

Emi Miyata (6148263)

Dr. Birgit Kaiser

MA Literature Today (English and Comparative Literature)

2 July 2019

The Postmonolingual Conditions in Japanese Literature Today:

Yoko Tawada and Hideo Levy

Table of Contents

Introduction.....3

1. Beyond the Monolingualism: Transition into the Postmonolingual Conditions... 9

2. Yoko Tawada: A Journey Beyond the Mother Tongue.....17

3. Hideo Levy: Bilingual Excitement.....31

4. Conclusion.....47

Notes.....49

Works Cited.....51

Introduction

Multilingualism in literature has been discussed widely over the decades in terms of objection against the nation-state monolingual paradigm. Not only the Western world but also in Asian countries controversies surrounding language and identity, such as ‘monolingualism’ argued by Jacques Derrida, are important issues. As scholars have discussed, Japan is one of these Asian countries where so-called ‘One nation, One language’ idea has been propagated over the decades (Loveday 2). Similar to other nation-states, many modern-day Japanese people believe that Japan is a monolingual nation-state, thus, having a good command of the Japanese language is a privilege of Japanese citizens and the ability is one of the important foundations of Japanese national identity.

In spite of the common belief of monolingual Japan, the Japanese language has been in a diverse environment through the ages. According to Patrick Heinrich, who studies Japanese language minorities, the ideas of the European nation-state and national language had never existed officially in Japan until the beginning of the Meiji era (from 1868 onward), when Western countries began to negotiate with Japan for opening and ‘modernizing’ the country (4). Heinrich illustrates that a unified national language in Japan which is called *kokugo* was established at the end of the 19th century (the beginning of the Meiji restoration), and spread through the education system: *kokugo* was designated by the government as a subject taught at school with school books. The ideology of the national language and identity derived from the European nation states such as Germany, France and Italy; these ideologies generated language nationalism in Japan during that period (see 3-6). Heinrich argues: “[i]n order to join the modern world and create ‘the Japanese’ as an imagined community, Japan invented itself as monolingual, a process which required suppression of linguistic diversity.” (6) “The linguistic diversity” in

Japan is controversial, since some scholars agree with the idea that there are or were other languages besides Japanese, while others argue that these are or were not languages but dialects or variations of the Japanese language. For instance, according to UNESCO's web page 'UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger,' there are eight endangered languages in Japan: Ainu (Hokkaido); Amami; Hachijō; Kunigami; Miyako; Okinawan; Yaeyama; Yonaguni. In any case, it can be seen clearly that the Japanese language maintains diverse conditions, thus, it should not connect with the idea of unified 'the Japanese.'

Such a myth of unified 'the Japanese' can be seen also in the field of literature. From the 20th century onward, Japanese writers and scholars tend to assert themselves as a representative of monolingual, monocultural and authentic Japan. For instance, Yasunari Kawabata, the first Japanese winner of the Nobel Prize in literature, told that his creativity was based on the Japanese mentality. In his winning lecture of the Nobel Prize in 1968, titled "Japan, the Beautiful and Myself," Kawabata quoted two medieval poems by Japanese priests in the 12th and 13th century, in order to underscore his 'Japanese spirit' is truly authentic. He also mentioned iconic words and phrases relevant to the traditional Japanese art and culture, which are regarded as "the very essence of Japan," such as the beauty of the four seasons, cherry blossoms, the moon, *Zen*, the tea ceremony, the Japanese garden and so on. In addition to this, Kawabata talked about many Japanese literary works from the 8th century onward, such as *Manyōshū* (in around the 780s), *Kokinshū* (in about 900), *The Tale of Ise* (in about 900), *The Tale of Genji* (in about 1000), *The Pillow Book* (in around 1000) and so on. He argued that Japanese literature has a long history and his tastes for Japanese literature and beauty were derived from these Japanese classics, especially from the *Genji*, which is regarded as the most influential text among Japanese literary works. This is still a controversial lecture¹ and I do not want to go deep into this topic here.

However, the point is that Kawabata apparently believed that Japan is one nation-state and ‘the Japanese spirit,’ ‘the Japanese culture’ or ‘the Japanese literature’ should be considered one firm tradition which has long, authentic history and can provide identity basis for ‘the Japanese’ people like him.

On the contrary, considering pre-modernized Japan, in ancient and medieval periods from the 4th to the 12th centuries, there were multilingual conditions and Japanese was not the only one language in this country; there was no writing system in Japan until the middle of the Heian period (from 794 to the 1180s), therefore the official language for political records was Chinese; the religious and cultural ideas and texts were imported from China and Korea; from the Heian period onward, the Japanese language system has developed gradually but still it bases on the Chinese writing system and Chinese loan words (Loveday 24, 25). In Japanese literary texts in the Heian period, Chinese literary form played crucial roles in many masterpieces such as *the Tale of Genji* and the *Pillow Book*. In addition to this, from the 17th to the 19th century, Western knowledge and terms in many fields such as medicine, physics, science and technology were introduced mainly from Dutch and German into Japanese (Loveday 25, 26). Even now, several language minorities are alive in Japan such as *Ainu*, in the Northern part of Japan, and *Okinawan* or *Ryukyuan*, in the southernmost part of Japan (Maher and Yashiro 3; Loveday 2). In these respects, Japanese society has been kept in multilingual conditions over the centuries, and the Japanese language and literature have developed in such a multilingual environment (Loveday 25, 26).

In brief, although Japan has been in multilingual conditions from ancient times onward and there are many cultural and ethnological layers, after the modernization at the end of the 19th century by means of European nation-state ideology, Japanese societies standardized the

Japanese language and people have been changed to prefer considering Japan is monolingual, monocultural nation-state, and the myth of homogeneity has spread also through the literary fields. Some scholars argue that Japanese literature is only considered such if written in standard Japanese, therefore, the literary texts written by multilingual authors tend to be judged by the aspect whether or not their Japanese is ‘correct,’ even if the writers aim to write in poetic styles or want to employ unique usage of languages.

Insofar as the environment still affects, how do contemporary multilingual authors create a place for writing in Japanese? In my opinion, Yasemin Yildiz’s ‘postmonolingual’ should be considered as one of the key concepts for understanding Japanese literature in a multilingual condition today. In this thesis, in order to critically examine the monolingual paradigm, I will reveal the ‘postmonolingual’ conditions in Japanese literary field today by means of discussing texts by two multilingual authors, Yoko Tawada and Ian Hideo Levy.

Tawada was born in Japan in 1960 to Japanese parents and she grew up in a monolingual environment in her early days. In contrast, she studied German and Russian in high school and university in Japan, and after graduation, she worked in the German publishing industry. In brief, she had been absorbed into the multilingual environment. After several years, Tawada enrolled in the Hamburg University and acquired the degree of Master in German literature, then she moved to Zürich University and acquired the degree of Doctor in German literature. During her study, Tawada wrote several poems and novels in Japanese and German, and her first poetry collection and novel were published in the 1980s by a German publishing house. From then on, Tawada writes in both Japanese and German, and won many literary prizes in Germany, Japan, U.S. and other European countries.² Based on her knowledge of European languages, literature and culture, Tawada deals with the mother tongue issue and challenges to go beyond the

monolingual paradigm in many ways. In this respect, Tawada is one of the most noticeable and successful multilingual authors in Japan. I will discuss her texts closely in chapter 2.

On the other hand, Ian Hideo Levy was born in the U.S. in 1950 to a Jewish-American father and a Polish-American mother and educated in Taiwan, Japan and the U.S. He graduated from Princeton University with a bachelor's degree in East Asian studies, after which he acquired a master's and doctor's degree in Princeton. After graduation, he worked at both Princeton University and Stanford Universities as a scholar who studied Japanese language and literature, specializing in ancient Japanese poetry. Levy is also known as a translator of *Manyoshu [The Ten Thousand Leaves]*, the oldest poetry collections in Japanese which was compiled in the 8th century, and with this translation, he won the U.S. National Book Awards in translation in 1982. However, Levy quit his job at Stanford and then became a fiction writer in the Japanese language. In his novels and essays, Levy often deals with his experiences through the Japanese and Chinese language and his identity issues, such as his alienation as a white man living in Asian countries, racial discrimination and the language barrier. In addition to this, he employs old Japanese language and Chinese characters as parts of his creative writings. Levy is acclaimed as the first native English-speaking author who won a literary prize in Japan. Levy is highly aware of multilingualism in literature in terms of the postmonolingual paradigm. I will reveal Levy's motive for writing and his creativity in chapter 3.

Although Tawada and Levy started from a different standpoint, they show strong interest in language itself and similar preference for writing in languages which are not native to them. This is because they are both keen on the mother tongue issues, monolingualism and multilingualism in literature, and therefore aim to reveal and go beyond these paradigms. Again, the main purpose of this thesis is as follows, in order to surpass the nation-state monolingual

paradigm, to reveal the postmonolingual conditions in contemporary Japanese literary fields and to heighten academic interests in multilingual authors in Japan.

