out, both religious and literary rhetoric appeals to its mother society's deeply beloved—because very successful—ways of doing and thinking about things. Further, they are forms of dialogue. And like all dialogues, they both spring from and powerfully influence the dialoguers.

Basically, Geertz's thesis is that religions are systems of symbols which synthesize a people's already existing outlooks and lifestyles.

As we are to deal with meaning, let us begin with a paradigm: viz., that sacred symbols function to synthesize a people's ethos—the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood—and their worldview—the picture that people have of the way things in sheer actuality are, their most comprehensive ideas of order⁸⁵).

Hence, it may be said that views as to what love in its innermost nature is, and literary expression of love, are two different modes of expressing the deepest notions and dispositions which a tribe or people have come to treasure most deeply. And people treasure these notions of love, because they have been found to work: to give the necessary strength for the successful living of daily life. In this section we will look briefly at religion's influence on notions of love, and how this influence did in fact affect the literary expressions of love in the two civilizations under consideration.

In the West, the passionate and fleshly but still selfgiving man-woman romantic love—the platonic *eros* of the *Symposium* and its counterpart in the Hebrew “Song of Songs”—had already taken on the force of a powerful metaphor (“love”) for the whole array of mature interpersonal and social relations before the dawn of the Christian era. After Christianity had swept through and taken the place of the classical worldview, this entrenchment of “love” as the dominant symbol for mature human relations became even stronger. Let us briefly consider how the process took place.

The whole new civilization—as it struggled out of the chaos following the collapse of the Roman Empire—became permeated by a religious rhetoric which argued that love was not only from God but was the very living presence and action of God being felt within the individual's heart. The love which people feel in their hearts, whether that between a man and a woman or that of a man or woman for the poor, the sick, or anyone else, was believed to be the sure sign of God's presence working within the human heart, “God is love,” argues the first letter of John in the New Testament, “and whoever lives in love lives in God, and God lives in him” (I Jn. 4, 16). Jesus' fundamental religious organization, the *ekklesia* (“church”) or the “Kingdom of God”, was based on the notion that the human being's very life and soul could and should be transformed and developed into its full potential as a human being by means of this mysterious interior working of “love”.

The love felt within the human heart was, then, the very life and presence of God within the individual's inner being. It could and would, according to Jesus', Paul's, and Augustine's argument, transform the individual into his full potential as a human being, and human society into a “City of God”, a utopian society identical to that Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. Naturally, this was not passionate man-woman love alone, but the important thing to note is that it did not exclude that kind of love. In fact, the exulting self-forgetful giving which passionate man-woman love stands for became the metaphor for the whole spectrum of relatively unselfish giving known as love or *eros* or *amor*, in both the *Symposium* and the Christian worldview as a whole—as seen in

Augustine's *City of God* (Bk. XIV).

The noble love described by Plato and in the "Song of Songs" received its definitive Christian development, as we will see below, in Augustine. Contrary to opinions popular among many literary critics, neither Paul nor Augustine were against erotic love between the sexes. Rather, both they and their master Jesus were expressed a Christian version of an ascetic rhetoric which, as Foucault points out, was already strong and developing in late-republican Rome. Whereas the Greek and the early Roman took erotic love and pleasure for granted as a good in itself, according to the various forms of this later rhetoric, clearly visible in the stoics and elsewhere, restraint of sexual passions contributed towards building up superior personal and social virtues⁸⁶.

According to these new ways of thinking, sexual restraint was seen as a kind of Greek *agon* or noble struggle capable of transforming the base and selfish man into his full noble potential. Unrestrained indulgence in sexual pleasure for its own sake not only led to evils such as rape and other licentious conduct, it easily led one to waste one's life in the headlong pursuit of sexual adventures. Ovid was brilliant in his cynical and humorous portrayal of the kind of abject slavery which the god of love demanded, and received. As Foucault points out, already before Jesus, Romans were even holding up lifelong virginity and complete celibacy as a heroic struggle capable of bringing out the best potential of the human being.

The late Roman empire into which Christianity was born was already well on its way towards developing a full-blown rhetoric in favor of sexual restraint and asceticism. Christianity, which placed love at the very center of its whole message, might even be seen as simply the most successful branch of this ethos of sexual restraint, one which took over and transformed the others.

The message of love as the one force capable of transforming man into the fullness of his potentialities fills both the Gospels and the letters of Paul and John in the New Testament. This kind of gentle love is called the "law of Christ". Jesus declares that this gentle law of love both fulfills and goes beyond the severe and vindictive Old Law of the Jews. "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another as I have loved you. This is the sign by which all men will know that you are my disciples: that you love one another as I have loved you" (Jn. 13, 34-35).

This love of course is *agape*, but it would be a mistake to think that it excludes or is completely unrelated to the sexual love between men and women. Paul advises husbands and wives to make love regularly, "lest Satan should take advantage of your weakness and tempt you" (I Cor. 7, 5). His logic regarding the goodness of sexual love is the typical Jewish notion that God made it and it is good. "Husbands, love your wives as Christ loves his Church... In the same way husbands should love their wives as they love their own bodies. 'For this reason a man should leave father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two will become one body' (Gen. 2, 24)" (Eph. 5, 25).

Here Paul clearly treats heterosexual love not only as good but as a metaphor for the highest *agape* type of love which is the center of the Gospel message.

It was Augustine, however, who brought this Christian notion of love to its full development in the Western Church. He uses *amor*, the Latin word for *eros* or sexually related love, to speak of Christian love. And he makes no great distinction between *amor* and *caritas*, the Latin for *agape*. They are used interchangeably. But this Christian love, is seen to be the very foundation of his soaring vision of the City of God, which was to become the goal inspiring both kings and priests for over a thousand years.

Two kinds of love (*amor*), he argues, are at war within the human breast (Bk. XIV). Only very slowly, like leaven in bread, can the selfless love which comes from God purify the corrupt and corrupting selfish love in both society and the individual. But as this power of God within the human heart works its magic the individual slowly rises to his full noble potential as a human being and human society slowly will be transformed into the City, or the Kingdom, of God.

