

# Into the Shadows: The Doppelgänger in the Literature of Endo Shūshaku

Mark Williams

In the introduction to his study of the *shishosetsu* genre of confessional literature that has so dominated the twentieth century Japanese prose narrative tradition, Edward Fowler suggests that “the basic difference [between the classical western narrative and the Japanese *shishosetsu*] derives from the fact that the *shosetsu* itself — that Japanese word we glibly translate as ‘novel’ — also differs fundamentally from western narrative.”<sup>1)</sup> The challenge, he suggests, is “to distance *shosetsu* from ‘novel’ while collapsing the perceived distinctions between *shosetsu* and *shishosetsu*.”<sup>2)</sup> What is required, in short, is the alternative methodology for reading the *shosetsu* which Miyoshi Masao has advocated, one which allowed for interpretation of the *shosetsu* “as a confluence of narrative possibilities as inherited by the Edo period and later writers whose perception and response, dream and realization, were guided and defined by the constraints of their times.”<sup>3)</sup>

As Fowler and Miyoshi are the first to acknowledge, the implications of this call are considerable. For, if we are to heed this advice, not only is there a need for a radical rethink of the “rhetoric of confession” upon which the *shishosetsu* is premised; there is a concomitant requirement to revisit a whole series of Japanese authors who have traditionally been pigeon-holed, again all too “glibly,” as heavily indebted to Western influences, as somehow belonging outside the native narrative tradition — and, by extension, as indebted to techniques espoused by the western novel. Quite apart from the questions raised by textualist critics with regard to the notion of “influence” (which, as James Fujii has pointed out, “suffers from the problem of privileging the person or work ‘influenced’ and also fails to account for more than naive unidirectional effects,”<sup>4)</sup> the attempt to locate such works within the Japanese tradition of the *shosetsu* is surely well-heeded. To persist with Fujii’s logic, “we might be better served by abandoning a static model of binary influence in favor of a view that accounts for what was and is a dynamic process of often self-reflective engagement with otherness.”<sup>5)</sup> To be sure, in seeking to divest such texts of some of their intercultural baggage, there is a danger that we will end up merely relocating them in some other equally one-sided liminal site. Whilst attempting to avoid such drastic over-rectification, however, we can at least continue the process of strengthening the structural supports upon which the *shosetsu* depends.

One such author who would surely benefit from reappraisal as a writer of *shosetsu* is Endo Shūshaku. Entrusted with the sobriquet of “Japanese Christian writer” from the

moment of his emergence on the literary scene in the 1950s, such categorisation rapidly escalated into the depiction of Endo as the “Japanese Graham Greene” which remained virtually *de rigueur* in journalistic circles until Endo’s death in late 1996. In large measure, the identification with Western literary tradition was self-induced: even before publication of his first work of creative fiction, Endo had gone on public record acknowledging his literary debt to the series of “French Catholic authors” who had represented the primary focus of his studies both as an undergraduate at Keio University and, later, as one of the first Japanese students to study in France after the War. In the aptly-named “Katorikku sakka no mondai” (The Problems confronting the Catholic Author, 1947), for example, in addition to the widely discussed “influence” of Mauriac, Endo also recognises the significance on his own subsequent literary direction of various French novelists, including Paul Bourget, Henri Bourdeaux, Gide, Proust, Charles du Bos, Daniel Ropps, Julien Green, Emile Baumann, Jean Maregu, Claudel and Georges Bernanos.<sup>6)</sup>

It is hard to exaggerate Endo’s literary debt to European letters. However, reinterpretation in the light of the caveats proffered by Fowler, Miyoshi and Fujii provides interesting insights into an author more deeply imbued in the *shosetsu* tradition — and more readily identifiable as building on the prewar *shishosetsu* tradition — than is generally acknowledged. It is these that represent the primary focus of the ensuing discussion. More specifically, this paper will attempt to locate Endo at the forefront of a tradition of fractured narrative perspective to which the *shishosetsu* gave way in the wake of defeat in the Pacific War.

### **In Search of Selfhood**

In theory, any attempt to relocate Endo within the *shosetsu* tradition is going to take us back to the earliest exemplars of the genre which Miyoshi and others have traced back to the early Meiji era (1868–1912). The issue was taken up by Karatani Kōjin in *The Origins of Japanese Literature*, a seminal work in which the author links the origins of the genre to the “discovery of interiority” that he locates around the turn of the century.<sup>7)</sup> In a paper focussing on the move towards a more complex narrative of the self in the literature of the postwar Endo, we can do little more than sketch the emergence of an approach to the individual that would colour the subsequent *shosetsu* tradition. In so doing, however, it is to be hoped that a more balanced picture of Endo as inheritor of a tradition born of the Meiji movement towards self-definition will emerge.

To Karatani, “the theme of the exploration of the modern self, however diverse its articulations, dominates discussions of modern Japanese literature.” The caveat following this observation is, however, highly significant:

Yet it is laughable to speak of this modern self as if it were purely a mental or psychological phenomenon. For this modern self is rooted in materiality and comes into existence . . . only by being established as a system.<sup>8)</sup>

For Karatani, this system emerged in the early Meiji period — in the form of the movement towards the “unification of written and spoken language” (*genbun itchi*) — and “it was the formation of [this] system that made possible the so-called ‘discovery of the self’” by a series of writers epitomised by Kunikida Doppo and his literary mentor, Kitamura Tokoku. A brief examination of the latter’s concept of the *naibu seimei* (inner life) that was to shape the literary focus not only of Doppo but of a whole series of authors more traditionally categorised as precursors of the naturalist tradition in Japan should serve to support Karatani’s thesis.