1. Beyond the Monolingualism: Transition into the Postmonolingual Conditions

The controversy surrounding language and identity has been discussed in many ways, especially in terms of the opposition to the monolingualism. Jacques Derrida was born into an Algerian-Jewish family and widely known as a monolingual, French-speaking philosopher. In spite of his monolingual condition, Derrida confesses hardship regarding the language and identity in his book, *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin*; his ‘mother tongue,’ French, is only one language which he can speak but still, he feels alienation for speaking French. Derrida asserts repeatedly that “I only have one language (yet, but, henceforth, lastingly) it is not mine.” (21) Derrida describes himself as a “Franco-Maghrebian,” who can be at once a “Maghrebian” and a “French citizen”. (13) A “Franco-Maghrebian” in general is a French speaker from Maghreb regions but does not have a firm status, which a French citizen has. Derrida explains three typologies of “French:” French speakers from France; ‘Francophones’ who are neither French nor Maghrebian; French-speaking Maghrebians who are not and have never been French citizens. (12) Then Derrida argues that: “I do not belong to any of these clearly defined groups. My ‘identity’ does not fall under any of these three categories.” (13) Although Derrida had only one language, French, he spoke it with difficulty; he was a French citizen, at the same time, he was a Jew not from Metropolitan France but from Algeria, where the possibility of withdrawal of the French language and citizenship existed. This is because colonial Algeria fell under French law, and France was occupied in the early 1940s by Nazi-Germany which took French citizenship away from all Jews, including those living in French colonial Algeria. Derrida argues again:

Consequently, anyone should be able to declare under oath: I have only one language and it is not mine; my “own” language is, for me, a language that cannot be assimilated. My language, the only one I hear myself speak and agree to speak, is the language of the other. (25)

In this sense, even if a person has only one language he can speak, it can be alien to him, and it may cause an identity crisis between languages. To clarify, ‘alienation’ in Derrida’s context is not alienation in general. According to Derrida: “This structure of alienation without alienation, this inalienable alienation, is not only the origin of our responsibility, it also structures the peculiarity and property of language” (25). Based on Derrida’s theory, ‘having’ a language is impossible for anyone.

Derrida argues that no one has the privilege to possess a natural tie with a language; nevertheless, some people represent an unfounded belief that a language is a property and they have the privilege to own it. Derrida illustrates French speakers in and from France as “the master” and they force to speak “their language” for French speakers outside France. Derrida argues:

Because the master does not possess exclusively, and naturally, what he calls his language, because, whatever he wants or does, he cannot maintain any relations of property or identity that are natural, national, congenital, or ontological, with it, because he can give substance to and articulate this appropriation only in the course of an unnatural process of politico-phantasmatic constructions, because language is not his natural possession, he can, thanks to that very fact, pretend historically, through the rape

of a cultural usurpation, which means always essentially colonial, to appropriate it in order to impose it as “his own” (23).

According to Derrida, although Francophone French speakers, “the master,” believe that speaking French is one of their innate traits and basis of their identities, that is a groundless myth; “because language is not his natural possession” (23).

Similar to Derrida, in his memoir *Out of Place* (2000), Edward W. Said begins the story from his confusion in terms of his identity and the multilingual and multicultural environment in his childhood. Said was born in 1935 in Jerusalem, to Palestinian parents, and had grown up in Jerusalem and Cairo, then educated in the United States. According to Said, he was uncomfortable with his first name ‘Edward’ because this English name seemed unsuitable for his family name ‘Said,’ which is apparently Arabic (*Place* 3). Said also writes that his linguistic environment was mixed and it affected his identity consciousness: “I have never known what language I spoke first, Arabic or English, or which one was really mine beyond any doubt.” The confusion like Said felt was derived from the myth of the mother tongue and monolingualism. If people should have only one language as his or her mother tongue, such a distorted perspective force people to choose one language and abandon the others. Such uncanny believe of the monolingual conditions is relevant to the nation-state paradigm, which foists the idea that people should own one ‘true’ language and nationality on the citizens. Such thoughts may connect the unrooted faith in racial and linguistic authenticity.

In this regard, one of Said’s landmarks in literary criticism is the concept of ‘affiliation and filiation,’ which is also relevant to the multilingual environment, appeared in his early work, *The Word, the Text, and the Critic* (1983). In this text, Said discusses the difficulties of filiation

or filial relationship in the modern world, where, as Lukacs says, “all the products of human labour, children included, which are so completely separated from each other.” (*The World*, 17) Filiation in this sense means natural or inherent relationships with others. On the other hand, affiliation means new forms of relationships without kinship (17). Said describes the concept more closely:

Thus if a filial relationship was held together by natural bonds and natural forms of authority – involving obedience, fear, love, respect, and instinctual conflict – the new affiliative relationship changes these bonds into what seem to be transpersonal forms – such as guild consciousness, consensus, collegiality, professional respect, class, and the hegemony of a dominant culture. The filiative scheme belongs to the realms of nature and of “life,” whereas affiliation belongs exclusively to culture and society. (*The World*, 20)

Accordingly, Said believes that people in the modernized societies can build voluntary connections regardless of their native societies, languages and nationalities. Affiliation can be understood as a new idea which begins to see the ‘nation’ as a much more diverse thing that monolingualism has made people believe.

Regarding Said’s ideas on affiliations and filiations, according to a postcolonial theorist R. Radhakrishnan, filiations in Said’s concepts mean something “completed being,” for example, “Born a Hindu always a Hindu, born American always American” (2). Thus, a connection between a person and his mother tongue, which means a native language for a person, or more literary, a language spoken by his mother, can be understood as one of the filiations.

In short, Derrida feels alienation to his could-be mother tongue French, although he is a monolingual; Said struggled with his identity issues between two (or more) languages and cultures. In this sense, regardless a person is monolingual or multilingual, it is apparent that the mother tongue concept is dubious and the monolingual paradigm can be unsuitable for some people.

In addition to Derrida and Said, in *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*, Yasemin Yildiz also discusses the issues regarding multilingualism and monolingualism, and the mother tongue thoroughly. According to Yildiz, the emergence of the monolingual paradigm was in the 18th century Europe with political, philosophical and cultural changes. The myth of the mother tongue influenced the developing of the monolingualism, in order to pursue the unification of people and societies (6). Yildiz illustrates: “late eighteenth-century German thinkers such as Johann Gottfried Herder, Wilhelm von Humboldt, and Friedrich Schleiermacher spearheaded the view that one could properly think, feel, and express oneself only in one’s ‘mother tongue’” (7). With the strong demand to connect language and nation for political reasons, the 18th century German intellectuals, especially Herder, praised “the distinctness of each language, which he saw as emanating from the genius of a particular nation” and claimed on “the need to maintain the distinctness of these national languages lest they lose their authenticity and rootedness in their respective nations” (7). In doing so, the mother tongue concept and European nation-state ideology were tied up with each other, and people believed that “individuals and social formations are imagined to possess one ‘true’ language only, their ‘mother tongue,’ and through this possession to be organically linked to an exclusive, clearly demarcated ethnicity, culture, and nation” (2). The monolingual paradigm has thrived throughout the European world for many decades through educational and cultural policies, even if inside a

multilingual region such as the Habsburg empire, where Czech and German are widely spoken (30, 31).

For instance, in early twentieth-century Prague, “the language wars” happened between the majority, Czech-speakers, and the minorities, German-speakers. Yildiz illustrates:

Because nationalist movements – be they Czech or German – threatened a person’s native language as a solid indicator of his or her nationality, they were invested in asserting that the people they represented had only one language. (31)

In this sense, according to Yildiz, the conflict between Czech and German was not only “the language wars” but also duels between two paradigms, the monolingual and the multilingual (31). People who supported the monolingual paradigm took for granted that language and identity have intimate relations.

... a multilingual paradigm, in which linguistic practices did not necessarily follow exclusive identitarian logics, and an emergent monolingual one, for which the connection between language and identity was paramount. Even as multilingual practices persisted to differing degrees, however, it was the monolingual paradigm’s conception of subjects, communities, and modes of belonging that carried the day. In this conception, the “mother tongue” was the medium through which one was tied organically to one’s nation as well as the only basis of proper subjectivity and legitimacy. (31)

As we can see, Yildiz criticizes the mother tongue concept and the monolingual paradigm. Instead of that, she argues that 'postmonolingual' condition should be considered in this multilingual world nowadays. In terms of Yildiz, 'postmonolingual' is a concept which criticizes and aims to overcome the former monolingual paradigm. Yildiz introduces the term closely; the prefix 'post-' contains two meanings: firstly, a temporal dimension, namely, not before but after the emergence of the monolingual paradigm in late eighteenth-century Europe; secondly, similar to a well-known concept 'postmodernism,' it represents the critical aspect for the former paradigm (4).

Herewith, Said's affiliation and filiation concept can be tied up with the Yildiz's postmonolingual condition. In the new postmonolingual paradigm, people can build affiliative connections among languages, even if they are far from each other in terms of linguistic kinship; in the literary fields, in order to overcome the former monolingual paradigm and the myth of the mother tongue, multilingual authors can choose their languages for writing, instead of using the dominant language.

In *Beyond the Mother Tongue*, Yildiz mainly deals with such multilingual authors and the postmonolingual condition in the German literary fields; Yildiz discusses a wide range of issues, not only traditional German-Jewish racial contexts and contemporary migrant-worker language environment but also more artistic relations outside the ordinal contexts. In this respect, Yildiz describes Yoko Tawada, a Japanese author based in Germany who writes both in Japanese and German, as one of the representatives who aim to go beyond the monolingual paradigm. Tawada chooses the German language for her creative writings even if there are no linguistic relations between her native language, Japanese, and German. As mentioned before, she writes in both Japanese and German, and sometimes uses Japanese and German at once within a work. This

unique technique succeeds to enhance her creativity and critical efficacy, as a result, many Tawada's works have been discussed in terms of her linguistic background, Japanese and German, and her poetic writing style.

In addition to these present reputations for Tawada, from my point of view/in my view, Tawada's uniqueness also comes from her sense of ancient Japanese classics and Chinese characters. One of the examples of Tawada's interest for Chinese, in her essay *Exophony: a Journey beyond the mother tongue*, Tawada points out the importance of Chinese characters in the Japanese language and several Japanese literary works by multilingual authors, for instance, Ian Hideo Levy. Tawada and Levy often mention each other in their works, and they sometimes take interviews together. They are both multilingual authors who are keen on creating affiliative connections among languages in their works, in order to go beyond the monolingual paradigm and pioneer new horizons, in terms of Yildiz, develop the postmonolingual conditions. In the next part, I will reveal Tawada's works closely, her perspective, writing style and process.