But there is no denying that Augustine was a puritan when it came to love. He wastes little time extolling the beauties of erotic love, barely allowing its goodness within marriage, providing it is kept strictly under control of "reason" and the ends (generation of children) for which God created it. One sees here the flowering of the Christian version of stoic determination to rise above the passions of the flesh—at the hands of a converted Roman citizen magnificently versed in the history, rhetoric, and ethos of Rome's classical civilization. Other writers and preachers such as Jerome were less balanced and downright fanatic in their condemnation of the flesh, and their numbers multiplied as monastic and clerical celibacy became stronger. But the central Christian thinkers both Protestant and Catholic—from Aquinas to Luther and beyond—held to and developed Augustine's basically positive vision of the love ethic.

In the light of this understanding of love, both heterosexual and other varieties, as the main pillar of the Christian worldview, it is not as great a wonder as has often been thought that the troubadours, some five or six centuries after Augustine, came up with the ideals later known as "courtly love". The heart of that loose collection of often conflicting notions was that if love for *ma domna* (literally, "my Lady-ruler") of the poet-knight-lover was of a sufficiently noble and knightly kind—ready for self-sacrifice during a whole lifetime for the sake of that love—it would transform that knight into the ideal man. It is, of course, no accident that this trope of *ma domna* was identical in meaning to *ma donna*, "my lady", or the "blessed Mother Mary", devotion to whom was surging at this time.

It is easy to see that the notion of the creative powers of self-sacrificing love in operation here is not basically different from that of Augustine. The mode, or key, is strikingly different, but the melody and song are the same. What is startlingly new is the lyric extolling of passionate romantic heterosexual love. Ovid's tongue-in-cheek rules

for the slavelike service of the god (or goddess, Venus) of love is combined with a borrowing of the passionate sublimated sexual tones with which the celibate monks had packed their hymns to the spotless virginal female, the mother of God.

By the eleventh century this authoritative image of Mary appears in many forms in the West as well. Fulbert of Chartres, St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm of Bec, all by birth Italians, promoted the cult of the Virgin as *domina*, queen of heaven and of the saints, man's powerful intercessor. They promoted this cult not only through their writings—in surviving prayers, homilies, verses, and such—but also through their direction of visual images—wall paintings, manuscript illuminations sculpture, and church architecture—that magnified Mary/Ecclesia [Mary was also a symbol of the Church, and in promoting her cult the monks and clergy were also promoting the power of the Church over the general affairs of the time.]⁸⁷

The monks, imitated by the surging Marian devotion of the laity, filled their songs of devotion to the Virgin with the erotic language and imagery of the Song of Songs. In so doing their devotion seemed to be at one and the same time passionately physical and "pure". "Many of the names for Mary in the Byzantine cult evoke her healing powers or the joy she brings man as a result of his redemption. The language of the Canticles [or Song of Songs] echoes through some texts"⁸⁸). The troubadours played upon this theme in every possible manner, from the most exalted comparisons of their love for their maidens with the pure devotion to Mary and to the Church as the pure bride of Christ to lewd and blasphemous puns. In the process they gave birth to the notion of courtly love: the notion that the object of one's passion was the "lady" or "mistress", whose love was impeccable and uplifting. The knight-troubadour-courtier's soiled and self-centered love for her could be raised up and purified by faithful devotion to so spotless a lover. In reality this new lady was a new goddess of love, demanding the same servile devotion as Ovid's, but with the promise of both ecstatic romantic bliss and the fullness of human nobility—if the knight or poet could but bear the strain of absolute self-disregarding devotion.

This "courtly love" with its exaltation of the woman over the man in the love relation, was the final stone in the grand classic synthesis of Western love rhetoric. With it, Ovid's pre-Christian, somewhat cynical but nevertheless real, glorying in the service of the pleasures of passionate love, which the celibate monks were instrumental in preserving by faithfully copying surviving manuscripts, was combined with the dominant Christian notions of love as explained above.

The knights and troubadours were by no means all "good Christians". They were often bitterly at odds with the monks and clergy who vied with them for political predominance. Sometimes their use of "my lady" for their lovers was a combination of pornography and anticlerical mockery⁸⁹). But this was but one side, and one which did not win out in the overall cultural rhetoric of love. In the end, as is clearly seen in the succession from Cavalcanti and Dante, to Petrarch, to Chaucer, to Donne, to Shake-

speare, to Milton, to Jane Austen, and beyond, the whole culture's Christian worldview adopted a noble and idealistic interpretation of woman and her love as positive and providential. It was mysterious and holy in that it came from God and could, if properly pursued, lead men back to him by melting the hardness of their egotism.

The new rhetoric invented by the troubadours, which quickly spread throughout Europe and underwent a process of metamorphosis as political, economic, and finally industrial transformations brought a middle class into predominance, was continually melded into the prevailing Christian notions and values. Religious and literary discourse on love mutually influenced and changed one another. Theologians gradually adopted the notions of courtly love in their own fashion, and poets like Dante, Donne, and Milton, tailored their rhetoric to fit their religious worldviews. Each new era made that merger in its own manner, and so the love notion constantly changed and developed—but still retained its basic synthesis—at least until the beginning of the present century.

The Japanese synthesis, on the other hand, portrayed “love”—i. e. young, passionate, premarital or extramarital man-woman love—typically as “longing”, as quickly passing, and as ultimately empty and vain. These apparently negative attitudes are clearly connected with the Buddhist worldview, which thoroughly saturated the whole conscious and unconscious cultural “atmosphere” and “archive” of a civilization. That is to say, Buddhism, and its close alliance with Shinto and Confucian animistic and ethical systems, furnished an immense Foucauldian power with its profound and world-embracing system of knowledge. This power affected the whole system of both conscious and unconscious modes of thought and thus entered deeply into literary, religious and other socio-cultural systems.

In this connection, no one is more famous than One no Komachi as the archetypal beauty and lover. The fact that she is said to have died ugly, alone, and a beggar is not the end of her story. In the Noh play, *Sotoba Komachi* we see her portrayed as indeed an old wandering hag, but also as an enlightened being who herself—precisely through her love—is said to have penetrated into the central truth of the “Emptiness” of all things.

But it would be a simplistic mistake to conclude that Buddhism, and not Christianity, took a negativistic view of human life and love. Both religions emphasize the danger of sexual pleasure for its own sake as *bonno* (煩惱: “the disturbing passions”) or *sarx* (“the flesh”, which “lusts against the spirit”). The key to a correct interpretation here is to see, with Geertz and Burke, that religious systems are themselves symbolic, rhetorical action. The basic notion of the Heart Sutra—that nirvana and samsara are one—gives the lie to the notion that Buddhism is a narrowly life-denying religion. The basic thrust of the discursive logic here is to maintain a sane balance: while men and women necessarily enjoy the pleasures of food, sunlight, and love, they are in danger of becoming self-destructively carried away, and forgetting that in fact these pleasures do all pass quickly

away and are ultimately empty—like life itself. Actually the logic of Christianity is not all that different. Each religion in its own way points out the foolish shallowness and social waste of a Don Juan's essentially self-centered and self-preoccupied life.