Born around the time of the restoration of Imperial rule in 1868, here was a generation of writers weaned on the notion of individualism introduced into Japan in the 1870s and convinced that the existence, morality and energy of the individual are valuable in their own right and, as such, worthy of respect. At the same time, attracted to the Christian doctrine of the uniqueness of the individual’s “inner life,” they were inspired to develop a new ideal of self-cultivation in the hope thereby of promoting a spirit of freedom and independence amongst the Japanese of the day. At the vanguard of this movement was Kitamura, described by Mathy as “the first writer to explore seriously the nature and possibilities of the self and to try to integrate a philosophy of the self into an overall view of life.”<sup>9)</sup>

As Janet Walker has suggested, in stressing the need for spiritual selfhood to ensure harmony in life, Kitamura’s ideal of selfhood may have developed in the context of orthodox Christianity; at the same time, it also “intersected with traditional Eastern ideals of the sage and the enlightened man, to emerge finally, leavened by Emerson’s transcendentalist philosophy, as an intellectual and spiritual vision of man in the context of democracy.”<sup>10)</sup> In contrast to the social and political focus of earlier advocates (such as Fukuzawa Yukichi), then, Tokoku’s interest was primarily spiritual, his desire to awaken the spiritual selfhood of the individual paramount. And yet he was concerned lest the ideal of independence derived from the West develop into a materialistic battle — and this was to shape his concept of freedom from the outset. In contrast to economic goals, which he saw as temporary, he cited spiritual goals which contributed to harmony, as eternal. And these were to be achieved, not so much by mechanical, externalised gestures (such as adherence to ritual), but rather by cultivating the *naibu seimei*. At the same time, this antipathy towards a materialistic concept of the individual led to Tokoku’s concern with inculcating a spirit of passion (*joñetsu*) that alone “would be powerful enough to overcome the traditional spirit of what he called *jakumetsu shiso* (the spirit of ego-extinction and detachment).”<sup>11)</sup>

For Tokoku, then, independence stood in stark contrast to the *naibu seimei* — and it was this preoccupation with the inner world of the individual that was to dominate his subsequent writing. Unable to identify with any one Christian sect,<sup>12)</sup> he eventually moved towards a more internal faith, a religion of the heart, not dependent on rites or creeds. More specifically, he came to develop his theory of the *kokoro* as consisting of two levels: the “outer” and the “inner”, arguing that although most lead their lives in the outer, it is only through penetration of the inner that one is fully able

to define the self. The individual's primary responsibility, therefore, was to define this inner world:

Man must by all means respect his [inner *kokoro*]; he must make it distinct; he must make it straight; he must make it clear and must make it public.<sup>13)</sup>

It is difficult to exaggerate the influence of Tokoku's *naibu seimeiron* on subsequent generations of Japanese writers. As the first concerted attempt to define the self in terms of the self, Tokoku succeeded here in identifying a philosophy of idealistic humanism that continued to inspire his literary successors. For Doppo and the group of writers on whom Tokoku's literary mantle fell at the time of his death (limited largely to those involved with the journal, *Bungakkai* in which Tokoku had expounded his philosophy), the challenge of couching the concept of the "inner life" in more specifically literary terms was readily assumed — to the extent that Karatani suggests that "the mainstream of modern Japanese literature continued along lines set forth by Doppo rather than by Ōgai or Soōeki. All the germs of the literature which was to be produced by the next generation were contained in the writing of Doppo."<sup>14)</sup> Of more relevance to this study, however, is the durability of the concept. For, as Janet Walker acknowledges:

If one links the novel to the spread of the ideal of individualism, both in its social and political manifestations and in the less obvious internal transformations, . . . one cannot help remarking the strength and endurance of the tradition of the subjective novel, and the progressive depth of revelation of the inner self that it has [subsequently] attained.<sup>15)</sup>

The point is pursued by Karatani who, in emphasising the far-reaching implications of the discovery of interiority, cited the vision of an alternative self, of a "self . . . severed from the self" as integral to the ensuing prose narrative tradition.<sup>16)</sup> For as he suggests:

The illusion that there is something like a 'true self' has taken deep root. It is an illusion that is established when writing has come to be seen as derivative and that voice which is most immediate to the self, and which constitutes self-consciousness, is privileged. The psychological person, who begins and ends in interiority, has come into existence.<sup>17)</sup>

To Karatani, the tendency to privilege "that voice which is most immediate to the self" provided a significant impetus to those authors of the subsequent *shishosetsu* tradition in their search for closer identification with their fictional constructs. At the same time, however, he stresses that "it was the literary form of the confession — confession as a system — that produced the interiority that confessed the 'true self'."<sup>18)</sup> Nevertheless, as Karatani is first to acknowledge, those who have criticised the ensuing *shishosetsu* form have argued that, "by conflating the author's 'I' and the 'I' of the works, the Japanese I-novel has failed to create a self-sufficient fictional

world.”<sup>19)</sup> In the section that follows, I shall argue that it is in the fictional worlds of the generation of writers to emerge in the aftermath of war — the so-called *daisan no shinjin* (third generation of new writers) who came increasingly to question the dependability of their own narrators — that the search for interiority is pursued with, if anything, a renewed intensity.<sup>20)</sup> In particular, I shall posit Endō as an author more deeply imbued with the literary ethos of this generation than is often acknowledged<sup>21)</sup> — precisely on account of his determination to give literary expression to the sense of the “self. . . severed from the self” through focus upon individual protagonists struggling to come to terms with the existence of their own perceived double.

