

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

岡崎 桂 二

(平成18年 8月21日受理 最終原稿平成18年10月10日受理)

(日本語要旨)

夏目漱石『こころ』とカミュ「客」はともに個人主義とその結果として派生する孤立感をテーマとする作品であり、さらに師弟関係が全編を貫いている。『こころ』は先生と呼ばれる人物の遺書を弟子が紹介する作品構造を持つ。先生は若年時、友人を出し抜いて三角関係にある娘を手中にした。彼は友情より愛情を優先させた利己的な行為をすぐに後悔するが、それより先に友人に自殺をさせてしまう。以来、先生は贖罪の日々を送り、世間から孤立して生きている。

他方、「客」はアルジェリア山中の僻地で教職に就くフランス人の許に、憲兵が殺人の嫌疑がかけられているアラブ人を連行してくる。彼は教師に最寄の警察署まで容疑者の護送を依頼する。生来のヒューマニストたる教師は人種、階層、職業、文化、等全てにおいて自己との対称に位置するアラブ人を「客」として手厚く遇する。一方、アラブ人もフランス人と同じ過酷な風土に生きる人間としての仲間意識を感じ始め、いつしか両者は互いに友情を抱きはじめて一晩を過ごす。翌朝、教師はアラブ人に金と食料を与えて、東に行けば警察署に至り、南は沙漠の遊牧民が住む村に通じると教え、男に選択させる。教師の予想に反して、アラブ人は自首を選択し、粗暴で無知と思えた男のこの倫理的な行為に、自らの責任を回避した教師は打ちのめされる。

このように『こころ』と「客」は個人主義というテーマ、主人公像、において近似しているのみならず、師弟関係が文中に織り込まれている構造をともに持つ。本稿は時代や日仏の文化的差異を越えて、同じテーマ、構造を有す両作品を師弟関係の視点から解釈し、その異同、特に終末部の相違の理由、を明らかにしたい。

Key words: *Kokoro*, *Exile and the Kingdom*, Sōseki, Camus, individualism

1. Introduction

Natsume Sōseki (1867~1916) is generally considered the greatest novelist of the Meiji Period (1868~1912), and *Kokoro* (1914) is almost unanimously regarded as his masterpiece, because it scrutinizes the patterns of human nature most clearly and vividly, especially individualism. Hibbett argues that along with *Kōjin*, *Michikusa*, and *Meian*, *Kokoro* is "stored with his richest psychological insights and . . . the culmination of his art".⁽¹⁾ The work is a three-part novel, depicting the relationship

岡崎 桂 二

between a young man and Sensei, his master.⁽²⁾ The first and the second parts are the young man's records of his encounter with Sensei in Tokyo and his life in his rural home respectively. The last part is Sensei's death note addressed to his disciple, the young man.

Kokoro shares many traits with Camus's *L'Hôte*, or *The Guest*, in terms of texts, paratexts, and contexts.⁽³⁾ Camus (1913~1960), the Nobel-prize winner, published his last major book entitled *Exile and the Kingdom* before his tragic and untimely death at the age of 47. The work is a collection of six independent short stories, one of which is *The Guest*. The short novel is narrated by a third-person quasi-omniscient narrator.

While *Kokoro* is set at the end of the modernizing Meiji Japan, *The Guest* is set in French-colonized Algeria. To the development of the two stories, the specific background attaches the crucial importance. In the Meiji era, Japan faced the rapid change of westernization, which brought people into chaos and egotism; in French-colonized Algeria, the French colonists and the colonized Arabs were confronting each other, driven into violent clashes. The two novels depict those who suffer most in the changing society; in *Kokoro*, the frustrated intellectuals, and in *The Guest*, the pied-noir, or the Algerian born Frenchman.