Applying this Buddhist rhetoric to the literature of Murasaki, of One no Komachi, and of Zeami, ultimately, each took for granted that not only love but human life itself is "transient" (*mujo*: 無常) and "absolute emptiness" (*zettai mu*: 絶対無). But none of them can be said to have concluded that human love was therefore a negative thing. Quite the contrary. "Compassionate love," or *jihi* (慈悲) is the sign of the bodhisattva or person well advanced toward Enlightenment. Not only Japanese writers but also their great Chinese models saw love in very positive terms. In spite of emphasis on its passing and ultimately empty aspects, its splendor and beauty were by no means neglected. And the deep human truth of the element of *aware* in the face of the transient quality of this greatest beauty in life is recognized by everyone, Japanese or not.

The rhetoric of Japan's Shinto-Buddhist worldview had the effect of highlighting the splendor of love as the natural flower of human life, while at the same time toning down the literary expressions of love's more vulgar and openly sexual qualities. This it did by supporting the beauty and wisdom of alluding to these physical sides of love in a very indirect manner using a whole system of delicate images and metaphors. Not only *kakekotoba* (掛詞) and *makurakotoba* (枕詞), but the whole of the Japanese poetics cooperated in this endeavor. It was in this manner that the Buddhist and literary symbol systems powerfully influenced and reinforced one another. In the process they gave to the Japanese people a very richly nuanced notion and ethos of love, one which reaches so deeply into their knowledge and identities as to have succeeded in resisting even the dissolving acids of a hundred modern revolutions.

B. The Structure of the Love-Rhetoric and the Structure of the Family in Japan and the West

But there is a still deeper dynamic to be considered if the role of both literature and religion in the formation of this love ethos is to be properly understood. We must consider the family systems of Japan and the West, and the discourse whereby they were protected. In both cases the family was the most important arrangement of man-woman love, both for the individuals involved and for society as a whole. We need to look at the relation between the family and extra-familial love in both cultures. If we look at the relation between the family institutions, both carefully regulated towards the generation and education of new human life, and the non-familial, the premarital and extramarital, love which is the usual subject of poetry and story, then we can gain entrance into this deeper level of love. In the West, a monogamous, nuclear family system prevailed, whereas in Japan the family system has been polygamous, until less than two centuries ago (whenever, at least, wealth and power permitted more than one woman). It was, and still

is, largely an extended rather than a nuclear family system. Both of these very important structures, going back beyond recorded history, came to be expressed, legitimated, and kept strong by means of a whole gamut of religious, legal, and other kinds of discourse.

In the West the picture of love was discursively painted in ideal terms: as the eternal plan of God—or, as early as Plato, of the gods. God made Adam, and then, seeing that he was lonely, gave him a loving helpmate, and the divinely ordained means for the continuity of the human race. Passionately expressed sexual love came to be symbol for a higher love between the Hebrew God and his chosen people. Finally, God and love came to be identified: “God is love”. Love, then, was seen as the divinely planned and ordained foundation upon which a whole civilization, but especially its family system, rested.

The fact is that for the greater portion of Western history the powerful, wealthy, and/or aristocratic families strove to maintain their power through careful marriage alliances in which love played practically no role at all—and so, in fact if not in theory, they resembled greatly the Japanese *ie* (家) in these respects. Nevertheless, the European family, at least after Carolingian times, was basically different in that it was monogamous and nuclear in its basic structure⁴⁰. Though powerful heads of families probably played around with their mistresses about as much as their Japanese counterparts did, the female consort’s role of waiting and longing for a man married to someone else was not sanctioned by the very structure of the system as it was in the case of Japan, and polygamy was rare.

Japan’s family system—the *ie*—came to be guarded by its own native, by and Confucian, religious rhetoric. Aside from sanctioning many wives (and so sanctioning their waiting, “longing”, and “enduring” while their mate was with other of his wives or lovers) one of the most important points to note here is that in this basically Confucian rhetoric the notion of “love” as such played little or no role at all. In fact, no such word existed. Its place was taken by equally idealistic and exalted notions such as *jin* (仁) or “humanity”, *shin* (信) or loyalty, *rei* (礼) or due ritual propriety, and the other due virtues of husband-wife, and parent-child, and especially the unquestionable authority and respect owed to the head of the *ie*.

Thus, in literature and in life, Japan has from the beginning built its marriage and child-rearing systems on the *ie*, or “clan-family”, system. According to Marx, and post-Marxist ideas, such as Peter Berger’s sociology of knowledge, such important realities go deeper than knowledge or truth, and are their basis and font⁴¹. Both poetry and religion—and all other “texts” and discourse—gain their legitimacy from root realities like mating, and the bearing and rearing of children together with the labor it requires.

“Love”, as we have seen, became the central symbol in the West and served as a kind of discursive foundation, which—during the course of the first millennium—slowly came to bear the entire weight of a civilization’s marital, familial, and child-education

systems. People married and raised their children for "love", in the above Christian sense.

The logic of the Japanese system is more or less the reverse: one does not marry for love; one loves, and marries, for the *ie*. The *ie* and not love is at the center of the family rhetoric. *Chowa* (調和) or "harmony", for instance, ranks far higher than love, because it is essential for the smooth functioning of the *ie*. Love or affection in this discourse became the means to harmony rather than its end. None of the central Confucian virtues correspond linguistically to either *koi* or *ai*. Together they form quite a different structure, but they serve essentially the same ends.

One result is that *koi* and marital affection (*aijo*, 愛情) are sharply distinguished, for the latter corresponds, in modern Japanese parlance at least, to the Confucian family ethos. But the Japanese rhetorical system has, in abundance as we have already noted, the kind of self-giving virtues which correspond to the function of "love" in the West. *Jin* or "humanity", *shin* (信) or "loyalty", and *jiji* (慈悲), or "compassion"—and, more recently, *aijo* (愛情), a general term for love between man and wife, friends, and the like. In the West these are all forms of love. In Japan they have no direct relation—unless it be that of opposites—to *koi*: passionate love between a man and woman who are not married to one another, that most important subject matter of every people's story and song.