### Picking up the Pieces

The Japan into which Endō and his peers in the *daisan no shinjin* were born towards the end of the Taishō era (1912–1926) was a nation in which the seeds of Taishō democracy had failed to flourish. Within years, establishment of the Great East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere had taken deep root and the clouds of impending war hung low. In short, Endō’s was the first generation of Japanese to come of age under wartime conditions. Educated in accordance with the increasingly militaristic code in the 1930s, here was a generation for whom the inexorable drift towards World War 2 hostilities had come to represent normalcy.

Such information is of more than mere biographical interest. For, as I shall argue with specific reference to Endō, no assessment of the changes effected on the narrating self in the postwar *shōsetsu* is possible without acknowledgement of the ambiguous position in which Endō and his peers found themselves in the wake of defeat in 1945. Glad to have survived the horrors of war, even those who, like Endō, had missed out on front-line action on medical grounds were nevertheless left scarred by the experience and, all too often, unsure how to cope with life in postwar reality.

The sense of rootlessness experienced by this generation who came together as the *daisan no shinjin* has been extensively documented by Van Gessel. Most relevant for the purposes of this study, however, is the extent to which this sense of living on the margins of society (a sense exacerbated by consideration of their own personal contribution to the task of nation-building being so assiduously and conspicuously pursued by their peers in the economic sector) led them “to attack the official, public versions of events by describing contradictory moments from individual experience.”<sup>22)</sup> In the light of this tendency to rely on autobiographical material as the basis for their fictions, comparisons with the ubiquitous *shishōsetsu* of the prewar generation are inevitable. As I shall attempt to show with examples from Endō’s literary corpus, however, these texts are marked by an assault on the hitherto privileged position of the narrator of the earlier *shishōsetsu*, a position seemingly wilfully undermined by the presence of an alternative perspective on characters and events.

Nowhere is this distinction more in evidence than in the novels of Endō. Dismissive of what he viewed as the inability of his *shishōsetsu* forebears to acknowledge a greater complexity to the process of recording individual experience by “delving be-

yond the level of the psyche,”<sup>23)</sup> here was an author determined to penetrate beyond the world of experience and to explore in his art his vision of the individual encapsulated in the following depiction:

Man is a splendid and beautiful being and, at the same time, man is a terrible being as we recognised in Auschwitz — God knows well this monstrous dual quality of man.<sup>24)</sup>

With this comment aimed at highlighting the “deep inside of man,” Endo effectively encapsulates a vision of the composite human being which, while heavily indebted to the author’s much vaunted study of Jungian psychology, is evident in his literature from the outset.<sup>25)</sup> At the same time, in the portrayal of the individual as representing an amalgam of conflicting forces, Endo can here be seen acknowledging his determination to penetrate beyond the superficial towards a deeper examination of human psychology, an attempt that has engaged the author in a concerted attempt to seek a literary reconciliation of the conscious and unconscious elements within human nature.

The result, in Endo’s fictional worlds, is a series of texts marked by the portrayal of individual protagonists struggling to come to terms with a deeper level of their being than that to which they had previously assented. The Endo protagonists are engaged in a remorseless quest, a search for greater understanding, not merely of the motivating force behind their seemingly impulsive behavior, but, by extension, of the relationship between the conscious persona which they have traditionally presented to society and their unconscious being in which such actions appear rooted. Troubled by the malice which they discern within themselves and obliged to acknowledge their powerlessness to exercise control over this realm increasingly dismissed as “unfathomable,” they find themselves in direct confrontation with a *doppelgänger*, their own double whose very existence they struggle, in vain, to deny.

Here is the “self . . . severed from the self,” frequently depicted in literary terms in terms of protagonists who find themselves confronted by “*mo hitori no jibun*” (another “me”). The discovery is often initially painful. But as one by one they come to acknowledge this other self as an integral part of their being and to appear, as such, as increasingly composite individuals, so they appear less and less troubled by the often conflicting agendas they come to discern in the depths of their being.

It is in this sense that I have chosen to identify Endo’s work as a “literature of reconciliation,”<sup>26)</sup> a body of literary texts in which the respective journeys towards greater self-understanding upon which each of the protagonists is engaged can be identified as integral to their individual “processes of individuation.” The discoveries that each makes along the way inevitably differ and the extent to which the author succeeds in maintaining the focus on this process of growth is, of necessity, determined, in part at least, by other narrative considerations. As a concerted attempt to penetrate the public facade and to expose the alternative facets of the divided self that lurk behind this veneer, however, Endo’s work represents an invaluable addition to

the corpus of literary texts in Japan devoted to consideration of this aspect of human nature. At this point, however, let us allow the texts to speak for themselves.

### Three Examples of the *Doppelgänger*

Let us turn first to the novel, *Chinmoku* (Silence, 1966), the novel with which Endo established his international reputation. Born of the author's determination to reconcile the distance he perceived between the religion he had adopted, albeit reluctantly, as a child and his cultural identity as Japanese — to “tailor the ill-fitting Western-style suit into something more appropriate to [his] needs,”<sup>27)</sup> the novel has been widely read as a portrayal of the Portuguese missionary, Rodrigues who, following his inevitable arrest for having entered the country in defiance of the shogunal ban on all Christian proselytisation, ends up renouncing his God and all that his life to date had stood for by acceding to the authority's demands that he go through the ritual of trampling on the *fumie* in a public act of apostasy. To such critics, the novel represented a misguided attempt by the author to posit an irreconcilable gap, both spiritual and cultural, between East and West, a reading seemingly supported at the textual level by Rodrigues' apostate mentor, Ferreira who, in a desperate attempt to elicit Rodrigues' apostasy, claims:

This country is a swamp . . . a more terrible swamp than you can imagine. Whenever you plant a sapling in this swamp the roots begin to rot; the leaves grow yellow and wither. And we have planted the sapling of Christianity in this swamp . . .