2. Yoko Tawada: A Journey Beyond the Mother Tongue

2.1 Exophony: Outside the Mother Tongue

‘Exophony’ is not a well-known term but an essential concept for describing Tawada’s attitude toward multilingual literature. In her essay *Exophony: A Journey Beyond the Mother Tongue* (2003), Tawada illustrated the meaning of this term as: “the general environment outside the mother tongue” (3). Exophony shows wider meanings than ‘Creoles’ and ‘migrant literature’. In today’s world, there are many authors who write outside their native language even if they are neither a Creole nor a migrant. In terms of Tawada, “The world has become more complicated” (3). Tawada mentioned authors in Senegal where French has widely been accepted for a written language, by reason of the colonial history. Although they have Wölöf as the native language, many writers in Senegal choose writing in French for their works. However, according to Tawada, some writers in Senegal began to write in Wölöf and English (6). Writing in Wölöf seems like a natural movement against the colonial history, however, writing in English is completely different that is in Wölöf and French, since people in Senegal have neither historical nor natural reasons for choosing English for writing language. In this respect, Tawada wrote:

I like their brisk attitude that choosing a completely different language at will instead of returning to the mother tongue, in order to be against the history that writing in French was coerced. It may be interesting if choosing English for writing is an independence movement not for searching their roots but for far away, toward another world. (6)

As we can see, Tawada is curious about writing in two or more languages unrelated to the mother tongue. This is her essential idea that differs from many multilingual authors. For instance, in Germany, there are many multilingual writers who use German and Turkish, such as Emine Sevgi Özdamar. In her short novel “Grandfather Tongue,” Özdamar employs German, Turkish and Arabic; by means of revealing the hidden linguistic roots among these three languages with loanwords and wordplays, she succeeded to connect these three languages, their culture and world.³ On the contrary, Tawada does not consider linguistic kinship and cultural roots to be important for creative writing. Her main concern is going outside or beyond the mother tongue. In her interview with Rachel McNichol, Tawada told that when you write in the mother tongue, you “rarely experience a playful, pleasurable sense of language” (143) and the meaning of a word and the word itself cannot separate easily; on the contrary, in a foreign language, “you have something like a staple remover: it removes what makes things cling to one another” (143). Tawada told the playful experience in a foreign tongue named “a second childhood” (142). In this regard, another interview with Bettina Brandt, Tawada told that the distance between languages, in her case German and Japanese, is very important for increasing creativity in the multilingual and multicultural world nowadays (“Ein Wort” 5, 6). In short, taking the distance from the mother tongue and experience a second childhood in another language, or other languages, is a new way for writing in multilingual and multicultural world today, namely, in postmonolingual condition.

Tawada’s thoughts on the mother tongue developed into another concept ‘exophony.’ In this regard, Tawada wrote:

I like the fresh concept ‘exophony’ which is like a symphony. Various kinds of music sound and echo in this world; when I go outside the sound of the mother tongue, what kind of music can I hear? This is an adventure. I feel the concept exophony is the opposite of “foreigner’s literature” and “migrants’ literature;” these terms represent the ideas that ‘people from the outside use *our* language for *their* writing’. On the other hand, exophone literature can be understood as the curious, aggressive and creative attempt that pursuing the mystery, ‘how to go beyond the mother tongue that guards (ties) me; what will happen?’ For this reason, if it generates intriguing literature, I do not think the difference is important, between ones who go ‘outside’ the world by themselves, and ones who were forced to go outside on account of colonial or political reasons.

(*Exophony* 7)

From Tawada’s standpoint, the environment ‘writing outside the mother tongue’ is important, regardless of what factors make people do so. Tawada is known as a Germany-based Japanese author, however, she has been concerned with Chinese and other languages as well.

In the same essay, Tawada illustrated that many translated words in Japanese were derived from Dutch, which has lots in common in German. With an example of a Japanese word ‘*bi* (美) [beauty],’ that was derived from a Dutch word ‘*Schoonheid*,’ Tawada wrote:

I learned the Japanese word ‘*bi* (美) [beauty]’ in my early days. Long afterward, when I started to learn the German language, I first run across the German word ‘*Schönheit*’ and realized that this word is the origin, or brother of the Japanese word ‘*bi* (美).’

Consequently, I understood that some Japanese words which I learned in my childhood

were ‘immigrants’ from other countries; through learning German and understanding the origin of these translated words, I was surprised with emotion that they were from around there, German and Dutch ... I was impressed with my idea that those words were “immigrants” from all over the lands, and finally, I arrived at the home of ‘bi (美).’
 (*Exophony* 121, 122)

To clarify, considering the pre-modern Japanese language, they did not have so many ideological terms, for example, ‘beauty,’ ‘society’ and ‘economy,’ as well as European language; therefore, in the late 19th century, at the beginning of the Meiji era, many ideological terms was imported from European languages such as German and Dutch, and several authorities and scholars translated them into Japanese by means of borrowing Chinese characters. When Tawada firstly knew the German word ‘*Schönheit*,’ she was able to connect this word to the Japanese word ‘bi,’ which has the same meaning of ‘*Schönheit*’ [beauty]. From this experience, she imagined a word as an immigrant who came to Japan across the sea. In this respect, as for Tawada, learning German made her recognize that the Japanese language is a melting pot of many languages whose origins were throughout the world. This awareness is important to Tawada, because she understood the Japanese language has a potential ability to play together with other languages regardless of its linguistic kinship. This idea can connect to Tawada’s poetic writing style that contains two or more languages at once.

Writing two languages at once is not a specific style to Tawada. In this regard, in the book *Experimental Nations: Or, the Invention of the Maghreb*, Réda Bensmaïa discusses a Maghrebi author Abdelkebir Khatibi and his work *Love in Two Languages* (1990) [*Amour bilingue*, 1983]. Khatibi uses both French and Arabic at once in his work. According to Bensmaïa, Khatibi, and other writers from Maghrebi regions, can choose neither French nor

Arabic for their writing language, since these two languages instantly recall the history of odious colonialization; moreover, it is impossible that a Maghrebi author will not be judged by the ability to command French, from the colonizers perspectives (103, 104). For these reasons, Khatibi employed both French and Arabic languages for one literary work; two languages were printed on a page together without merging. This radical style named 'bi-langue' by himself. Bensmaïa valued Khatibi's originality of his writing style as below:

for the first time in such a radical and concerted way, the question of belonging to (at least) two languages burst theoretically and practically upon a space for writing that had previously been dominated by a Manichean version of language and (cultural, ethnic, religious, and national) identity. (104)

Above all, Khatibi and Tawada show similarity in their writing styles, however, the reasons for employing two or more languages are different; Khatibi aims to flee from colonized history and their roots which provides the basis of Maghrebi identity; Tawada tries to go beyond the framework of the mother tongue and play with languages. In the following part, I will reveal Tawada's playful writing style closely.

2.2 Tawada's Writing Style: Word Play

Tawada's novel *Kentoshi* (2014), the English translation published as *The Emissary* in the U.S. and as *The Last Children of Tokyo* in the U.K., won the U.S. National Book Award for translated literature in 2018. This dystopian novel is set in imaginary Tokyo, it implies the situation of

Japan after the earthquake 3.11 and the Fukushima nuclear disaster in 2011, where the soil and plants are contaminated and few animals survive. In this fiction, the roles of elderly people and young people are upside down; elderly people have extremely tough bodies and they cannot die; on the contrary, children and young people have weak bodies which were polluted by radioactive contamination derived from the nuclear disaster so that they cannot live long. Therefore, elderly people should take care of younger generations, their grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

There are two main characters, Yoshiro and his great-grandchild, Mumei. After the disaster, the Japanese government prohibits immigration and emigration, and they cut off the Japanese people, language and culture from the world. This is because the government thought: “every country has serious problems, so to keep those problems from spreading all around the world ... each country should solve its own problems by itself” (The Emissary 42). Although in such a closed situation, some underground people believe that selected children should go overseas as the emissary, named ‘Kentoshi,’ in order to learn knowledge and culture from the continent, namely, China. At the end of this story, readers can understand that Mumei is a possible candidate of the emissary.

The *Kentoshi* system actually existed in Japan from the 7th to the 9th century, however, Tawada applies unusual Chinese characters to represent this term, in brief, she coinages an imaginary term; the original ‘遣唐使’ means the emissary to the ancient Tang dynasty China, which aimed for absorbing knowledge and culture from the prominent country; instead of the original one, in this novel, Tawada employs ‘献灯使,’ which literally means ‘the servant of light.’ Regarding this title, in her interview with Robert Campbell, who is a prominent Japanese literary scholar in Japan, Tawada told that she wanted to assert her belief in crossing the border. Tawada said:

With the title ‘*Ketoshi*,’ I want to express my idea that we should go outside the country and learn from the continent. [...] One day he [Mumei] leaves Japan, goes across the sea and learns something there, exchanges begin, and finally the isolation is over: this is a hope of this novel.⁴ (“Interview with Yoko Tawada and Robert Campbell” 4)

In this context, “the continent” can be understood as the Eurasian continent, especially China, because of the fact that *Ketoshi* originally means the emissary to China. However, in the Japanese language, there are no differences between singular and plural forms; therefore, it may introduce another possibility that “the continent” means both the Eurasian and the European continents, where the presence sometimes implies in the novel and is deeply relevant for Tawada’s works. Accordingly, her message can be interpreted as not only for the relationships between Japan and China but also for those of among the world; Tawada criticizes people inside the isolated country since they do not want to imagine outside their world, and moreover, isolation per se.