In other words, *koi* in Japanese literature is seen as the most beautiful of human relations. But, unlike "love" in the West, it plays no central role in the all-important task of guarding the institutions by which the society reproduces itself and educates its offspring. Like *jin*, *shin*, *rei* and *jiji* in Japan, "love" in the West has a kind of transcendent value. It is the mark of the mature man. Perfect love or perfect *jin* is the mark of the perfect man.

Decidedly, *koi* does not enjoy such a status. In fact, the very structure of the polygamous *ie* and the courtship customs of the Heian period joined together to give special meaning to the emphasis on the passing, the *shinobu*, and the empty characteristics which were underlined by the Buddhist worldview. A grand noble like Hikaru Genji not only could but was expected to have many wives, consorts or mistresses, and girlfriends of less serious status. The woman's role was to wait for love until the man came to her. The woman's lot, then, had loneliness, "endurance", pain, emptiness, and feelings of love's bitter vanity, swift passing, and meaninglessness built deeply into its inner structure. There is no doubt that this deeper structure of the above characteristics is every bit as important as the religious worldview, which "legitimized" it. The central thrust of our argument is that the rhetoric and structure of the religious and family system on the one hand and the literary rhetoric on the other reflect and reinforce one another. That is, of course, near the very center—though each of them present it in quite a different manner—of Kristeva's, Foucault's, Burke's, and Geertz's understandings.

To summarize our interpretation of the two classic literary syntheses on love: we have attempted to make two points.

First, although there are many kinds of "power" which come together to form the basic discursive structure of any society's whole archive of knowledge, we have argued that in the premodern periods of both Japan and the West, the power of religious systems were of central import because, in Geertz's words, they "synthesized a people's ethos". By understanding the Buddhist, Confucian, Hebrew, and Christian religions as—among other things to be sure—symbolic systems of rhetoric we have been able to see how great literary and powerful religious forms of discourse flowed into one another, used one another, and sometimes fought one another. But in the end, they inevitably joined together to form a whole people's most fundamental notions about love—whether in literature or in the larger discourse of daily life.

Our second point is the more difficult one, which uses the basically Marxian philosophical insight that every society's discourse and knowledge is based on its people's most favored, regularly used modes of working and living. Japan and the West evolved their very different manners of keeping their societies strong by elaborating two very different family systems. These legitimated⁴²⁾ and protected their respective systems. For the West the family was monogamous and love-centered. For the Japanese it was polygamous and clan (or *ie*)-centered. Both of these family structures were supported by means of ethical and religious rules, taboos, and worldviews. The Western system calls for an idealistic conception of love. The Japanese system, having little or nothing to do with love, is free to point out the negative—from both the personal and the social points of view—side of man-woman love. Further, the polygamous and male-dominant nature of the Heian court's customs of courtship and love made the woman's role exceptionally open to being left alone and lonely, contemplating the truth of the Buddhist teaching that all things—especially the various kinds of *bonno* (煩惱) or "disturbing passions"—are vain and pass quickly.

These two points, it seems, go a long way towards explaining the dynamic involved in the two classic love syntheses under discussion. We might dramatize the differences by considering the ideals of life and love of the knight and the samurai.

We do not intend to be romantic or sentimental. In both cases the work of the warrior was killing. Typically, the motivation of neither the samurai nor the knight was a high ethical ideal. But it is also true that in both cases they were not mere foot-soldiers or infantrymen but aristocrats. As such they embodied at one and the same time the sensitivities of their civilizations and its skills at slaughter. They were also in both cases one of the central objects of the literary imagination. As such the images of them painted in literary works are very useful distillations of the culture of a people. When it came to love, their notions were so different as to serve as a useful image of their whole cultures.

For the knight, love—and in a special manner love of his “lady”—was an important force in his whole way of life. One need only think of stories such the Arthurian legend and that of Tristan, and their place in the literature of both France and England to realize that it must be taken seriously as a reflection of a civilization’s ideals during hundreds of years.

Ideally, the knight not only obeyed but loved his liege lord. He loved justice, and his country, and he risked his life out of love for and service of his lady. The source of his ability to face death unflinchingly was thus bound up in many religious and non-religious ways with love. For him, the way to perfection as a knight and as a human being was the way of love: love of God, love of his fellow man, and love of his lady.

Naturally, for both the knight and the samurai the ruling virtues of life were such things as skill with weapons, bravery in the face of death, and loyalty and obedience to his lord. At once further back and higher up in the scale of values of both were another set of virtues rooted in religious notions of what constituted the perfect man—and hence the perfect warrior. We have noted that for the knight human perfection lay in perfect love.

For the warrior of medieval Japan, highly influenced as he was by Buddhism—and especially by Zen after the emergence of military governance—an interior peace and calm conducive to the samadhi of the bodhisattva played the role which love played in the life of the Western knight. The perfect man was the one who had perfectly mastered the “disturbing passions”, passed through the bright calm of samadhi or *zammai* (三昧) and had tasted the liberating insight into the *shinnyo* (真如), or “Suchness” (Sanskrit: *tathata*) of all things in *satori* (悟り). Human perfection meant “becoming a Buddha”, by seeing through the illusions of everyday reality. This could only be done by achieving perfect inner calm of both body and mind through *zazen* or meditation, and other means.

Dogen aptly describes the religious ideal which powerfully influenced the warrior class from the Kamakura Period onward. At the beginning of his *Bendowa*: (弁道話) we read:

The Buddhas have a very excellent way to understanding so that they may transmit the Truth . . . it is the embodiment of meditation which is of itself utterly joyful . . . Every living being has a great store of Buddha Nature, but it can never be seen unless practice is undertaken, nor can it be evinced in daily life unless one becomes enlightened. If you do not cling to it your hand will be full of it. If you speak of it your mouth will be full of it, for its height and width are immeasurable; all Buddhas dwell therein eternally clinging to no one-sided attachment whatsoever; all living beings work therein once they have transcended one-sided attachment . . . once this is thoroughly mastered there is an end to clinging to trifles⁴⁹.

Based on such teaching the ideal of the samurai was to keep all his loves or desires in careful check so as to cultivate the Buddha Nature already within his heart and mind.

Perfection for him was likely to be the shining calm which reigned when through the hard discipline of zazen he achieved insight into a world without either thought or desire. The secret of his ability to face death unblinkingly was his knowledge that life and death are one—for both are equally illusory.