The Japanese to this day have never had the concept of God; and they never will . . . The Japanese are not able to think of God completely divorced from man; the Japanese cannot think of an existence that transcends the human.<sup>28)</sup>

To Endo himself, however, such criticism, whilst not surprising, was evidence, both of a continuing reluctance on the part of the church to address the tension he had come to perceive between literature and religion and also of a tendency to view the scene in which Rodrigues is finally persuaded to defile the *fumie* with his foot as the culmination of the novel. As Endo was first to acknowledge, interpretation of the novel along the lines outlined above may be readily supported by an analysis of the first eight chapters of the work, chapters in which the primary focus is on the psychological drama played out within the protagonist's mind as he wrestles with his conscience. Significantly, however, the novel does not finish with Rodrigues' act of apostasy. The protagonist may emulate his mentor, Ferreira, in stepping on the *fumie* and in subsequently accepting a Japanese name, a wife and a residence in Nagasaki courtesy of the very authorities who had driven him to apostatise. As Endo is at pains to stress, however, there is evidence in the brief concluding section that, for all his outward capitulation, inwardly Rodrigues is ultimately possessed of a faith more real and more profound than that which had inspired him to risk all in embarking on his mis-

sion to Japan in the first place.

Viewed in this light, the novel *Silence* comes to assume a very different complexion. Far from an outburst of despair at the seeming failure of the Christian missions to come to terms with a fundamental reluctance on the part of the Japanese to embrace the “Western” religion, the novel can now be seen as a protracted attempt to penetrate the depths of the protagonist’s inner being — in a desire, similar to that evidenced in the earlier novels, to discern there some archetypal positive quality to human nature.

So how does this process of self-discovery work at the textual level? A discussion of the portrayals of Rodrigues before and after his decision to trample on the *fumie* serves to reveal the extent of the journey towards greater self-awareness traveled by the protagonist as a result of confrontation with his own psychological doppelgänger.

The Rodrigues who arrives in Japan in 1640 would indeed appear to represent the epitome of self-assuredness. Fired by a seemingly unquenchable missionary zeal and enthusiasm to rescue the believers in Japan abandoned to a lonely existence as preservers of a proscribed religion, he appears possessed of the vision of an omnipotent and omniscient God that would seem sufficient to equip him with the resilience required to defy all the physical pain his fellow humans could inflict upon him. He is, in short, undeterred by the reports of Christian persecution emanating from Japan, convinced that “it was the great mission of [my companion] Garrpe and myself to tend” the seed of Christianity that had been sown in Japan “lest it wither and die” (p. 55). Viewed out of context, such evidence suggests a protagonist of unbending principle, a man for whom apostasy, regardless of the provocation, could never be a viable option. Closer examination of the text, however, reveals evidence, even at this early juncture, of a greater complexity to Rodrigues’ being. Immediately after the above display of optimism, for example, the protagonist is drawn to confess to a lingering uncertainty *vis à vis* God’s purpose for the mission in Japan:

Why has God given our Christians such a burden? This is something I fail to understand (p. 64).

At this stage, such nagging doubts are largely suppressed for the benefit of public consumption. Even when the full reality of the choice confronting those who continue to resist the shogunate line is brought home with horrendous force — as Rodrigues is obliged to observe the agonising deaths suffered by two of the local converts, Mokichi and Ichizo, tied to stakes at the shoreline at low tide and abandoned to their inexorable fate by the increasingly callous authorities, Rodrigues’ “public” reaction suggests an attempt to cling to his fundamental convictions:

I do not believe that God has given us this trial to no purpose. I know that the day will come when we will clearly understand why this persecution with all its sufferings has been bestowed upon us — for everything that Our Lord does is for our good (p. 96).

Such steadfastness is, however, belied by his next words, “And yet, . . .,” and it is



not long before he gives vent to the deep-rooted sense of uncertainty that this incident has simply served to bring into clearer focus. At the same time, however, he is increasingly troubled by “a voice . . . from the deepest core” of his being. “Supposing God does not exist,” it whispers (p. 117).

At a rational level, Rodrigues is still in a position to acknowledge that “if I consented to this thought, then my whole past to this very day was washed away in silence” (p. 118). More and more, however, his inner being is developing into a battleground for conflicting voices, the voice of conscious reasoning increasingly challenged by a voice from a deeper level of his being that calls into question the very nature of the mission in which he is engaged.

That Rodrigues is “filled with disgust” by this voice is hardly surprising: the thought of abandoning the faith that had ordered his life to date remains unconscionable and, in public at least, the protagonist succeeds in preserving the unquestioning facade which the Japanese converts with whom he shares a cell following his own arrest had come to expect. Confronted by the seemingly pointless death of his colleague, Garrpe, however, his ever-increasing doubts appear to reach their logical conclusion:

Did God really exist? If not, how ludicrous was half of his life spent traversing the limitless seas to come and plant the tiny seed in this barren island! How ludicrous was the life of Garrpe swimming in pursuit of the Christians in that little boat! (p. 223)

The growing uncertainty experienced by the protagonist at the conscious level as a result of the gnawing “voice from the depths of his being”, serves to provide the all-important ring of authenticity to Rodrigues’ subsequent decision to go through with his outward display of apostasy. On the one level, the depiction of Rodrigues as he stands before the *fumie* is one of absolute despair, the darkness, both physical and psychological, in which he is enveloped, seemingly impenetrable. It is at this very moment, however, that “the first rays of the dawn appear” (p. 271). At the same time, the protagonist comes to recognise for the first time in the image on the cross he had studied so often in the past, not the powerful image of dignified beauty of European tradition, but rather the face of a man with the desire simply “to share man’s pain” (p. 271), a fellow sufferer who breaks His silence with the words, “Trample! I more than anyone know the pain in your foot. Trample! It was to be trampled on by men that I was born into this world” (p. 271).