In this novel, Tawada adopts many wordplays like the title. For instance, the names of bread are named after German cities, but they are described with Chinese characters. These Chinese characters just hold phonetic relevancies with the names of those cities, but they are playful nonsense.

かすかに酸味のあるこの黒パンには、「亜阿片」という変わった名前がついていた。パン屋の主人は、自分の焼くパンに、「刃の叔母」、「ぶれ麺」、「露天風呂区」など変わった名前をつけている。(*Ketoshi* 17)

This faintly sour black bread was called “Aachen,” written with Chinese characters that meant “Pseudo Opium.” The baker had named each variety of bread he baked after a German city, which he wrote in Chinese characters with roughly the same pronunciation, so that Hanover meant “Blade’s Aunt,” Bremen “Wobbly Noodles,” and Rothenberg “Outdoor Hot Springs Haven.” (The Emissary 11)

In the English translation, the translator inserts the explanation about the origin of these bread’s names, however, in the Japanese original version, there are no descriptions for German cities. Because of that, the wordplay in the original text can enhance the interest of a link with Japanese phonetic sounds and Chinese characters, both the meanings and visual aspects. Moreover, it brings readers surprise and joy when they realize that the names are derived from German cities.

Tawada’s wordplay is not only a literary technique but also an expression of her essential, transnational, exophone ideas. Considering the names of bread, German cities and Chinese characters are connected by Japanese sounds and letters. This can be understood as Tawada’s hope to go beyond the language and national borders. In terms of wordplay, Tawada argues:

I want to develop my own ability to revitalize two emotions simultaneously; thinking seriously while laughing. This laughter is not like laughing human being at all, but I prepared myself to laugh at human folly. And for me, words and *kanji* [Chinese characters] is the most enjoyable companions to play. In this sense, word play is important to me.⁵ (“Interview with Yoko Tawada and Robert Campbell” 4)

In terms of the novel *The Emissary*, “human folly” can be interpreted as many ways; the law bans using foreign languages by the Japanese government; the nuclear disaster; the desire of people for having immortal body; the myth of the real estate in Tokyo and so on. In addition, thinking widely, Tawada may criticize language nationalism, which limits usage and meaning of language in one ‘true’ way.

In Tawada’s early works, wordplays were often employed in order to underscore the strangeness derived from the gap between written texts and their sounds in foreign languages. Her debut short novel *Das Bad* [*The Bath*] (1989) describes the strangeness when one sees and hears foreign languages for the first time. For instance, the protagonist, a Japanese woman, could not pronounce the German name ‘Alexander’ because it was printed on a card as “Xander,” which she could not understand. She expected “X” as a mysterious code:

Until the day I learned Xander was short for Alexander, I was tormented by the question I had first encountered in my junior high school math book: “Find the value of x.” If x was *durchein*, it meant *durcheinander* (mixed up); if it was *mitein*, then *miteinander* (together) – but I couldn’t help suspecting there were even more horrifying words. (*The Bath* 9)

There is no way to understand what ‘X’ means if one is not familiar with German or European languages. Instead of that, the Japanese woman associated the ‘X’ with her memory of the junior high school in Japan, and then, she felt the unknown word as “horrifying” one. In this sense, Tawada describes the uncanniness of languages that are not familiar to him or her and focuses on its distance. Tawada often describes such strangeness through surrealism texts. In this respect,

Yildiz argues that Tawada's attempts is: "[i]n conjunction with real and imagined translational mobility, she uses bilingualism as a literary strategy of detachment from any language's claim on the subject, rather than as a basis for a claim to double belonging" ("Mother Tongue" 111, 112).

Regarding strangeness of language, readers can feel strangeness for unknown words in the text, even if they read them in their native languages. Tawada created such a situation in her fantastic novel *Hikon* [Flying Soul] (1998), which is set in China in ancient times. In this novel, Tawada employs Chinese characters to express the names of characters and imaginary nouns in a creative way. For instance, the name of the mystic master is written as '龜鏡' it literally means 'turtle-mirror.' This is an odd name so that readers cannot pronounce it correctly. However, turtle and mirror are known as typical items for magic rituals, thus, the name effectively expresses the master holds mysterious power. According to Miho Matsunaga, a literary scholar who translated several of Tawada's works, pointed out that Tawada borrows visual effects and literal meanings of Chinese characters effectively in this novel (88).

Tawada's wordplay technique is based on her interest in sound and appearance of words, regardless she writes in Japanese or German; moreover, Tawada efficiently applies the visual effects of Chinese characters to her texts. In short, the multilingual moves here between meaning, phonetics and graphics. Tawada's multilingual writing styles can be understood as her expressions that the desire to go beyond the mother tongue paradigm and into postmonolingual condition by means of poetic and playful ways.

2.3 Tawada's Writing Process and Circulation of Her Works: Japanese, German, and Chinese Characters

In terms of Tawada's writing process, *Schwager in Bordeaux* (2008), whose Japanese version is *Borudo-no-Gikei* [The Brother-in-law in Bordeaux] (2009), is a noticeable work. It is the first long novel (*Roman*) she wrote in German prior to the Japanese version: at first, the novel was written in German and published as *Schwager in Bordeaux* by a German publisher konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke in 2008, and the year later, it was translated into Japanese by Tawada and published by a Japanese publisher in 2009. This is a new challenge for Tawada: she translated her work by herself, from German into Japanese, instead of the natural way that she firstly writes in her native language and then translates it into German. In this connection, the opposite process was taken for writing *Yuki-no-Renshusei* [Etudes in the snow] (2011), the German title published as *Etüden im Schnee* in 2014. Tawada firstly wrote the novel in Japanese, and then translated into German herself. Another bilingual work is the play *Till* (1998) wrote in German; it was rewritten to a Japanese novel *Futakuti-Otoko* (1998). As we can see, Tawada uses many processes between German and Japanese for writing bilingual texts. In this regard, Yildiz pointed out that Tawada "tends to write poetry and novels in Japanese, and plays, short prose, and literary essays in German." (111) However, in recent years, Tawada has tackled more acrobatic activities and the former preference cannot appear: she sometimes writes a novel in German, as the case of *Schwager in Bordeaux* exemplified that; she sometimes writes a novel in Japanese, then translated it into German, and vice versa. In brief, Tawada has kept trying to develop her bilingual writing process and to enhance her presence among other multilingual authors worldwide.

In addition to the unique writing process of *Schwager in Bordeaux*, the way to unfold the story is also experimental and suggestive: Tawada wrote the novel inspired by the meanings and appearance of Chinese characters and told the story along with those Chinese characters. Each

chapter has one Chinese character as its' title,⁶ for instance, the first chapter titled “始” [beginning / start] is like that:

始

The train that Yuna got on in Brussels arrived in Bordeaux, at noon on that bright dry summer day. Upon getting off the platform, Yuna searched for the figure of a man whom she had never met before. When she stood there and looked around, the people who got off the train flowed in a liquid state toward the exit, and at the end, only Yuna and a young electrician remained. The engineer put a toolbox on the ground and opened the gray door of some equipment. (*Borudo* Kindle Locations 4-8).

The meaning of the Chinese character ‘始’ is ‘start’ or ‘beginning,’ so that it is a suitable title for the first chapter of a novel. In addition, the letter was made by two parts: the left side of this letter, ‘女,’ means ‘female’; and the right side ‘台’ means something plat on which people stand. Thus, in addition to the meaning of the letter ‘始,’ the appearance of this Chinese character also implies images of a female and a platform of a train station; in other words, a female protagonist, Yuna, stood on the platform is a story inspired by the Chine characters ‘始.’

Considering the story, Yuna is a Japanese female exchange student who has been living in Hamburg, German. Besides German, she also wants to learn French. She consults the desire with her older friend Renée, who has though French literature in Hamburg for ten years. Renée tells that her brother-in-law has lived in *Bordeaux*, France, but will stay in Vietnam during the summer vacation, so that Yuna can stay at his place during the period. Then Yuna goes to *Bordeaux* and stays there. Yuna writes memorandums for describing things that happened

around her by using one Chinese character per thing. With one Chinese character, Yuna can tell the story about what happened at that moment. In this respect, readers should recognize that the whole novel was constructed by Yuna's memorandums.

Tawada ends the story at a swimming pool, where Yuna meets a 'dictionary theft'; the theft steals Yuna's French-German dictionary and this incident discourages Yuna's attempt to learn French. This story was constructed from numbers of words which can tie with languages, besides, names of cities in many countries: Hamburg; Bordeaux; Vietnam; Brussel; Paris; Vancouver; German; French; Japanese; Chinese and so on. In this way, one of the main themes of this novel can be interpreted as the multilingual environment regarding travel, trans borders, trans cultures and languages. Above all, Tawada created a story inspired by Chinese characters and writes it in German. In this process, Tawada did not use Japanese but used Chinese characters in creative ways. This can be evaluated as an attempt to go beyond the limitation of the monolingual literature.