Here we catch sight of an important aspect of the deep structure which underlies all of the above ten characteristics of both notions of love. But what is most interesting and significant about these two models is their similarity. The fact is that the knight and samurai hold each other's central virtues in high esteem. To the degree that the samurai achieved his world's ideals of authentic peace in samadhi and satori, to precisely that degree did the unselfish loving compassion of the bodhisattva pervade all his actions and human relations. Thus the ideal samurai, especially as it was theoretically elaborated during the Tokugawa Period in the what is known as the Way of the Samurai (*bushido*, 武士道), was not only gentle and nonviolent in all his human relations, but his heart was filled with selfless benevolence towards his fellows.

In similar fashion, the knight's love, if it was authentic and mature, brought deep interior peace. Authentic love is unselfish. Perfect love, as Jesus said, casts out fear, and so brings interior peace. The reverse is the case with Buddhism. The highest ideals of the samurai had the interior peace of samadhi and satori as their center, but compassionate love for all sentient beings was seen to follow spontaneously from its achievement. Likewise, the knight's perfect love of God, of neighbor, and of his lady (which, however passionate, was ideally a controlled passion) brought deep interior peace. In both cases, complete mastery of self-centered desires brought both peace and love.

Such ideals were, as often as not perhaps, masks for brutal manipulations of power-hungry lords' oppression of poor masses. It is nevertheless beyond question that they were pervasive, very influential, and sincerely pursued by thousands of leading men in both civilizations. The ideal knight, like the ideal samurai, was painted in the hues of his own respective worldview. These two worldviews, in many ways, could hardly have been more diverse. Nevertheless, it is not by chance that, by means of extremely different religious rhetoric, they espoused very similar social and personal virtues. It seems evident then that the roots of the notions of love in Japan and the West lie in the same social soil. They both lie in the many rhetorical systems and family structures by which individuals and societies go about not only mating, and bearing and educating children, but successfully, and harmoniously building strong and warm bonds between fellow members of a society.

CONCLUSIONS

A. The Fate of the Two Classical Syntheses: Today and Tomorrow

All of the preceding material should have had the cumulative effect of pressing into our consciousness yet another set of insistent questions. They go something like this. Even if we grant that the ten characteristics enumerated do more or less accurately sketch a core of love rhetoric visible in the classical literary canons under discussion, the fact is that we no longer live in that classical age. What about today? Are not most or all of these characteristics obsolete today? And precisely because they are so long obsolete perhaps, they are already well-known to every literary historian. What about the characteristics of love in the contemporary literature and life of Japan and the West? Are they not more or less a point by point refutation and destruction of the classical ones listed above?

The answer to almost all of these questions is a decided—"Yes and No". In fact, it is this question which furnishes the present discussion with one of its most interesting and important facets: *In what manner* are these ten characteristics ancient history, and in what manner are they still very much alive in contemporary poetry and prose literature? If we find the answer to this question we will have discovered perhaps, not only the fact but the manner in which "texts", rhetoric, and attitudes built out of ancient systems of knowledge fix themselves into the very identities of all the people of a given civilization and remain stubbornly in place in spite of many a metamorphosis. I wish to argue that, to a certain degree at least, such syntheses as the two described above are so deeply entwined with the very identity of a people that they have continued through revolutions both of societies and of consciousness, simply finding new rationales for their very old identities.

In his *Ulysses*, James Joyce carried Flaubert's ironic destruction of the so-called "bourgeois morality" of romantic love to its full completion. The loves of Bloom, and of his "son" Steven Daedalus, far from being endless, educatory, sacred, oriented towards marriage, and proudly proclaimed in passionate terms, are almost the exact negative images of all ten of the above characteristics. And Molly Bloom's tryst with her husband's oppressor can hardly be said to be the higher love by which men's hearts are ennobled.

Samual Beckett's image of the woman in childbirth about to deliver the fruits of her love into an open grave—and Nabokov's story of Humbert Humbert's incestuous love for the barely adolescent Lolita—seem to spell an end to all the traditional illusions as to what love is all about. In the same manner, Akutagawa's and Mishima's and many other modern Japanese writers' works tend to do likewise for the Japanese system. But the matter deserves a closer look, in a comparative light.

The whole confluent point of Kristeva's, Foucault's, and Burke's arguments is that the practiced eye will look beyond the surface of the storyline or the literal meaning of the novel, poem—and religious system. Rather, that eye will focus on the attitudinal and value thrust of the rhetoric being employed. When we look at *Ulysses* through these kinds of glasses—and focus not just on the Western archive and intertextual complex but on another which can act as a sort of sociological control—we see something different—and significant.

There is no question at all that Joyce was indeed out to deride into oblivion the Irish-Jesuit-Christian literalist chains on thought and life with which the culture in which he was raised had bound him. His disciple Beckett and countless others have—each in his or her own manner—continued his work. But when we look more deeply we see a Bloom who in fact does love his wife with not only an undying but a forgiving, purifying love. And Steven Daedalus, for all of his determination to follow beauty and art rather than the Catholic Jansenist brand of puritanism as the light of his life, in his love for his dead mother and refusal to follow Buck Mulligan's empty, all-on-the-surface lifestyle, still preserves the basic rhetoric of Western love—stripped of its narrow doctrinal and moral strictures but preserving its mood, its tone, and essential attitudes. The love of this modern Ulysses is after all faithful to his Penelope and, in her own inane romantic way, Penelope to her Ulysses. Bloom's love at least is ennobling and purifying, the key to the perfection of secular men and women. Bloom is a Christ figure.

Similarly, Kawabata, for all his drive to assume the modernist perspective of his French models, in his *Snow Country*, or in *Beauty and Sadness*, portrays a love which is filled with the *aware* contained in the latter work's Japanese title. Neither the male nor the female protagonists express their love in words. On the contrary it is filled with the spirit of *enryo* and *shinobu*. Both the loves of Shimamura in *Snow Country* and Komako in *Beauty and Sadness* have their Springs and their Falls, and Winters, leaving a tragic and empty nothingness in their wake. In both cases it is the *ie* which remains inviolable and central; *koi* for all its power, beauty, and tenderness is an aesthetic accessory rather than a central structure of life. The same can be said, in varying degrees at least, for the works of Tanizaki and Mishima. Witness, for example, the latter's praise of the *Hagakure's* admiration for undeclared love taken unspoken into the grave⁴⁴.