The protagonist of *The Guest* is a French teacher, isolated from the society, sincere and moral-bound, whose features resemble very much those of Sensei in *Kokoro*. One day, an Arab murderer is brought in by a local gendarme, who orders the teacher to surrender him to the police station in the town nearby the next day. Daru, the teacher, confronts an existential choice; either to follow the order and surrender the criminal to the jail, which is against his moral codes, or to set the Arab free, which is considered treason against the whole French colonists.

In this way, the main character of *The Guest* is set in the same situation as Sensei in *Kokoro*, who confronts the ultimate choice between fraternity and affection in his youth. Sensei and his closest friend, K, share a lodge and vie for love of the landlady's daughter and Sensei succeeds in proposing marriage to her without letting his friend know anything about it, which leads K to kill himself. Sensei's behaviour is conducted from blatant egotism, which causes him feel guilt and compels him into total isolation from the society.⁽⁴⁾ Thus the Japanese and the French novels have a shared characterization and the twin themes of individualism and isolation.

In terms of contexts, the two novels are not independent, but the pieces of work compiled in a collection with same themes. *Kokoro* is a novel in Sōseki's later trilogy, which depicts the educated protagonists, the members of the Meiji intelligentsia,

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

isolated from the society, worrying about the future of Japan.⁽⁵⁾ Of all the three novels, *Kokoro* portrays most vividly the anxiety and guilt of the main character. Readers can understand the intentions and the ideas of the writer clearer when they read *Kokoro* along with the other two sister novels with the same characterization and the themes.

The same is true of Camus's *The Guest*. Mentioned elsewhere, it is a work compiled in a collection of six short stories, and Camus gives it an enigmatic title of *Exile and the Kingdom*. Readers, therefore, may appreciate *The Guest* better in the reading of the other five stories and realize that 'exile' and 'kingdom' of the title designate isolation and unity respectively.⁽⁶⁾

In terms of para-texts, wherein titles occupy the most important element, Sōseki and Camus name their work with only one non-referential term, kokoro and hôte. *Kokoro* means many things, "denot [ing] 'mind', 'heart', 'sensibility', 'soul', and 'essence', used in a philosophical sense [signifying] consciousness or the center of intelligence or sentience".⁽⁷⁾ Therefore we have various kinds of translations of the title, and McClellan appears right in leaving the original title as it is without restricting the meaning to a single interpretation.⁽⁸⁾ The simplified but many layered word, kokoro, should induce readers to expect the novel concerned with the complicated working of a human mind and his psychology.

As for *hôte*, it designates the two contrasting meanings, either 'guest' or 'host', wherein Camus's ingenuity as a novelist is demonstrated.⁽⁹⁾ Readers of *L'hôte* have to discern who the hôte is, which one a character is, a host or a guest. The title of Camus's novel, therefore, implies a psychological drama between a host and a guest. The ambiguous title, moreover, will contribute to enhance the suspense of a story, which is, unfortunately, lost in the English version where the title is simply translated as a guest.

In interpreting literary texts, 'incipit', or their first words, sets the tone for the whole text and serves well as a guide to it. Sōseki's *Kokoro* opens with a narrator's explanation.

I always called him "Sensei." I shall therefore refer to him simply as "Sensei," and not by his real name. It is not because I consider it more discreet, but it is because I find it more natural that I do so. Whenever the memory of him comes back to me now, I find that I think of him as "Sensei" still. And, with pen in hand, I cannot bring myself to write of him in any other way. (S.K. 1)

岡崎 桂二

We sense from these passages that the narrator feels great reverence for Sensei and expect that the novel will revolve round the narrator and Sensei. 'Sensei' literally means a teacher, but it is often used as a term of respect for someone superior or dignified such as doctors, lawyers, and members of an assembly. It connotes the French word *maître* and suggests the relationship of master and disciple. Therefore, it seems appropriate for the translator not to render the term into a simplified teacher but leave it in the original, *sensei*, as he does with the title, *kokoro*.⁽¹⁰⁾ Thus the incipit of *Kokoro* tells us that the story will center on the relationship between the master and his respectful disciple.