In respect of circulation, few books were published with two or more languages at once, since publishers cannot expect that many readers read both the two languages, in brief, it should be unprofitable. Despite such a negative environment, Tawada did succeed to publish her two-languages debut poetry collection, *Nur da wo du bist da ist nichts: Anata-no-Iru-Tokoro-dake-Nanimo-nai* [Only Where You are is Nothing] (1987), due to the support by a German publisher, konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke, and a translator Peter Pörtner. In this book, the Japanese lines by Tawada alternate with the German lines by Pörtner. In addition, *Schwager in Bordeaux* and the reprinted version of *Das Bad / Urokomoti* (2015) are also bilingual books on which German and Japanese were printed together.⁷ Regarding the bilingual style books, in her interview with Robert Campbell, Tawada told that she does not expect readers can understand

both languages; the purpose of publishing novels and proses written in two different languages at once is enhancing readers' curiosity for the texts and recalling uncertainty or uncomfortableness to them ("Yoko Tawada: The Fascination of Exophonic Literature."). Tawada's experimental literary texts contain more or less 'untranslatability,' as a result, multilingual printed style seems suitable for her works, from which readers can derive Tawada's objective. Moreover, the style can be shown her position against the dominant commercialism of the publishing industry, which aims to circulate more and more books and to gain huge commercial success. In this sense, Tawada's writings have been created in postmonolingual condition.

In conclusion, Tawada pursues to create literary texts in between languages; her stance on multilingual literature is represented by a term 'exophony,' which means writing in the environment outside the mother tongue. Her attitude against monolingualism also can be seen in her creative writing style which has been full of wordplays by means of connecting two or more different languages with their phonetic sound of words, meanings of words, or the imagery of words inspired by Chinese characters. Her bilingual writing process and publishing style can be interpreted as a manifestation of Tawada's believe that people can choose their writing languages as they like, despite the monolingual paradigm which force people to write in one dominant language. In addition, Tawada's two-languages style books can be against the present-day publishing trend, which aims to circulate books that were written in or translated into major languages, in order to gain commercial success and prevailing position.

3. Hideo Levy: Bilingual Excitement

3-1. 'Going Native': From a Japanologist in the U.S. to a Writer in Japanese

Ian Hideo Levy is a Japan-based multilingual writer who speaks English, Japanese, and Chinese but only writes in Japanese. Levy was born in 1950 in Berkeley to a Jewish American father and a Polish American mother, however, during his childhood, he grew up in Taiwan and Hong Kong as his father was a U.S. diplomat and a former Sinologist who commanded Chinese language. During his stay in Taiwan, from 1956 to 1960, Levy's father and mother divorced and his father started to a new life with his second partner from China. Then Levy, his mother and his brother went back to the United States, separately from his father. Despite the difficult situation, in 1967, he first began to visit Japan and he stayed with his father and his father's partner, in order to learn the Japanese language. Years later he went back to the U.S. again and studied for East-Asian studies specializing in Japanology at Princeton University, acquiring a doctoral degree (*A Room ix*). His speciality was ancient Japanese poetry; Levy wrote his doctoral thesis on *Kakinomoto Hitomaro*, one of the most prestigious poets from the 7th to the 8th century and published a research book *Hitomaro and the Birth of Japanese Lyricism* (1984). Until his forties, he was a Japanology scholar who worked for Princeton and Stanford Universities. As mentioned before, Levy translated the first volume of *Manyoshu* [*The Ten Thousand Leaves*], the oldest public poetry collections in Japan that was compiled during the 7th to the 8th century and contains around 4,500 poems with 20 volumes. In the 1980s and the 1990s, Levy was coming and going to Japan and the United States many times and met many Japanese scholars and writers. He often mentioned a Japanese writer, Kenji Nakagami, as the first Japanese novelist who urged Levy to write fiction in Japanese instead of translating the text of other author's.

In addition to his careers as a Japanologist and a translator, he began to write fictions in Japanese and published his first novel *Seijoki-no-Kikoenai-Heya* (1992) from a Japanese publisher, Kodansha. He got the Noma Literary Prize with this debut novel, which was the first award of a Japanese literary prize given to a non-native Japanese speaker from the Western world. Two decades later, this novel was translated from Japanese into English by the young Japanologist Christopher D. Scott in 2012, as *A Room Where The Star-Spangled Banner Cannot Be Heard*. Up until now, Levy has published many novels: *Chiji-ni-Kudakete* (2005); *Kari-no-Mizu* (2009); *Mohankyo* (2017) among others; he has also written a variety of essays on the Japanese language and literature, translation, world literature, multilingual literature and identity issues. Moreover, he has given myriads of lectures worldwide, both as a scholar of Japanese literature and as an author writing in Japanese.

At first, Levy was distinguished from other multilingual authors in Japan since he was from the ‘Western’ world and a native English speaker. This was in contrast with other Asian related authors, such as Korean-Japanese and Chinese-Japanese, so-called ‘*zainichi*’ writers who had lived in Japan for a long time and shown rational reasons for writing in Japanese.⁸ Levy is a ‘white man’ and a former U.S. Japanologist, thus, according to the established colonial, US-centric view of Japan, his conversion from the U.S. intellectual to a Japanese writer seemed to be an eccentric behaviour, which was from ‘superior’ to ‘inferior.’ In this regard, in his interviews with Tamotsu Aoki, a famous cultural anthropologist in Japan, Levy stated that he was aware of the colonial context in the paradigm of Japanology, which aimed to rule Japan efficiently during the General Headquarters (GHQ) occupation period by means of understanding Japanese literature, culture and people. He considered how to get into another culture through literature and found the answer was ‘going native,’ to live in Japan and writing in Japanese, which was a

taboo among these scholars. In doing so, Levy crossed the border from the colonial to the colonized world and chose to write in the language of the colonized nation (*Ekkyou* 108). In this sense, Levy's challenge was quite aggressive, which was admired by Japanese novelists, such as Kenzaburo Oe and Kenji Nakagami; meanwhile, according to Levy, most of the Japanese people were strongly against his behaviour and asserted that people from outside Japan could never write literary works in Japanese. Above all, Levy went against the perceptions of two sides: the U.S. Japanologists assert colonial 'supremacy' of them; while the Japanese claim authenticity of the Japanese language and literature.

In comparison with the former situation, in recent years, Levy has attracted the attention of scholars in the context of multilingualism in literature and world literature, which aims to go beyond the national literature paradigm. Besides Japanese and English, Levy can also speak standard Chinese, Mandarin Chinese, moreover, the dialect in the Henan province of China. Levy argues that the experience in the third country, besides the U.S. and Japan, could open his mind and perspective more widely; instead of comparing two languages and cultures, he acquired the third place so that he can compare them in wider perspectives and get a deep insight into each of them (*Ekkyou* 65). Based on his experiences in China, Levy has published several novels and essays concerned with China and the Chinese language, such as the awarded novel *Tenanmon* (天安門) [Tiananmen] (1996) and essays *Wareteki-Chugoku* (我的中国) [My China] (2004) and *Enan* (延安) [Yanan] (2008). Levy experienced his first trip to China in 1993 and from then on, he has been to China over twenty times and been fascinated with writing *about China in Japanese* (*Bilingual* 63). Moreover, in the latest novel which resembles travel writing, *Mohankyo* (模範郷) [Model Village] (2016), Levy wrote about his relationship with Taiwan and the linguistic environment in there. Levy's family had lived in Taiwan in his childhood, and

during the stay in Taiwan, his family became involved with politicians and intellectuals fled from mainland China. These Chinese people and his father had spoken in Chinese, therefore Levy often heard standard Chinese language more than Taiwanese language. Although in such a situation, Taiwan is a special place for Levy, where he is deeply tied with his childhood memories.

Above all, Levy is a multilingual author who speaks English, Japanese and Chinese and commits both to the Western and Eastern world, moreover, the third places, China and Taiwan; he is keen on literary multilingualism and languages per se. In this respect, Levy and Tawada have lots in common in their interests and multilingual situation. In the following subchapters, I will discuss Levy's awareness of multilingualism as an author between America and Japan, English and Japanese and his identity consciousness.

3-2. A Story of Exile and Identity: *A Room Where The Star-Spangled Banner Cannot Be Heard*

In his autobiographical debut novel *Seijoki-no-Kikoenai-Heya*, the English translation title is *A Room Where The Star-Spangled Banner Cannot Be Heard*, Levy deals with the alienation of a foreigner in Japan and the difficulties to establish one's identity beyond nationalities and languages. The protagonist Ben Isaac, a seventeen-year-old man, decides to leave the mother's house in Washington D.C. in the United States, and to go to Japan for one year, in order to live with his father's family in Yokohama, Japan. Ben's father is a U.S. diplomat but he hates Japan and the Japanese language; his second wife is a Chinese woman and they think the Chinese language superior to Japanese. Despite the situation, Ben begins to learn Japanese at a university

in Tokyo, then Ben commutes from Yokohama to Tokyo three days per week. His father tells Ben that he should go back home early and never go to Shinjuku as it is a town with evil ways.

During the study, he meets several international students and Japanese students who belong to the 'English Conversation Club (ECC).' Although the Japanese members of the ECC club want to talk with the international students in English, the international students do not take care of the club members and only talk within their community. Ben is in the middle of the ECC club members and the international students' circle so that he can talk with the Japanese students in English. In contrast with the club members' accurate Queen's English, their 'conversations' are very odd "like an interview" or "an interrogation."

"Don't you feel guilty about the Vietnam War? What about the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima?"

...

"What is your ethnic background?"

"I'm half Polish, half Jewish."

"*Jewwwisssh?*" the student responded, eyes widening, as though he hadn't heard the part about "half" or "Polish." The hunter had bagged a rare breed of animal, and he could hardly contain his excitement. "Well then, what do you think of Zionism?" he asked.

"I don't." Ben had never really given it any thought.

"But surely you support Israel?"

"I don't really care."

"But," the student with the Queen's English persisted, "you are Jewish, are you not?"

Ben didn't know what to say. ...

“I’m a Jew who doesn’t dream of Israel.”