Now let us have a closing glance—taking advantage of our comparative method to gain entrance—at the everyday Japanese and Western cultural atmosphere of today. It is the stuff out of which our very knowledge—of love and all else—is now being born. Unquestionably, not one but several revolutions have taken place, both in our understanding and in our actual practice of love. They include scientific revolutions in our knowledge of our own bodies, medical revolutions which allowed—until AIDS at least—to control disease and our fertility. They also include political, educational, communi-

cations revolutions—and so on.

From Plato and the Song of Songs to the troubadours, Dante, and Shakespeare, to Milton and the Romantics, and after, a very optimistic notion prevailed. Whether religious or secular in tone and worldview, love was seen as the transcendent, mysterious alchemy which—if only it is pure and sincere enough—can turn our base selfishness into the gold of altruistic love capable of embracing everything from nature to the poor, the sick, and the downtrodden.

Goethe's *Faust* exemplifies this in a very sophisticated manner, not relying on mere religious faith or romanticist optimism, but following man's worst selfish inclinations through to a slow maturation of the ability to forget self in an expansive love for one's fellows. The period of romanticism ended when the hopelessly unrealistic romanticist version of this view of love collapsed under the weight of rather hideous new historical realities. The new age of bitter realism was born.

First, French modernism, and then the more universal Nietzsche-based strain, gained ascendancy in Western literature. And they have gone a long way towards bringing our two classic syntheses of literary love notions to heel. All ten Western love notions have since been exposed as hollow in the glaring light of an essentially ego-centered, loveless world.

In the cold light of value-neutral, scientific assessment a new "truth" is abroad. It has to do with man's oneness with other forms of animal life, and his apparently accidental coming into being, and his certain demise in the cosmic winter of dying planets. Inspired by the force of this new truth and an allied Nietzschean nihilism, artists and writers vie with one another to pour the acid of irony on the old love-notions whenever their rear their heads.

Nevertheless, the important thing to note here is that neither the Western nor the only slightly less ideological Japanese kindred notions and attitudes which make up the two syntheses have by any means vanished from either the conscious or the unconscious cultural archives where they reside. They often crop up in many literary disguises, even among the most ironic of the postmodernists. In the West these modernists, and a similar type of postmodernist, still themselves marry "for love", vow that it will last until death, and see it as an ennobling center of their lives. And in Japan they still marry for their *ie* and expect that *koi* can continue alongside of their affection for their wives—not just as an exception but as the rule. *Koi* is still sad in its fleeting beauty. The male is still the master, but the woman's love is still the stronger.

Highly favored clusters of attitudes, values, moods, and tones—not to speak of intellectual notions—die hard. They do die of course, but they die hard. Their roots are very deep. They lie at the very base of cultural and individual identity; and nowhere is this more true than in the case of love. Modernists, from Flaubert, Joyce, Gide, and Mann to Pound, Hemmingway, Akutagawa, Kawabata, and Mishima—and their de-

scendants among postmodernists such as Samuel Beckett and Nabokov, to name but a few—have indeed worked out alternative schemes of artful love literature: cool, light, graphic, and concrete description, with an appearance of absolute detachment from all ideology. But that in itself is an ideology. It demands all the commitment of religious faith—and for the same reasons. It too involves a rhetorical symbolic system of convictions and commitments.

According to this worldview, love, like everything else, is simply what appears on the surface. No theories. This approach has indeed, to a very large degree, replaced the two classic syntheses—on the surface, at least—in one, albeit central, current of postmodern writing.

If once again we focus on moods, attitudes, and values which have remained beneath the surfaces of today's writers we see a gray rather than a black and white surface. In spite of an unquestionable confluence of new attitudes and notions, both Japanese and Western portraits of love seem to retain a large portion of many of the contrasting elements which both have inherited from the great rhetorical archives of their respective pasts.

B. The Culling Process: Intelligent Rejection and Reaffirmation

How shall we confront this phenomenon? How explain it? How assess its direction and significance? The present study had its genesis in the need to ask these questions, and to organize the very tentative and incomplete insights that form the concluding section of this comparative study.

In both civilizations it is science and technology which have taken the place of "the old-time religion" as the chief source for both our practice and our understanding of what the real nature of sexual attraction, union, and pairing really are. The certainty that we grew, along with other primates, out of lower forms of life, the realization that male and female hormones are the basis for attraction which leads to union, the knowledge about human reproductive systems which led to the technologies of birth control, and the Marxian insight that—to an important degree at least—it is out of family and economic structures that the symbolic forms arise by which both poets and religious leaders erect their symbolic images, stories, and structures. All these new discoveries have been and are the keys to our day-to-day civilized understanding and behavior in the matter of love. These discoveries, as they slowly accumulated, were no doubt responsible in no small part for the rebellions which the modernists and postmodernists from Flaubert to Beckett have successfully staged. But this is by no means the end of the story.

Love is more than sexual attraction and union. It is a human relationship. Our comparative investigation has revealed to how great an extent it is embedded in a specific, variable complex of manners, attitudes, and values which we each love almost as much as physical love itself. In fact, it is very clear that they too are also, and always, very essential elements of human love.

When I observe love itself and attitudes towards it in Japanese society on any and every social level today—in my students and my colleagues, in the married and unmarried lives of my neighbors and my friends, and in the songs sung and the stories told in the "karaoke" bars (the image of the lonely woman walking in the rain or weeping into her sake cup is still the dominant image)—I observe that the attitudes which I encountered in classical literature are still very much alive. *Koi* still has its beginning and its end. It is still beautiful, necessary, and important, but passes quickly, is generally not to be openly and verbally expressed, has its Spring and its Winter, and is filled with the pathos of *aware*. It still has little to do with marriage, which is still almost entirely in one way or another a factor of the *ie*. Even in so-called "love" marriages two families still come together, plan, investigate, and either permit or forbid the union.

The Western equivalent of "karaoke" music is equally expressive of premodern attitudes, moods, and values respecting love. This is generally true not just of country-western music but of a large portion of the pop and rock types as well. Whether they are professors or dock workers, physicians or philosophers, most Western people consider love to be the normal basic motive for, and ingredient of, a successful marriage. They really expect love to perdure and hold the marriage together, and to be a major factor in whatever degree of human maturity they might be able to achieve. This is not, generally speaking, the case in Japan, where the *ie* in its many forms and guises still reigns supreme and—in a more effective manner than "love" in the West—succeeds in holding marriages together.