Likewise, Camus begins *The Guest* by the narrator's description.

The school master was watching the two men climb toward him. One was on horseback, the other on foot. They had not yet tackled the abrupt rise leading to the schoolhouse built on the hillside. They were toiling onward, making slow progress in the snow, among the stones, on the vast expanse of the high, deserted plateau. From time to time the horse stumbled. Without hearing anything yet, he could see the breath issuing from horse's nostrils It was cold; he went back into the school to get a sweater. (C.G. 85)

Unlike the first-person narration of *Kokoro*, *The Guest* is narrated by a third-person, and begins by his calm and objective description of the natural circumstances. He introduces the school master and implies that he is the 'host' and the two the 'guests'. From the expressions of 'hillsides, snow, stone, and the high, deserted plateau', we perceive the rigid environmental setting the school master is surrounded with and have a premonition that something harsh and cruel will happen among the three, the man on horse, the man on foot, and the school master.

In this way, 'incipit', the beginning words of a literary work, vividly presages the development of the stories; *Kokoro* suggests the story of a master-disciple relationship, while *The Guest* the characterization of the three introduced in the beginning of the story.

Before analyzing the main texts, we have obtained various similarities between the two novels in the themes of individualism and the characterization of the protagonists. Now we proceed to read closely the texts and examine the affinity in the description of the protagonists in terms of their master-disciple relationship.

2. Sensei as a mentor

The 1980's saw the fundamental change in the study of *Kokoro*.⁽¹¹⁾ Before that, focus was fixed on the third part of the novel, or the death note of Sensei, and analyses were, therefore, directed towards Sensei, his ethical way of living. Readers as well as literary critics nearly unanimously sympathized with Sensei's agony, impressed with his ethical and moral personality. They found his suicide a noble death, a typical Japanese way of redeeming the disgrace he had incurred. *Kokoro*, in short, was regarded not as a novel of entertainment, an object of pastime, but as that of morality, which was thought proper for an educational text. *Kokoro* has enjoyed an established reputation as a school text, an authorized teaching material. The process of canonizing *Kokoro* parallels the ongoing process of patriarchal society of the Meiji era, as Komori argues.⁽¹²⁾ Sensei's testament is appropriate as a model for a patriarchal society. In this literary as well as pedagogical context, "I", therefore, was reduced to a mere narrator, a supporting actor in the story.

But both Komori and Ishihara insist on the importance of the role "I" plays in the novel. He is not merely a narrator, but as important a character as Sensei. They argue that *Kokoro* should be read and analyzed from the standpoint of "I", which will provide a new, still unknown perspective of reading the novel.⁽¹³⁾ The present writer is of the same opinion with them and wants to interpret *Kokoro* from "I"'s viewpoint.

Kokoro is a recollection of a young man in the first person narration. It opens with the narrator's explanation of the reason why he calls the protagonist Sensei, and his initial encounter with him. It says that to call him Sensei is so natural for him that he can't think of any other nomination. The young man proceeds to tell the first encounter with Sensei on the beach in Kamakura. He recounts his attraction towards Sensei. The reason he gives is that Sensei was with a white skinned westerner, which implies that the university student, a member of the new generation, is mainly attracted to the westernized figure of Sensei and specifically to his new knowledge acquired from Europeans. Sensei stands out from the crowd so clearly that the youngster can easily catch sight of him. His strong interest in Sensei may be tinged with sexual desire, as some critics argue.⁽¹⁴⁾ Anyway, his whole attention is fixed on Sensei with a foreigner.

I felt from the start his strangely unapproachable quality. Yet, at the same time, there was within me an irresistible desire to become close to Sensei. Perhaps I was the only one who felt thus towards him. Some might say that I was being foolish and naïve. But even now, I feel a certain pride and happiness in the fact

岡崎 桂 二

that my intuitive fondness for Sensei was later shown to have not been in vain. A man capable of love, or I should say rather a man who was by nature incapable of not loving; but a man who could not wholeheartedly accept the love of another – such a one was Sensei. (S.K. 12)

The main attraction the young student feels for Sensei is the cultural and spiritual affinity with himself as intellectuals in a new industrialized society, so he can recognize him instinctively among the crowd with ease. The young man wants to get to know him better, but his various attempts to acquire close relationships with Sensei are thwarted and rejected each time.