(*A room* 21, 22)

Ben is fed up with these ‘conversations,’ since he is only seventeen years old and has never thought about such complicated issues. Ben is just a young man from an oversea country, but the Japanese students regard him as “the West itself” and want to ask him many questions (21). They do not take care of Ben himself, but they are interested in his nationality and Western ideology. In such a situation, another Japanese student, Ando, comes to the circle and asks Ben “Why are you speaking English when you’re in Japan?” (24) Ando continues: “To these people, you are nothing more than an ornament, an accessory, like a ring or a pendant imported from abroad” (25). Ben was shocked by Ando’s words, and then he leaves from both the English Conversation Club members and the international students’ group. From then on, Ben spends his time not with them but with Ando and becomes immersed in the Japanese language environment. However, Ando is the only one who accepts Ben as a companion. Ben still has been called ‘*gaijin*,’ which means people from outside, and other Japanese people have never deemed that he is a member of Japanese society. One day, in a café in Shinjuku, a woman asks Ben who he is. Ben tells her that he is a “BO-MEI-SHA,” which means refugee (59).

Ben is an American man with ‘blond hair and blue eyes,’ in addition, he has the privilege that he is a son of the U.S. diplomat, so that he could not assimilate to *the Japanese*. This story can also be understood as a fiction based on Levy’s experience of exile from America to Japan. He has been labelled as an American man so that he has never gone into the Japanese community, in other words, he has lived in Japan as an alien. And yet, or thus, he has been a strong desire to be a ‘native,’ a member of Japanese society. In this respect, in his interview with Tawada, Levy

noted: “[o]ne of my motivations to write in Japanese is, the frustration which I still have had, such as I cannot be accepted as a Japanese by the Japanese even though I feel I am one of them; I have never been allowed to be a Japanese” (*Ekkyou* 38).

In addition to Levy’s alienation in Japanese society, he feels a similar feeling from the perspective of a Jew and an American. Although Levy, and Ben in the novel, have the U.S. nationality, they are Jews who hardly feel a country is their own place. Moreover, according to the novel, in contrast with the European people, the Americans “had abandoned their homes or had been driven from them. That’s what made them Americans” (44). Therefore, when they are told “go home” by Asian people, it could be “the cruelest joke they could play on American in Asia” (44). Levy wrote: “Where on earth was home? Brooklyn? Shanghai? Or some distant, dreamy Jerusalem?” (44)

Another important point of this novel is Levy’s strong desire to write in Japanese. In the first part of the story, he described a situation that a foreigner is getting into another language world; Ben is getting involved in the Japanese language world, meanwhile, he is pulling away from the English world, namely, his father’s language. In this regard, a Japanese scholar Aoyagi argues that English is his (Ben’s and Levy’s) “father tongue” rather than the mother tongue, and this novel is a story of the acquisition of identity through a new language. Apart from their father’s world and collapsed families, both Ben and Levy pursue their hope to establish their new *home* (14). In this sense, this novel should be written in Japanese instead of English. Levy himself also argues that: “when I first came to Japan, in the 1960s, I was neither a child nor an adult. My identity as a Western man had not established yet. I could come to Japan before the completion, this is all the start point of mine” (*Nihongo* 153, 154).

Above all, the novel can be interpreted as a story about an exile of a Jew from America, and he never realized his desire to establish his identity as a Japanese by means of using the Japanese language. In the following novels and essays, Levy succeeds to develop the theme, exile and identity, and to create wider cross-border perspectives. I will reveal Levy's perspectives next.

3-3. Bilingual Excitement: Cross the Borders and Beyond the National Identity

At the beginning of Levy's career, he struggled with establishing his identity between the following contrary things: two societies, the United States and Japan; two languages, English and Japanese; two cultures, the continental and an insular; and two parents, his mother and father. However, he gradually shifted his position toward another big issues, China and Chinese. As mentioned before, Levy had grown up in Taiwan where several variations of Chinese and Taiwanese were spoken, thus, Levy already experienced living in a Chinese speaking world in his childhood. However, he had not mentioned Chinese as often as Japanese and English, before the first trip to China in 1992.

Levy firstly went to China accidentally in 1992, that is because his planned meeting with Tawada in Germany could not be realized, and then a publisher suggested that he goes to China instead of going to Germany (*Nihongo* 198). This stimulating experience opened his eyes toward the third place, China. The novel *Tenanmon* (1996) was based on the memories at the first visit to China. At the beginning of the story, the protagonist, Levy himself, heard 'bourbon (whiskey)' with another intonation and pronunciation in the Chinese language, 'bu-ru-be-n'. That was also different from the Japanese pronunciation of bourbon, 'ba-a-bo-n,' so that he

noticed that he stood among the three worlds, the United States, Japan and China (“Tenanmon” Kindle Locations 15-19). This surprising awareness had been kept during his stay in China. At the end of the story, when the protagonist went toward the mummy of Mao at the Tiananmen park, the ancient Japanese language suddenly overlapped English in his mind:

Himukashi-no-No-ni... such an ancient Japanese sentence burst on my ear like sudden intoxication. *Kagirohi-no-Tatsu-Miete*. Although the Japanese word came up to mind, I could not remember how to say ‘*Kagerou* [heat haze],’ which was called *Kagirohi* in the ancient Japanese, in English. No one of the thousands around me will hardly understand the thought if I speak out it; or it may sound like a nonsense. ...

“I can see the flames of morning rise.” I once translated the sentence in English like that.⁹ (“Tenanmon” Kindle Locations 467-470, 474-476)

At that moment, he was in China but thinking in Japanese and in English. Levy experienced living within the three languages at once, and then he wrote it in Japanese. From then, he has consciously written about China in Japanese, this act brought him the new perspectives for languages. In his essay, Levy summarizes his writing style in short:

In my case, I went beyond the border from America to Japan at the end of the 1960s and had been getting soaked into the realm of the Japanese language. My debut work was on the issue ‘from English to Japanese,’ which was based on my migrant experience, since the main subject of the novel is ‘America and Japan.’

In the 1990s, I first went to the continent, China, from my living country, Japan, with my childhood memory about ‘Asia’ where I had lived in my infancy before coming

to Japan. America, Japan and China; I described a protagonist in unsettled condition among the three linguistic environments, and then published it as the novel titled ‘*Tenanmon* [Tiananmen].’

In this story [Tiananmen], I dealt with the issue ‘the collapsed of a family,’ which is related with American literature, and ‘history,’ one of the traditional themes in Chinese literature; and I tried to mix the two issues by means of employing typical Japanese narrative style, *shishousetsu* style, which has constructed the mainstream of the Japanese modern literature. (*Nihongo* 52, 53)

Levy is a multilingual author who stood among the three literary fields and connected them by using Japanese as his writing language. In this respect, Japanese scholar Toshiaki Sasanuma pointed out that this juxtaposition of these languages was generated from Levy’s memory of the home in Taiwan, where Levy and his family lived together and where his first contact with the Japanese language happened (3). Based on his childhood memory in a multilingual condition in Taiwan, he became one of the pioneers who connected three literary traditions and developed the creativity of Japanese as a writing language toward world literature.

In terms of historical literary contacts between Japanese and Chinese, it firstly occurred in the 7th century, as mentioned in chapter 2, with the emissary from Japan to China. The emissary called *Kentoshi* brought various technology, knowledge, culture, literature, language and so on from the great China where was ahead of Japan in many aspects. On the other hand, there were some immigrants from the continent, China and Korea, to Japan. According to Levy, a Japanese scholar Susumu Nakanishi, who is the authority of the *Manyoshu* study, published a book on Yamanoue Okura in 1973; Okura was one of the *Kentoshi* and a prestigious Japanese

poet around the 7th and the 8th century, but Nakanishi argued that he was one of these immigrants from the southern part of the current South Korea (*Bilingual* 25, 26). Okura worked as a court poet and created a variety of poems both in Japanese and Chinese. At that moment, the nobility in Japan deemed Chinese as superior to Japanese, therefore many poets created poems in Chinese. Although in such a situation, Okura created many literary works in the Japanese poetry style. For instance, Okura composed a poem which was celebrating the setting sail of *Kentoshi* for China and hoping for their safe return. In that poem, he called Japan a ‘*kotodama-no-sakiwau-kuni*,’ which means ‘a country blessed with spirits of language’ (*Bilingual* 26). From this point, if Nakanishi’s theory that Okura was from Korea is true, as a creative writer from Korea, Okura was interested in the Japanese language and its literary style so that he consciously chose Japanese as his language for creative works, instead of using the dominant Chinese language. In this respect, Levy noted: “Okura was a forerunner of me who attends the Japanese society by means of expressing his thought in the Japanese language; during his periods, Japan was already globalized” (*Nihongo* 167, 168); “*Manyoshu* can be rethought in the context of world literature” (*Bilingual* 27). In this sense, Okura was, and Levy is, a multilingual author in Japan who developed the fields of the Japanese language in terms of its creativity.

Regarding Okura’s attitude toward Japanese, Levy coined a term ‘Bilingual Excitement,’ in his interview with Kenzaburo Oe. ‘Bilingual Excitement’ means an exciting feeling when a multilingual creator expresses his ideas in two or more languages (*Ekkyou* 159). According to Levy, this excitement is generated from a *gap* between languages. Levy told that the awareness of such a gap can generate creative writings by multilingual authors. He also argues that world literature can be created by writing *about* inside *from* outside (*Bilingual* 92). In this sense, in the

context of world literature, writing with Bilingual Excitement is an essential way to develop the literary creativity of a multilingual author.