From a literary perspective, this is the moment of catharsis, the moment in which Rodrigues finds himself responding, in spite of himself, to the voice of his unconscious. On the conscious level, this act of betrayal results in his release from detention and provision of accommodation by the very authorities who had succeeded in inducing his apostasy. This dramatic turn-about in his physical fortunes is, however, as nothing when compared with the metamorphosis occasioned on his inner being. To be sure, the protagonist’s assertion in the immediate aftermath of his release that “Lord,

you alone know that I did not renounce my faith” (p. 275) may still appear lacking in absolute conviction. By the conclusion of the novel, however, the extent to which Rodrigues has indeed heeded the “inner voice” that represents his guide along the road to self-discovery is reinforced — in the depiction of the protagonist agreeing to hear the confession of Kichijiro, the very man who had betrayed him, Judas-like, to the authorities. To the orthodox church, this decision — the willingness to cling to the vestiges of priesthood even following his public act of renunciation — may be seen as the ultimate heresy. To Rodrigues, however, the reaction of his peers is now of little concern. His journey of self-discovery has removed him from concerns for the reactions of his former colleagues. Instead, he is now armed with a new-found confidence in his continuing and strengthened relationship with God, leading him to conclude:

No doubt his fellow priests would condemn his act as sacrilege; but even if he was betraying them, he was not betraying his Lord. He loved him now in a different way from before. Everything that had taken place until now had been necessary to bring him to this love. “Even now I am the last priest in the land” (p. 298).

Rodrigues has indeed traveled far during the course of the novel. It is as a character whose increasing awareness of inner growth born of a gradual renunciation of his earlier pride and heroism that he comes to represent a model for all the author’s subsequent examinations of the composite individual. Here is the author’s most convincing examination to date of human psychology; here, the strongest indications to date of the possibility of reconciliation of seeming oppositions.

Let us turn now to *Sukyandaru* (Scandal, 1986), a work whose connection with the author’s previous novels has been seen as tenuous but which, in its unrelenting focus on the often conflicting forces at work in the human unconscious, can be seen as the author’s most concerted study to date of the role of the doppelgänger. Indeed, here the determination to address the human duality is incorporated into the very structure of the work — in the person of Suguro, a “Catholic author” approaching the end of a distinguished literary career, who is identified from the outset as protagonist of the novel. The choice is highly significant: in choosing deliberately to locate his fictional construct in territory traditionally assigned to himself, the author not only parodies the *shishosetsu* form of self-referential narrative, but also places overt emphasis on the potential for which this affords him for self-satirisation. In short, Suguro is established from the outset as Endo’s fictional double. Readers who proceed to read the entire ensuing narrative as some form of literary atonement by an author resolved to expose his “true” identity are, however, in for a rude awakening. For, from the moment Suguro is disturbed by the appearance of a man, seemingly identical in every physical detail to the protagonist himself, leering at him from the back of the auditorium, Suguro is reduced to an increasingly frenzied state of self-doubt. Attempts to confront this “imposter” lead Suguro to experience the seamier side of Tokyo’s Kabuki-cho with its seemingly inexhaustible supply of scandal-mongers bent on de-

stroying the reputation of this popular novelist through exposure of his less salubrious pleasure pursuits. And the more Suguro struggles to uncover and expose the “truth” concerning this “imposter,” the more he finds his destiny tied up with those who seek his downfall.

The consequent probing of the psychological drama experienced by Suguro is persistent. What such a reading fails to acknowledge, however, is the carefully-crafted and jealously-guarded narrative distance that separates Endo—both from his ever-complicit narrator and from his hapless protagonist. Through skillful manipulation of the potential with which creation of this literary *alter ego* has presented him for examination of the composite being, the author affords himself a unique opportunity for analysing his literary material, not as belonging to the external world, but as stemming from his own deep consciousness. The result is a literary consideration of the “Shadow” that appears firmly rooted in Jung’s depiction of the archetype.

For a while, in public at least, Suguro seeks to play down the significance of the initial appearance of his double during the course of his speech, trying to convince himself that:

The figure he had seen from the lectern could have been a hallucination. If not a hallucination, then a vile prank perpetrated by the imposter. It had to be one or other of these two options.<sup>29)</sup>

Already, however, in acknowledging that Suguro is obliged to “nudge himself towards that conclusion” (p. 141), the text provides ample evidence that Suguro is wavering in his conviction. Nevertheless, despite having come to doubt his original assumptions, Suguro remains incapable of identifying an alternative explanation and it is only when confronted with the sight of his “double” taking advantage of the innocence of Mitsu, the young girl he had earlier employed to clean his office, that he is in a position to offer a reassessment.