Sōseki characterizes the young man unfavorably, or rather negatively.

Fortunately, Sensei was mistaken. Inexperienced as I was then, I could not even understand the obvious significance of Sensei's remarks. (S.K. 15)

"If I were the sort of person she thinks I am, I would not suffer so." How he suffered, my imagination then could not conceive. (S.K. 19)

I was more mystified than ever by Sensei's talk. (S.K. 28)

I was a rather simple-minded young man; women, for example, were total strangers to the kind of world I knew or I had experienced. (S.K. 37-38)

I assumed that. . . I could not guess that [Sensei's questions] implied much more than appeared on the surface. (S.K. 60)

From these minute depictions of the young man, we conceive of him as a man immature, naïve, inattentive, lacking in understanding. Sōseki portrays the young man as a stock character he shows in such works as *Botchan* and *Sanshirō*.⁽¹⁵⁾

As for Sensei, Sōseki describes him favorably as aloof, often silent, living surrounded with foreign books. Though Sensei is unemployed, he is depicted as someone leading an intellectual life worthy of respect from a university student. Therefore, his attitudes contrast that of the inexperienced young man, which emerges clearly in the following scene in the sea.

The next day, I followed Sensei into the sea, and swam after him. . . . My

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

whole body seemed to be filled with a sense of freedom and joy, and I splashed about wildly in the sea. Sensei had stopped moving, and was floating quietly on his back. I then imitated him. The dazzling blue of the sky beat against my face, and I felt as though little, bright darts were being thrown into my eyes. And I cried out, "What fun this is!". (S.K. 6)

Notice the difference in their corporal positions; the young man is on his belly, Sensei on his back. And the stillness of Sensei contrasts sharply with energetic movement of the youth.⁽¹⁶⁾ Sōseki puts the two persons in exactly opposite to each other. Sensei is old and mature, living as if he were dead; the young man is immature and sings the praises of youth. But Sōseki inconspicuously refers to the young man's wish to be like Sensei. From the start, the attraction of Sensei is so strong as to lead the young man to follow him and copy his actions.

Another secret of Sensei's attraction lies in the fact that they share same inner psychological traits despite of their outward differences; they are lonely, conscientious, diffident, and sexually immature. In short, "the young man is portrayed as a more immature phase of the Sensei-persona".⁽¹⁷⁾ Sensei is what the young man will later become. Some critics argue that they are psychologically doubles, while others insist on their homogeneous relationships.⁽¹⁸⁾ One of the reasons for their affinity is that the whole story is told in the first-person narration. The narrator of the first and the second parts is the young man, and that of the third part is Sensei, but because of the same tones of the 'I' narration, the confessions of the two narrators gradually converge into one, and can't be separated from each other. We have to investigate their association more closely.

Sensei shows an evasive attitude towards the approaching young man, partly because of his propensity for misanthropy arising from the feeling of guilt over the death of his closest friend, but specifically because he is afraid of having his past secret concerning the death revealed. The presence of the young man scares Sensei because the youngster approaches him not as an enemy, destroying him, but a worshiper, admirer, wanting to be like him. Sensei is trapped in an existential choice; either to let the young man know his secret, which will lead to his own death, or to refuse the young man's wish, which is against his morals and denies his ethics.