It is by no means self-evidently the case, as so many of my teenage Japanese students think, that Western notions about love and love-marriages are the more desirable of the two systems. A single glance at the divorce statistics, at the rate of teenage pregnancy and single motherhood, and at the problems of teenage delinquency, emotional illness, crime and drugs, leaves no doubt that the Japanese manner of conceiving of love and marriage is without much question the more socially—and quite possibly, the more personally—healthful today. If any objective standards exist—and few do—the uninvolved observer would surely have to conclude that it is in Western society that a strange switch in love characteristics has taken place. Due to the sexual revolution of the past two or three decades, today it is Western love which passes quickly—and is relatively vain and empty, and though (beautiful and necessary) is thoroughly saturated with pathos. Japanese love by comparison, is positive, longlasting, and considered to educate and ennoble the human heart. But neither does that bring our story to a close.

As a final assessment, again guided by the insights of Kristeva, Foucault, and similar thinkers, we must conclude that notions of love in Japan and the West have most definitely, during to course of the present century, changed radically and permanently. They have not, however, broken completely with the past. We both are still strongly influenced by our respective traditional notions of love. But we espouse them in a new manner. We

are very aware, as first Nietzsche, and then Heidegger taught us, of the facticity, and the hermeneutic circularity, the Derridean *différance*, of our notions of love—and of everything else. This keeps us from too chauvinistic an exclusivism.

We know now that notions of and attitudes towards love are relative. But for all that we are by no means ready to give up our most beloved traditional attitudes, values, ways of proceeding, and tonal qualities respecting love. It was their love of their beauty and their wise and practical successfulness, which originally made our forefathers espouse them and enshrine them in our literature. Even though few of us, in any literal or serious way manner at least, “believe in” the religious systems and worldviews which helped to form and legitimize them, still, we are committed in important ways to the attitudes, moods, and dispositions which motivated our ancestors to embrace them.

The fact is that we cannot give these up, because we do not want to. Without them we have neither a cultural nor an individual identity. They are us. Those who want to reject them all simply because they are “metaphors”, are in danger of becoming like Nietzsche himself who, failing to see the rhetorical truths beneath the literal falsity of God and Christianity, abandoned himself to insane attempts to jump out of his civilizational skin.

This dilemma contains the central question which divides postmodern thinkers into two camps: one side would go with Nietzsche, Pynchon, Nabokov, and a host of others, and engage in the Dionysian dance of absurd playfulness. That might be fine for a few artists who imagine that the dreams they project have no power to impinge upon the real world. But many of our best writers, such as Saul Bellow, see—like the final Foucault, Burke, and his disciple Lentricchia, that literature is itself a potent form of symbolic action which can and does help either to build or to wreck social structures and individual lives. Neither couples nor societies can long endure in a vacuum.

So what can, or should, we Japanese and Western writers, critics, and teachers of literature do with our still incredibly beloved but somehow obsolete notions of love? We wish neither to abandon them nor to be bound by them, so what can we do?

The answer suggested by the dynamics of our comparative study does not seem so difficult. To the degree that we know both literary and religious systems to be simply “texts” or rhetorical action systems we are free both to firmly reaffirm what we still love, and to reject what we do not, with equal decisiveness. Both Buddhist and Christian religious traditions and the canons of our literary classics are still “texts” which can be loved and affirmed. Both are grounded in reality, but in a symbolic manner. They synthesize and express millennia of experience and knowledge concerning the outermost parameters of life, love, and reality. We can—as we have always in fact done in the past—be discriminating, respecting the characteristics of love as well as other central foundations of human life. We can winnow and cull.

We can strongly affirm what our own cultures have found to be “true” regarding love.

But only those which are special to our own civilization. Others are common to almost every culture and we can enrich what is ours by borrowing compatible elements from others. We can reject the empty vanity of purely sexual liaisons and affirm—each in his own manner—the splendor of a giving kind of love, and the need for restraint, dignity, and compassion.

We also know, however, that the new realities and vastly wider perceptions of the present world offer a wealth of valuable new possibilities which we have no reason to discard, even though they may—less often than we might think—contradict the traditional notions of love. These new realities are such things as relatively greater wealth, education, a planet filled with more than enough human beings. They are birth control, sexual equality, and control of all (but the newest) sexually connected diseases. We are free, both ideologically and politically, if not always economically, to allow these two sets of traditional and modern "powers" to compete with, rub against, and wear away the conflicting corners of one another—in our personal lives as well as within the society as a whole. This is the manner of our culling and winnowing.

Whether or not we agree that this is what should happen, the fact is that it is what is happening. It is in fact what always has happened. A new synthesis is in the process of being born. And, for better or worse, that modern version of the medieval synthesis will without question once again be mirrored and expressed in literature, and it will be transcendently "legitimized" by all the authorities or "powers" which in fact are bringing it into existence. *Plus ça change, plus c'est le meme.*

NOTES

- 1) Our own interpretation is not based on Derrida's thought. It is important, however, to note that both Japanese and Western notions of love were to a large extent built upon symbolic structures such as Buddhism and Christianity. Our critique is built on the premise that these structures themselves are expressible only in words and so are forms of discourse, resting not on "solid" physical or metaphysical foundations but on "traces" continually "deferred" and mirrored by the words which bring them into focus. Our ability to validly compare notions of love which are of totally differing origins rests on Derrida's notion, "il n'y a pas de hors-texte". See Jacques Derrida, "Differance", in *Speech and Phenomena and other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*, trans. David B. Allison (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1973), 159.
- 2) Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, trans., Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980), 65 ff.
- 3) See Vol. I "An Introduction", (Trans., Robert Hurley, (Middlesex: Penguin, 1981). Here Foucault analyses the manner in which the modern notion of "sexuality" is a product of the confluence of such diverse "powers" as the medieval examination of conscience, and confession of sexual sins, the bourgeois penchant for controlling both family and sex for the profit motive, and especially the bringing of all these hitherto diverse forces into under the "truth" of "science" and medicine, beginning in the eighteenth century and continuing into the present. In Volumes Two and Three he goes back to first the Greek and then the Roman civilizations and traces how sexuality gradually changed its focus from one of pleasure (II) to one of "Care of the Self" in late Roman times (III). The present analysis of love attempts to parallel this kind of analysis. And, while keeping the focus on literature, it recognizes that literature is but one facet of a

civilization's wider "archive" of knowledge.