The scene is carefully orchestrated by Madame Naruse, a woman whose “split” identity as a confirmed sado-masochist who has nevertheless succeeded, at the same time, in earning a reputation as a most caring and sensitive hospital volunteer, provides her with a unique vantage point from which to seek to influence Suguro’s understanding of events. As Suguro stands with his eye to the peep-hole in the cupboard in the hotel room to which he has been lured by Mme. Naruse with the express purpose of introducing the protagonist to the “urges of his unconscious” (p. 211), Suguro tries desperately to distance himself from the image of this “imposter.” For all his incredulity, however, he is unable to tear his eye away from the peep-hole and increasingly he finds himself “bec[oming] one with the man” (p. 216). As the jangling telephone summons him back to reality, therefore, far from outright dismissal, Suguro is obliged to conclude:

What he had seen through the peep-hole had been no illusion, no nightmare . . . That had been no stranger, no pretender. It had been Suguro himself. It had been

another side of himself, a separate self altogether. He could no longer conceal that part of himself, no longer deny its existence (pp. 219, 221).

But even this conclusion is not entirely free of ambiguity: the desire to dismiss the phenomenon as “a separate self altogether” has not entirely receded. Suguro has nevertheless traveled a long way from his initial terror at seeing the “imposter” in the auditorium — although significantly, such fear has been replaced, not by relief at the exposure of his double as a fraud, but rather by recognition of a relationship between the two that, in its complexity and intimacy, serves to induce within Suguro a radical reconsideration of human nature. The more he comes to admit the futility of continued pursuit of a physical double, the more he is obliged to acknowledge the fundamentally symbiotic relationship that lies at the core of the human drama. The discovery is hard-earned, the true implications for Suguro only fully identified at the conclusion of the novel — in the scene in which Suguro is informed by his ever-supportive publisher that he has purchased and destroyed some potentially ruinous photographs of Suguro and Mitsu taken by Kobari, the unrelenting journalist in search of a “scoop” that will destroy Suguro’s reputation as a “Christian author” once and for all. By this stage, the narrative is explicit:

The photograph and negative had been reduced to ashes. But that man had not been burned to death along with them. He continued to live inside Suguro. With his sneering smile (p. 234).

An act that was designed to resolve all the problems and appears, initially, to have succeeded in this aim has served, rather, to bring Suguro one step closer to recognition of the shadow side of his personality.

In true Jungian fashion, therefore, the role assigned to the Shadow in *Scandal* is that of making Suguro more aware of his own Self — and of accompanying the insecure protagonist in his first tentative steps along the road to self-discovery and wholeness of self. Without this presence, Suguro would have remained possessed of his conviction that he had “looked upon hideous things in all their hideousness” (p. 136), totally oblivious to the fact that, shut up in his study and absorbed in creation of his next literary “success,” he had unwittingly been obstructing the path to greater self-awareness. The Shadow is integral to the process of individuation upon which Suguro is involved and, by the end of the novel, Suguro does indeed encounter his Shadow — precisely in the shocking realisation that there is no true “double” or “imposter,” merely his own personal unconscious. In this sense, Suguro is conforming to the task that Jung assigned to the individual:

If . . . a person wants to be cured it is necessary to find a way in which his conscious personality and his shadow can live together.<sup>30)</sup>

In keeping with the precedent established in *Silence*, the function exercised by the doppelgänger in *Scandal* is that of a catalyst for augmenting Suguro’s self-doubt. In

this, however, he is not alone: a similar function is performed by the other characters with whom he comes into contact as a direct consequence of his desperate attempt to unmask his assailant. In this sense, these characters, too, serve as manifestations of Suguro's alter ego, the seemingly unfathomable divisions between Suguro and these figures initially suggested by the text gradually eroded as the narrative unfolds.

I have discussed elsewhere the extent to which the characters whom Suguro encounters during the course of the novel can be seen as embodying elements of his own unconscious being, and suggested that, in this, they conform closely with the Jungian model of resentment: those qualities that they find unattractive in Suguro appear increasingly to reflect those they have sought to repress within themselves.<sup>31)</sup> The model is carefully crafted — and subsequently receives more comprehensive treatment in Endo's final novel, *Deep River* to which we now turn.

As Endo acknowledged at the time of publication of *Scandal*, central to the narrative design of his next novel was to be the figure of Mme. Naruse, who is so integral to Suguro's journey of self-discovery.<sup>32)</sup> At the same time, Endo had determined to locate his next novel in India, besides the Ganges in which he had come to recognise a mandala, a convergence and ultimate fusion of life and death, beauty and ugliness, hope and despair, that served as a perfect symbolic end-point for the searches embodied in the earlier Endo protagonists. The more he strove to portray the symbiotic relationship between the various, seemingly conflicting, qualities within the single character and to adopt the symbol of the Ganges as the great river affirming this process, however, the more he was drawn to depiction, not of a search carried out in isolation, but as part of a much larger process. The "subsidiary" characters consequently grew in significance, and Mitsuko's role as unquestioned protagonist was subverted by the increasing importance attached, not merely to Otsu, the "weak" and "powerless" voice whom, try as she might, Mitsuko is unable to leave behind, but also to a series of other fellow-travellers brought together on the tour to India that forms the narrative basis for the novel.