The young man plays the role of a detective.⁽¹⁹⁾ He tries to probe into Sensei's past by visiting his house frequently, and by lying in ambush for him in the grave, but every time his attempt proves futile. He feels disappointed. But finally, the immature, simple-minded university student strikes up relationship with Sensei. The young man

岡崎 桂 二

admits his own development; "I felt that I had become more mature since my first visit to Sensei's house" (S.K. 21). He comes to "consider conversation with Sensei more profitable than lectures at the university", and "value[d] Sensei's opinions more than [he] did those of [his] professors" (S.K., 28). Sensei, on the other hand, recognizes in the young man affinity with himself. The young man's honesty and sincerity induce Sensei to assume the role of a mentor to the protégé. In this way, they come to form a master-disciple relationship, which is crucial in the understanding of the novel.

Psychologically, Sensei's reject and enigmatic question are considered to be a kind of invitation and enticement to his secrets like flirtation, because efforts to decipher the mystery need close relationship with the object. Sensei's long hidden secret waits a confidant, someone to confess to. But the disciple's curiosity is not satisfied soon; "he is kept deliberately on the edge of attraction and disappointment".⁽²⁰⁾ Because "Sensei teaches indirectly by asking questions or not answering them, and by tossing out Zen-like *koans* and aphorism" as Wright indicates.⁽²¹⁾

"Did you follow me? How. . .?" (S.K. 9)

". . .But—but do you know that there is guilt also in loving? . . ." (S.K. 26)

"I don't even trust myself. And not trusting myself, I can hardly trust others. There is nothing that I can do, except curse my own soul." (S.K. 30)

These enigmatic expressions and allusions serve to enhance suspense of the story, which is the reason why it is regarded as a kind of a detective story. The inquisitive young man, who plays the role of a detective, edges Sensei into confession of his past experience. Sensei, the suspect, gradually admits young man's sincere heart towards himself, and finally confirms the disciple's resolution.

"You are certainly an audacious young man," he said.

"No, sir, I am simply being sincere. And in all sincerity, I wish to learn about life."

"Even to the extent of digging up my past?"

Suddenly, I was afraid. I felt as though the man sitting opposite me were some kind of criminal, instead of the Sensei that I had come to respect. Sensei's face was pale. (S.K. 67-68)

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

The young man's instinct proves right. Sensei regards himself a criminal and leads a life full of guilt over the crime he committed. Confession of the crime, betrayal of a friend, will lighten his guilt, but he keeps the secret to himself, without revealing it even to his wife, which has haunted him for the rest of his life after his friend's suicide. But he finally finds a trustee of his experience, who wants to have lessons from him.

". . . But for some reason I don't want to doubt you. It may be because you seem so simple. Before I die, I should like to have one friend that I can truly trust. I wonder if you can be that friend. Are you really sincere?"

"I have been true to you, Sensei," I said, "unless my whole life has been a lie." My voice shook as I spoke. (S.K. 68)

In this way, the disciple wins the trust of the master. He receives Sensei's death note in the rural home, wherein the master confesses his long hidden secrets to his disciple. The confidant reads the master's testament in the train for Tokyo in the vain hope of his safety, for Sensei discloses his intention to kill himself in his will. The note makes him realize fully what has haunted his master for a long time, what happened between him and his best friend, who killed himself as Sensei is going to do now. The young man understands how sincere Sensei is, how nobly he accepts the responsibility for his friend's death. He learns from Sensei's life that death is sometimes above shame. Sensei teaches the young man that deep in human mind (*kokoro*) lies something evil, something like a demon, which is so great that the person himself can't control it. Psychologists may call it super-ego, which compels its owner to do more than he expects, more savage, more inhuman.⁽²²⁾ But to lead a sincere life is to take full responsibility for whatever he has done, consciously, subconsciously, or unconsciously alike.