In the short story “Henry Takeshi Lewitsky’s summer travelogue,” Levy describes a historical episode about Jewish people in China. A thousand years ago, there were many ancient Jews emigrated from the Western world to China and they became a part of Chinese society; for instance, Lewitsky changed his family name to a Chinese name ‘Li’ (李). The protagonist’s unique name “Henry Takeshi Lewitsky” shows his racial complicity; the English given name “Henry,” the Japanese first name “Takeshi” and the Jewish family name “Lewitsky.” When Henry told his name, many people derided the unusual name, thus, Henry was ashamed of. He struggled with the identity crisis between Jewish-American and Japanese. Henry’s name is similar to Levy’s name, Ian Hideo Levy, Levy was embarrassed by it in the same way as Edward Said experienced it. “Hideo” was named after Levy’s father’s Japanese friend, so that he has a Jewish family name, Levy, and a Japanese first name, Hideo. Henry, and Levy himself, felt alienation regarding his racial and religious identity. However, when he arrived at an ancient capital city in China, Kaifeng (開封), he saw a synagogue style deep-drilled well, then he realized the ancient Jews in China could *become* Chinese. This experience opens Henry’s eyes to the fact that “the *gaijin* [foreigners] did not to be *gaijin* but became ones of the inhabitants” (“Henry” Kindle Location 2359). From this point, identity issues between nations became less important to Henry, and Levy. They can see the world from a wider perspective, in brief, they could obtain a critical perspective toward the definition of identity which was based on the European nation-state ideology.

In this respect, in his interview with Mo Yan (莫言), a famous Chinese author who won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 2012, Levy told that the journey to Kaifeng is not only an experience which aims to search his identity roots:

As far as I researched that, Levy became 'Li'(李). This does not mean I found an ethnic root, rather, I would like to think that Kaifeng was an ultimate place where people from outside the East-Asian countries became ones of the East-Asian people. I believe that the concept of 'national' is a modern one, but long before the emergence of the paradigm, 'identity' existed in China as completely different thoughts. [...] By means of going beyond China, in that place, I might touch the origin of 'identity' per se. (*Ekkyou* 130, 131)

In this regard, in other essays, Levy expresses this idea in detail based on another fact. In 2004, a newspaper reported that one of the *Kentoshi*'s names was inscribed with a eulogy on an epitaph excavated from inland China. This fact suggested that a Japanese emissary died in China was approved by Chinese authority, in other words, although he was originally from Japan, he died as an honoured person who occupied an important part of the Chinese history. From this point, Levy argued that this fact expands the realm of the concept of 'identity,' which can contain wider perspectives than modern nation-states' narrow sense of national identity. (*Ekkyou* 212, 213)

Levy struggled with his identity difficulties between American and Japanese societies for many years, which means, he wanted to become a Japanese but the Japanese never allowed that to him. However, in China, he felt possibilities that people from outside could become an East-

Asian people, by means of going beyond the nation-state paradigm. This experience encouraged him to write in Japanese, even though many Japanese people have still denied him as a Japanese writer because of the monolingualism myth about the Japanese language, in brief, only Japanese people own the Japanese language so that people from outside Japan, ‘*gaijin*,’ never could command it. Levy coming to China many times and writing about China in Japanese, and in doing so, he had gradually fled from the identity crisis between two nations, the United States and Japan. Rather, he has been fascinated with a wider perspective in multilingual condition. In this sense, beyond the identity issues within the nation-state, monolingual paradigm, he has been soaked into writing Japanese in post-monolingual condition, with Bilingual Excitement.

3-4. Writing in The Postmonolingual Condition in the Japanese Literary Fields

Consequently, in terms of Levy, how to write in the postmonolingual conditions in the range of Japanese literature? One of the answers can be seen in his latest novel *Mohankyo*. Levy wrote a chapter about Pearl Buck regarding writing style in today’s literature. In his stay in China, he found a paperback titled ‘Pearl Buck in China’. Pearl Buck is an American female writer who wrote about Chinese farmers’ lives in detail. Her novel *The Good Earth* was known as one of the representatives of Chinese Peasant literature and won the Nobel Prize in Literature. However, according to Levy, her reputation had been fallen in the United States because Buck was considered ignorant in East-Asian intelligence (*Mohankyou* 125). On the contrary, in terms of today’s literary study on China, Buck has been rethought in the positive context of ‘going native,’ which means, “she lived and wrote culturally as an Asian person, even though she was racially Western, a white woman” (130). However, Levy shows his doubt about why she did not write in

Chinese. In conclusion, Levy argues: “if ‘going native’ could be realized, it will do when a writer wants to live his new life within the words which were created by the real ‘native;’ this is neither racial nor living environmental issues, but issues of writing style (143). In this sense, from Levy’s perspective, writing in the postmonolingual condition should be an attempt to create a new space within the existing literary tradition formed by *native* authors. Based on this idea, Levy has written his literary works in Japanese by means of employing the “*shishousetsu*” style, which was known as the traditional narrative style of Japanese modern literature, instead of writing them with European literary style.

In addition to this, thinking and writing in Japanese is Levy’s essence of writing. He had a strong desire to be a Japanese writer and create the history of the Japanese language and literature (*Nihongo* 158). With such a desire, he has broadened his perspective by means of moving among Asian countries. Levy has travelled from Japan to China many times, and absorbed various images in China, and then, he went back to Japan and wrote them in Japanese. Writing about China in Japanese is one of the important roles of Japanese literature nowadays, since China has been in difficult situations politically, so that many Chinese authors have been controlled by the government and their right to express themselves has been limited. In this regard, in his interview with a Chinese author Yan Lianke (閻連科), Levy told that he can understand and speak the roughly sixty percent of the dialect in the Henan province, and cannot understand the remaining part of them; while the remain unknown realm might be important since this unknown space, or the gap between known- and unknown- space within the Chinese language can generate freshness and bring him a new perspective on the world. Yan agreed with Levy’s attitude toward such an *unknown-ness* and told that:

I always desire that no one will conclude ‘this is China;’ you can express your hope, or despair, about China, however, nobody knows whether China will go toward the delightful future, or not. ... Even though he or she cannot solve each problem directly, by means of writing, every person who deals with literary works can play an important role as an observer in today’s world. I hope that, if you yourself see China, and hear the Chinese language, you will express them diligently and vividly.” (*Bilingual* 84, 85)

Levy’s attempts to become a Japanese writer has been definitely succeeded. Moreover, he also achieved to grow new generations such as Wen Yourou, a Taiwanese author who has grown up in Japan and writes in Japanese. She was a student of Levy and became a writer who deals with multilingualism in literature, among Japanese, Chinese and Taiwanese. In this sense, Levy has created a new stream in the Japanese literary history and developed the range of the Japanese language.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, how to create a space for writing in Japanese in the postmonolingual conditions? In this sense, Yoko Tawada is a multilingual author who aims to make a place between languages and rethink the mother tongue from the outside. By means of playing with words and taking bilingual writing process, she has always transported from one language to another and tied them together. In doing so, she has created the history of two languages, German and Japanese: her activity is not relevant to linguistic kinship or the colonial history, thus, it can be interpreted as the new challenge against the monolingualism. Moreover, by employing Chinese characters in her literary texts, she was successful in developing her creativity. Tawada's interest in Chinese characters leads the wider perspective toward the continent, China.

On the other hand, Hideo Levy is a multilingual author who has a superior command of both English and Japanese, and is able to speak Chinese in several variations. Despite his language skills, he only writes in Japanese employing the *Shishousetsu* narrative style, which is specific to Japanese modern literature. This is because his long-lasting desire, and to flee from the colonial Western paradigm is important to him. He had been struggling with the identity crisis between two nations, the United States and Japan, however, by means of going to and thinking about China, he has shifted his position toward the wider fields among Asian countries; he gained a new perspective so that he was able to consider the concept of 'nation' or 'identity' per se. In terms of writing style, Levy has connected English, Japanese and Chinese with his knowledge of ancient Japanese literary texts. When they were written, Japan was in a multilingual condition, thus, going beyond the monolingual paradigm and writing in a multilingual condition is not a new but a natural way to create literary texts in Japanese. Based

on these ideas, and by means of traveling between Japan and China, Levy consciously has created a multilingual environment in order to create a space for writing in Japanese with bilingual excitement. Levy's challenge is important not only for his career but also the history of Japanese literature.

Tawada and Levy are both multilingual authors who write against the monolingual nation-state paradigm, and in order to go beyond it and into the postmonolingual conditions, they have travelled among places, languages and cultures. They have kept in a multilingual environment for creating a space for writing. In addition, their interest in Chinese and China build affiliative connections among languages, and Western and Asian countries. This is also a possible way to stand against the European nation-state paradigm and develop the range of Japanese literature. In this sense, they build a new generation in today's Japanese and world literature.

Notes

1. For example, as a critique on Kawabata's lecture, Kenzaburo Oe, the second winner of the Nobel Prize in literature from Japan, gave the Nobel Lecture in 1994 titled "Japan, the Ambiguous, and Myself."

2. See Tawada's official website, *Yoko Tawada: the official homepage information about Yoko Tawada's life books events projects and news*, for a detailed bio-bibliography of her.

3. At the last part of the story, the protagonist recognizes that the word *Ruh* in Turkish resembles *Ruhe* in German. The Turkish word *Ruh* is a loan word from Arabic. See Bettina Brandt, ("Collecting Childhood Memories of the Future" 307).

4. The original Japanese text is here: 『献灯使』という題名には、外に出て、大陸に学ばないとだめなんじゃないか、という思いが込められています。(……) 彼がいつか日本を出て、海の方こうに渡って何かを学び、交流が始まり、鎖国が終わるとというのが、この小説のひとつの希望になっているんです。(“対談：多和田葉子×ロバートキャンベル” 4)

5. The original Japanese text is here: 笑いながら真剣に考えるという、二つの感情を同時に活性化するような能力を、自分でも育てていきたいと思っているんです。この笑いは決して人間を笑うようなものではないのですが、人間の愚行を笑う覚悟はあります。そして、私にとって何よりも楽しい仲間は、言葉や漢字なんです。そこで言葉遊びが出てくるんですね。(“対談：多和田葉子×ロバートキャンベル” 2)

6. These titles represented by Chinese characters were printed on both the German and Japanese versions, however, in the Japanese these Chinese characters were printed in mirror writing.