The resulting novel can be seen, in large measure, as a literary response to the critic, Moriuchi Toshio, who had argued in a review of *Scandal*: "I am fascinated to discover whether, in the future, Suguro will intone the music of destruction or of rebirth."<sup>33)</sup> Endo's initial response to Moriuchi was explicit:

My aim is to focus, not on the psychological worlds of the characters, but on the issues that trouble their souls — and to cut everything else that one normally includes in a novel. I know of no example of a Japanese novel, be it popular or psychological, in which all the characters are engaged in searching their souls. So I decided to give it a try.<sup>34)</sup>

The empty lives and absence of hope and dreams for the future betrayed by Endo's protagonists from the outset had been painfully exposed in *Scandal*; the requirement now was for a work that would delve deeper into the causes of such "aloneness" and, in so doing, provide a fresh perspective on the concerted search for identity that had

pervaded Endo's entire oeuvre. It is in this context — as an exploration of the possibilities for “rebirth” of the individual — that the novel *Deep River* is perhaps best appreciated.

First indications within the novel of the significance to be attached, not merely to the process of evolving self-awareness but to the desire for rebirth born of renewed optimism is provided by Endo's title for the novel and the decision to cite the Negro spiritual of the same name as a prologue. The spiritual, born of decades of slavery in the American South and replete with its dreams of freedom from all persecution, focusses on the promised “campground,” the land of renewed hope and new beginnings, that lay, so near and yet so far, before them. The ensuing novel depicts the gradual rapprochement of a group of Japanese tourists, each drawn to India as part of the search for something to assuage the emptiness of their routine lives and united only in their sense of being abandoned and alone. In keeping with precedent, Endo initially deliberately accentuates the differences between the various characters. As the drama unfolds, however, and as the extent to which the characters are indeed linked in their search for answers to certain fundamental questions that have resonated throughout Endo's corpus becomes apparent, so the characters are confronted with previously ignored aspects of their own inner being — in the form of confrontation with their own double. It is this heightened self-awareness, coupled with the confrontation with both death and rebirth they experience besides the Ganges that leads to a fusion of the differences that had initially separated the various tourists.

First to sense the presence of his own doppelgänger in the novel is the war veteran, Kiguchi, whose trip to India is motivated by the desire to perform a memorial service for the numerous friends and colleagues who had perished in the infamous “death march” through the Burmese jungle at the end of the Pacific War. Aware that his own survival was thanks, in no small measure, to the selfless care of his friend, Tsukada, Kiguchi's recollection of those days, “as they dragged their legs along in utter exhaustion”<sup>35</sup>) incorporates a hazy differentiation between his physical self and “an exact replica of himself walking alongside him.”

“Walk! You must keep walking!” His double, or perhaps the Kiguchi who was about to collapse physically, had bellowed at him. “Walk! Keep walking!” . . . He was certain that his exact duplicate had stood at his side, berating him (p. 87).

The “exact replica of himself,” “his double,” or “his exact duplicate” — all translations of the same *mo hitori no jibun* in the original — continues to haunt Kiguchi, his release from its clutches finally achieved only as he stands beside the Ganges intoning the sutras and concluding that, like good and evil, the two aspects of his being are linked in a symbiotic relationship: they stand “back to back with each other, and they can't be separated the way you can cut things apart with a knife” (p. 200).

Equally disturbed by the presence of a doppelgänger standing alongside her is Mitsuko who, in keeping with the model established with Mme. Naruse in *Scandal*, is aware of conflicting impulses within her being — the one drawing her to devote much

of her free time to care of the sick and elderly as a hospital volunteer, the other attracted, in spite of herself, to the “freshly severed head and blood flecked lips” of the Hindu goddess, Kali. Significantly, moreover, as she “flicked back and forth between the photos and paintings [of Kali], *Mitsuko felt that both images were herself*” (p. 115, my emphasis).

Awareness of this alter ego is something with which, over the years, Mitsuko has learnt to live. And as the narrative explicitly acknowledges shortly after this, those times in which the two appeared as conflicting voices within her were the source, not so much of concern, as of acceptance of a greater complexity to her being than was appreciated by those with whom she came into contact:

On . . . occasions, she heard another voice identical to hers saying: ‘This invalid isn’t going to get better . . .’ None of the nurses or doctors was aware of her two faces . . . *Otsu wrote that God has many faces*, she suddenly thought . . . *And so do I* (pp. 124–5, emphasis in original).

For all this apparent acceptance, the presence of this alternative self is nevertheless enough to induce Mitsuko to travel to India — “to search out the darkness of her own heart” (p. 58) and, once more, it is only in the depiction of Mitsuko as she stands alone with her thoughts on the banks of the Ganges at the end of the novel that the narrative alludes to the potential for reconciliation of these disparate voices.

The examples are by no means exhaustive: there are occasions in the lives of each of the tourists when they are forced to confront similar echoes of their unconscious being. In terms of narrative intensity however, all these ultimately pale in comparison with the experience of Ōtsu, initially depicted as the caricature of the weak and ineffective victim of circumstances, but whose quest for the being whom, in deference to Mitsuko, he refers to as his “Onion” leads to frequent confrontation with his own double.

From the outset, the sense that, for all his lack of social graces, Ōtsu is not alone is crucial. His vision of a powerless, yet compassionate God — the *doñansha* (companion) figure initially depicted in *Silence* — is constantly alluded to. For Ōtsu, this figure represents the ultimate influence behind all his decisions; here is the being — and as he readily admits, whether he be called God, Tomato, or even Onion is of no concern — who offers him the absolute reassurance he seeks:

Just as my Onion is always beside me, he is always within you and beside you, too. He is the only one who can understand your pain and your loneliness. One day he will transport you to another realm. We cannot have any idea when that will be, or how it will happen, or what form it will take. He makes use of every means (p. 120).