- 4) Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, in their *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982) 104-207, analyze the development of Foucault's ideas along these lines. Their analysis is given the imprimatur of the master, as it were, in the "Afterword" by Foucault himself, one of the last statements of his ideas before he died. There Foucault declares that the ultimate object of his search has not been "power" and "knowledge" so much as the self: how power of many kinds go into the objectivizing of our individual selves. "Thus it is not power, but the subject which is the general theme of my research". (209) Here we use his thought as a guideline in our search to see what forms of "power" and "knowledge" went into the formation of that primary element of every self: love.
- 5) Burke has spent his life lecturing and writing about literature and its "rhetoric". His final synthesis, however, is wider and includes religion as another "symbol system" which, like literature, is primarily a form of "symbolic action", or persuasion. "The subject of religion falls under the head of *rhetoric* in the sense that rhetoric is the art of *persuasion*, and religious cosmogonies are designed, in the last analysis, as exceptionally thoroughgoing modes of persuasion. To persuade men towards certain acts, religions would form the kinds of attitude which prepare men for such acts". *The Rhetoric of Religion* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1970), Introduction, v. In this manner Burke places religion alongside of literature, seeing both as types of rhetoric, discourse, or persuasive symbolic action.
- 6) In the manner of Foucault's genealogy of "sexuality" in his last major work, *The History of Sexuality*.
- 7) Already in the very first lines of the Preface of the *Kojiki* we see reference to the Male and the Female—or the Yin and the Yang—as being the origin of all things. (*Kojiki*, Donald L. Philippi, trans., Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1968), 37. The first twelve chapters of Book I recount the story of the incarnations of these two primordial "spirits", Izanami and Izanagi, including the mother of the imperial line, the sun goddess, Ameratesu (47-71).
- 8) See Chapter Five called "Lavender", Edwin Seidensticker, trans., *The Tale of Genji* (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1978), 85-111.
- 9) *Ibid.*
- 10) Laurel Resplica Rodd and Mary Catherine Henkenius, Trs., *Kokinshu: A Collection of Poems Ancient and Modern* (Princeton: The Princeton University Press, 1984), 35.
- 11) See Nakanishi—on whom I have relied for so many of the present notions, 中西進『日本人の愛の歴史：古典の主人公たち』角川選書, 29 (昭和53), 9.
- 12) Kathryn Sparling, tr., *Yokio Mishima on Hagakura: The Samurai Ethic and Modern Japan* (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1978), 15-24.
- 13) See Ivan Morris, *The World of the Shining Prince* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1964), 211 ff.
- 14) See Haruo Shirane, *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of 'The Tale of Genji'* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 11-12.
- 15) Laurel Rasplica Rodd and Mary Catherine Henkenius, trs. and annotators, *Kokinshu: A Collection of Poems Ancient and Modern* (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1984), The Introduction, 21-23.
- 16) *The Splendor of Longing in the "Tale of Genji"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 206.
- 17) As cited by Norma Field, 298-299.
- 18) See Haruo Shirane, *The Bridge of Dreams: A Poetics of the "Tale of Genji"* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987), 186-193.
- 19) As translated in Thomas Blenman Hare, *Zeami's Style: The Noh Plays of Zeami Motokiyo* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986), 152-153.
- 20) *Op. cit.*, 10.
- 21) 伊藤 整, 「近代日本における「愛」「虚偽」」 in 「近代日本人の発想の諸形式」, 昭和59 (1984) 139-199.

- 22) *The Symposium* Walter Hamilton, tr. (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951), 93.
- 23) As cited in A. J. Smith, *The Metaphysics of Love: Studies in Renaissance love poetry from Dante to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 32. I have recast his translation.
- 24) See George Duby, *The Knight, the Lady, and the Priest*, tr. Barbara Bray (Middlesex: Penguin, 1983), pp.23-53.
- 25) I have found especially helpful Maurice Valency's *In Praise of Love: an Introduction to the Love Poetry of the Renaissance* (New York: Schocken Books, 1982), A. J. Smith's *The Metaphysics of Love: Studies in Renaissance love poetry from Dante to Milton*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) Irving Singer's *The Nature of Love* vol. 2: *Courtly and Romantic Love* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966 and 1984), and Bernard O'Donohue's careful documentation of the major works which demonstrate the manner of its birth and growth in his, *The Courtly Love Tradition: Literature in Context* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1977).
- 26) Middlesex: Penguin, 1983), 17-70.
- 27) Lawrence and Wishart, 1973.
- 28) Glasgow: Fontana, 1977.
- 29) Weidenfelt and Nicholson, 1977.
- 30) See "Religion as a Cultural System", in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973), 85-91.
- 31) *Ibid.*, 90.
- 32) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982, 235-236.
- 33) "Word, Dialogue, and Novel", in her *Desire in Language. loc. cit.*
- 34) "Religion as a Cultural System", in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 90 ff. (*Ibid.*, 89).
- 35) *Ibid.*, p. 89.
- 36) See *History of Sexuality*, Vol. III, *The Care of the Self*, especially Chapter Three, "The Regimen of Pleasures", which begins with the words, "Sexual acts must therefore be placed under an extremely careful regimen". 124-144.
- 37) Laura Kendrick, *The Game of Love: Troubadour Word Play* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 141.
- 38) *Ibid.*
- 39) See Kendrick's discussion of William IX of Aquitaine's mock treatment of a convent of prostitutes, and the like. 157-182.
- 40) See Frances and Joseph Gies, *Marriage and the Family in the Middle Ages* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1987), 68-98.
- 41) See Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967), 92.
- 42) See Peter L. Berger, in his discussion of religions as systems for "World construction" and "World Maintenance" in, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1967), 3-53.
- 43) Based on a translation in Jiyu Kennett's *Selling Water by the River* (New York: Vintage Books, 1972), 115-116.
- 44) "The ultimate love I believe to be secret love. Once shared, love shrinks in stature. Too pine away for love all one's years, to die of love without uttering the beloved's name, this is the true meaning of love". (*Hagakure*, Bk. One) Commenting on this passage, Mishima write, "The stature of love has become insignificant, and undeclared love is rare. Love is losing its scope ..." Yukio Mishima, Kathryn Sparling, tr., *Yukio Mishima on Hagakure: The Samurai Ethic and Modern Japan* (Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1978), 78-79.