7. The first edition of *Das Bad* (1989) is a German translation of Tawada's pre-debut novel, *Urokomoti* [covered with scales], which was written in Japanese but has never been published in Japan. Although up until now this short novel has been translated into several

languages, the original Japanese version first appeared in 2015, when the revised version was published by a German publisher, konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke. (*Das Bad / Urokomoti* 188). The design of the revised version takes into account Tawada's bilingual writing style: Japanese is printed on the left-hand page, and German translation by Peter Pörtner on the right, so that the reader can see two languages at once.

8. In this regard, Tamotsu Aoki said: "I cannot remember the case that an author from a major language spoken country expressed his ideas in a minor language. 'Zainich-Koreans' has grown up in Japan and acquired Japanese language, thus, their choice writing in Japanese seems natural" (*Bilingual* 106).

9. The original Japanese text is here: ひむかしののに、と頭の中でそんな日本語が突然の酔いのようにさっと浮かび上がった。かぎろひのたつみえて。そんな日本語が浮かんでしまったのに、「かげろう」の正式な英語は、思い出せなかった。まわりに溢れている何千人の、誰一人にも通じない、口にすればたわごとのように聞こえるだろう。... ぼくには見える、朝の炎の立つのが古代の日本語を、昔、そのように英語に訳したことがあった。(天安門 *Kindle Locations* 467-470, 474-476)

Works Cited

- Adelson, Leslie A. "The Future of Futurity: Alexander Kluge and Yoko Tawada." *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, vol. 86, no. 3, 2011, pp. 153-184. Taylor & Francis Online, DOI: doi.org/10.1080/00168890.2011.585082. Accessed: 9 Jan. 2018.
- Aoyagi, Etsuko. "The plurality and the literature: need of the literature of the children to the thresholds, the cases of Levy Hideo and Mizumura Minae." *Gengobunkaronshu*, Tsukuba University Departmental Bulletin Paper of the Contemporary Literary Studies, 56, 28 Mar. 2001, pp.1-29. hdl.handle.net/2241/8880. Accessed: 26 June 2019.
- Apter, Emily. "Introduction" in *Against World Literature. On the Politics of Untranslatability*. Verso, 2013, pp. 1-27.
- Bensmaïa, Réda. "Multilingualism and National 'Traits'." *Experimental Nations*. Princeton UP, 2003, pp. 99-135 (ch. 6, parts 1 and 2).
- Brandt, Bettina. "Collecting Childhood Memories of the Future: Arabic as Mediator Between Turkish and German in Emine Sevgi özdamar's Mutterzunge." *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory*, vol.79, no. 2004, pp. 295-315. Taylor & Francis Online, DOI: doi.org/10.3200/GERR.79.4.295-315. Accessed: 9 Jan. 2018.
- . "SCATTERED LEAVES: ARTIST BOOKS AND MIGRATION, A CONVERSATION WITH YOKO TAWADA." *Comparative Literature Studies*, Vol. 45, No. 1, East–West Issue, Penn State University Press, 2008, pp. 12-22. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/25659630. Accessed: 13 Dec. 2018.s
- and Yoko Tawada. "Ein Wort, ein Ort, or How Words Create Places: Interview with Yoko Tawada." *Women in German Yearbook*, Vol. 21, University of Nebraska Press, 2005, pp. 1-15. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/20688244. Accessed: 13 Dec. 2018.

- Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?* Princeton UP, 2004, pp. 1-6; 110-133.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin*. Trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford UP, 1998.
- Heinrich, Patrick. *The Making of Monolingual Japan : Language Ideology and Japanese Modernity*. Channel View Publications, 2012. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=922851>.
- konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke. “Yoko Tawada.” *konkursbuch Verlag Claudia Gehrke*, www.konkursbuch.com/html/tawada.html. Accessed: 11 June 2019.
- Levy, Hideo. *A Room Where The Star-Spangled Banner Cannot Be Heard*. Translated in English by Christopher Scott. Columbia University Press, 2011.
- . *Bairingaruru ekisaitomento*. [*Bilingual Excitement*]. Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 2019.
- . *Chiji-ni-Kudakete* [*Broken into Thousands of Pieces*]. Tokyo, Kodansha, 2008.
- . *Ekkyou-no-Koe* [*Voices beyond the Border*]. Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 2007.
- . *Hitomaro and the Birth of Japanese Lyricism*. Princeton Legacy Library, 2014.
- . *Mohankyou* [*The Model Village*]. 2016. Tokyo, Shueisha, 2019.
- . *Nihongo-wo-Kaku-Heya* [*A Room for Writing Japanese*]. Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 2011.
- . *Seijouki-no-Kikoenai-Heya*. 1992. Tokyo, Kodansha, Kindle Edition, 2013.
- . “Henry Takeshi Lewitsky-no-Natsu-no-Kikou [Henry Takeshi Levitzki’s Summer Travelogue]” (2002) and “Tenanmon [Tiananmen]” (1996). *Tenanmon* [*Tiananmen*], Tokyo, Kodansha, Kindle Edition, 2013.
- . *Wareteki-Nihongo* [*The World in Japanese*]. Tokyo, Chikuma Shobou, 2010.

Loveday, Leo. *Explorations in Japanese Sociolinguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1986. *ProQuest Ebook Central*,

<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=805784>.

Matsunaga, Miho. "Tawada-Yoko-no-Bungaku-ni-Okeru-Shinkasuru-'honyaku' [the developing 'translation' of literature by Yoko Tsawada]." *Bulletin of the Graduate Division of Literature of Waseda University. II, English literature, French literature, German literature, Russian literature, Chinese literature*, 48, Waseda University Humanities, 2002, pp.77-89. hdl.handle.net/2065/8480. Accessed: 12 Dec. 2018.

Maher, John C., and Kyoko Yashiro. *Multilingual Japan*. Multilingual Matters, 1995.

EBSCOhost,

search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=18900&site=ehost-live.

Moseley, Christopher (ed.). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edn. Paris, UNESCO Publishing, 2010. Online version: www.unesco.org/culture/en/endangeredlanguages/atlas. Accessed 31 May 2019.

New Directions Publishing. "The Emissary." *New Directions Publishing*,

www.ndbooks.com/book/the-emissary. Accessed: 20 Feb. 2019.

Radhakrishnan, R. *A Said Dictionary*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2012.

Said, Edward W. *Out of Place: A Memoir*. Granta Books, 1999.

---. *Orientalism*. New York, Pantheon Books, 1978.

---. *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Harvard UP, 1984.

Sasanuma, Toshiaki. "'Taiwan' in Hideo Levy." *The Journal of Tsukuba University*

Comparative Literature Studies, 29, 2011, pp. 1-14.

- Stanford University. "Ian Hideo Levy." *The Book Heaven*, 19 Feb. 2010, bookhaven.stanford.edu/tag/ian-hideo-levy/. Accessed 6 June 2019.
- Tawada, Yoko. *Borudo-no-Gikei*. 2009. Tokyo, Kodansha, Kindle edition, 2013.
- . *Das Bad. Urokomoti*. 1988. Tübingen, Konkursbuch verlag Claudia Gehrke, the second edition, 2015.
- . *Exophony: Bogo-no-Soto-he-Deru-Tabi* [*Exophony: A Journey Beyond the Mother Tongue*]. 2003. Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 2012.
- . *Facing the Bridge*. Translated in English by Margaret Mitsutani, New Directions Publishing, 2007.
- . *Hikon*. 1998. Tokyo, Kodansha, Kindle Edition, 2016.
- . *Kentoshi*. Tokyo, Kodansha, 2014.
- . *Yoko Tawada: the official homepage information about Yoko Tawada's life books events projects and news*. yokotawada.de/?page_id=28. Accessed 31 May 2019.
- . *Schwager in Bordeaux*. Tübingen, Konkursbuch verlag Claudia Gehrke, 2008.
- . *The Emissary*. Translated in English by Margaret Mitsutani, New Directions Publishing, 2018.
- . "The Bath." *Where Europe Begins*. Translated by Susan Bernofsky and Yumi Selden, New Directions Publishing, 2002.
- and Rachel McNichol. "From Mother Tongue to Linguistic Mother." *Manoa*, Volume 18, Number 1, University of Hawai'i Press, 2006, pp. 139-143. *PROJECT MUSE*, DOI: doi.org/10.1353/man.2006.0039. Accessed: 12 Dec. 2018.
- and Robert Campbell. "対談：多和田葉子×ロバート・キャンベル Taidan. Yoko Tawada, Robert Campbell: Yagate-kibou-ha-modoru [Interview with Yoko Tawada and Robert Campbell:

hope will come back later].” *Kodansha Book Club*, kodanshabunko.com/kentoushi/.

Accessed: 10 June 2019.

--- and Robert Campbell. “Yoko Tawada: The Fascination of Exophonic Literature.” *NHK World*,

28 Apr. 2019, www3.nhk.or.jp/nhkworld/en/ondemand/video/2043047/. Accessed: 10

June 2019.

Yasunari, Kawabata. “Japan, the Beautiful and Myself: Yasunari Kawabata Nobel Lecture.” *The*

Nobel Prize, www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1968/kawabata/lecture/. Accessed: 6

June 2019.

Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. Fordham

University Press, 2013.