As the novel progresses, however, so this image is increasingly fused with the narrative portrayal of Ōtsu himself — to the extent that he ultimately emerges as the narrative embodiment of his own view of Christ. The more Ōtsu plumbs the depths of

his being in search of his soul, the more he is obliged to acknowledge the presence there of his “spirit double” — the voice of his own unconscious calling him to intensify his efforts on behalf of those dying beside the Ganges. In helping those in need, Ōtsu strives for their salvation, not in a physical sense, nor even in an orthodox Christian sense, but salvation for their *anima*, the soul at the heart of their being. The influence of this example, not merely on Mitsuko, but on all the Japanese tourists cannot be overemphasized. Each has been depicted as travelling to India engaged in a search. As the narrative progresses, so the object of this search comes to be identified, as a result of juxtaposition with scenes of Ōtsu’s altruistic devotion, as the *anima*. And as each experiences their moment of epiphany beside the Ganges, so they come, not only to recognise the absence of the help of the *anima* in their lives to date, but also to acknowledge it as essential to human existence.

For each individual, the process is, of necessity, intensely personal. As each life is touched by the influence, direct or indirect, of Ōtsu — as Ōtsu’s presence and example serve increasingly to confront the various characters with their own doppelgänger — so the initial portrayals of a group of unspectacular individuals is subverted. Thereafter, the more they are depicted as engaged in dialogue with this “self . . . severed from the self,” the more they too can be identified as engaged in their own personal journeys of individuation.

#### Notes

- 1) Fowler, Edward, *The Rhetoric of Confession: Shishosetsu in Early Twentieth Century Japanese Fiction* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1988), p. ix.
- 2) *Ibid.*
- 3) Miyoshi, Masao, “Against the Native Grain: The Japanese Novel and the ‘Postmodern’ West,” in *Postmodernism and Japan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989), p. 159.
- 4) Fujii, James, *Complicit Fictions: The Subject in the Modern Japanese Prose Narrative* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1993), p. 23.
- 5) *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- 6) *Endo Shuṣaku bungaku zenshu*, vol. 10, pp. 20–29. I have placed the terms “Catholic author” and “influence” in inverted commas to draw attention to the problems surrounding both terms suggested above.
- 7) Karatani Kōjin, *The Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*, de Bary, trans. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993).
- 8) *Ibid.*, p. 61.
- 9) Mathy, Francis, “Kitamura Tokoku: The Early Years,” in *Monumenta Nipponica* 19: 1–2 (1963), p. 1.
- 10) Walker, Janet, *The Japanese Novel of the Meiji Period and the Ideal of Individualism* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979).
- 11) *Ibid.*, p. 78.
- 12) During the decade leading up to his suicide in 1894, Tokoku moved from affiliation to the Union Church of Christ in Japan, via the Bretheren and Quakers, to his final formal affiliation with the Unitarian church.
- 13) “Kakujin shinkyūnai no hikyu” (The Heart, A Holy of Holies), in Katsumoto Seiichirō, ed., *Toḱoku zenshu*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1950), p. 14.
- 14) Karatani, *op. cit.*, p. 71.
- 15) Walker, *op. cit.*, p. 116.
- 16) Karatani, *op. cit.*, p. 69.



- 17) *Ibid.*
- 18) *Ibid.*, p. 77.
- 19) *Ibid.*, p. 76.
- 20) The ensuing discussion of the trend towards the divided narrative perspective in the literature of the *daisan no shinjin* is indebted to Van Gessel's studies of their literature. cf. *The Sting of Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989) and "The Voice of the Doppelgänger," in *Japan Quarterly* (1991:2).
- 21) Although, as Gessel asserts, Endo was a regular attender of the *daisan no shinjin* meetings following his return from France in 1953, his name is rarely mentioned in connection with this grouping by Japanese critics (who tend to limit their discussions to such founder members as Yoshiyuki Junnosuke, Kojima Nobuo, Yasuoka Shofarō, etc.)
- 22) "The Voice of the Doppelgänger," *op. cit.*, p. 199.
- 23) *Ningen no naka no X* (The 'X' within Man) (Tokyo: Chuōkōron, 1978), p. 161.
- 24) "Deep Inside of Man," in *Chesterton Review* 14:3 (August 1988), p. 499.
- 25) I have discussed the influence of Jungian psychology on Endo's literary corpus elsewhere and will therefore not pursue this here. See my "In Search of the Chaotic Unconscious: A Study of Scandal," in *Japan Forum* 7:2 (Autumn 1995) and "Inner Horizons: Towards Reconciliation in Endo Shūsaku's *The Samurai*" in *Japan Christian Review* (Autumn 1996).
- 26) See my *Endo Shūsaku: A Literature of Reconciliation* (London: Routledge, forthcoming).
- 27) "Awanai yofuku" (Ill-fitting Clothes), in *Endo Shūsaku bungaku zenshu*, *op. cit.*, 10, p. 374.
- 28) *Silence*, trans., Johnston (London: Quartet Books, 1978), pp. 237, 241. All further references to the novel are taken from this edition.
- 29) *Scandal*, trans., Gessel (London: Peter Owen, 1988), p. 141. All further references to the novel are taken from this edition.
- 30) "Psychology and Religion," *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, vol. 11 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953–77), p. 77.
- 31) See my "In Search of the Chaotic Unconscious," *op. cit.*
- 32) Lecture by Endo Shūsaku at *Kirisutokyo geijutsu senta* (Tokyo, April 14, 1988).
- 33) *Tosho shinbun* (12 April, 1986).
- 34) Cited in *Kirisutokyo bungaku kenkyū* 12 (1995), p. 14.
- 35) *Deep River*, trans., Gessel (London: Peter Owen, 1994), p. 86. All further references to the novel are taken from this edition.