Thus, the master's will is delivered to the disciple. How does the young man respond to it? In what way does he utilize the master's lesson after reading his last will and testament. In other words, does Sensei's teaching take effect? Does Sensei fulfill his duty as a mentor? The novel doesn't give us any clue to these questions. *Kokoro* ends with the following words in Sensei's long death note;

I want both the good and bad things in my past to serve as an example to others. But my wife is the one exception – I do not want her to know about any of this. My first wish is that her memory of me should be kept as unsullied as

岡崎 桂 二

possible. So long as my wife is alive, I want you to keep everything I have told you a secret – even after I myself am dead. (S.K. 248)

The novel finishes abruptly without an epilogue, a definite conclusion, which leads critics as well as readers to interpret in every kind of imagination available. Opinions, therefore, differ as to the future of the disciple as well as that of the master's widow.⁽²³⁾

The protégé is caught in a double bind, because Sensei tells the young man to do as he did but not to imitate him. His death note asks the disciple to live sincerely, which requires him to reveal the secret he knows, but the master forbids it.

In fact, against the warning of the master, the young man makes Sensei's testament public by confessing himself, which is the text we have in the form of a novel, and betrays his mentor through this action. Is he a bad student?

Some critics argue that the disciple can't tell anyone about what he knows because of the master's prohibition, quoting the narrator's words that "Nor did his own wife know how wretched this tragedy had made him. To this day she does not know. Sensei died keeping his secret from her" (S.K. 25).⁽²⁴⁾ He, therefore, can't share the secrets with anyone. He is obliged to keep everything to himself, which resembles his master's attitude over the suicide of his closest friend. The disciple leaves his father on his death bed, going up to Tokyo to meet Sensei before his committing suicide. This implicit kind of patricide will give him guilt, just as the friend's suicide did to Sensei. He is put in the same situation as Sensei was. The human tragedy will repeat itself without interruption. But this kind of interpretation is too gloomy and doesn't agree with Sensei's concept of life: our hearts change for better or worse.⁽²⁵⁾ According to this view of life, another interpretation about the role of a teacher is made possible: the disciple may be a bad student by violating the teacher's order, but a better human being by living sincerely and honorably as the master asks him to do.

The tragedy between Sensei and K, between Sensei and his wife, arises from the lack of communication, which is a key feature of the Japanese association with others, especially in the Meiji era. The long tradition of Confucianism as well as cultural and racial homogeneity contributed to the development of the Japanese propensity for social harmony and keeping silence. But as the master predicts, the disciple will one day "drift away from [him]" (S.K. 27), to be more precise, will transcend him. He lives in a new era, different from olden times in culture and patterns of behaviour: the following generation will speak with less reserve, communicate better with each other. Sensei himself expects that "a new life lodges itself in your breast" (S.K. 129) after his death, which indicates that the messages, the mentor's last lesson, should be

transferred from him to his protégé.

Dodd insists that "if the novel suggests any possibility of mutual understanding powerful enough to transform positively the lives of others, it does so through the portrayal of the relationship between Sensei and the student."⁽²⁶⁾ Sensei knows it a vain wish to communicate with others including his wife. But his disciple will develop enough to realize the mentor's concept of life, when he is unbound from the testament and begins to write his own confession, *Kokoro*.

Our interpretation goes not so far as Komori and Ishihara do, who argue that the young man will marry the widow, because it is nearly impossible to make the confessions public without wife's knowing. Once they share Sensei's secrets, they have no other choice but to help each other, living together with the master's memory for ever.⁽²⁷⁾

In examining the text closely, the reader endowed with artistic sensibility can notice that Sensei doesn't necessarily inhibit his disciple from making his will public, because it says that "tsumaga onoreni taishite motteiru kiokuwo, narubeku junpakuni hozonsiteoite yaritai".⁽²⁸⁾ Narubeku means 'if possible' in English, and McClellan translates these passages as "My first wish is that her memory of me should be kept as unsullied as possible" (S.K. 248). Sensei implies a possibility that his secrets will be disclosed by his protégé some day, when he overcomes the obstacle set by his master only to make them public, or when he transcends his master.⁽²⁹⁾

One of the narrative peculiarities of *Kokoro* is that most of the characters are nameless with few exceptions. The protagonist is called Sensei, which literally means 'teacher' or 'master', an honorific title, by an anonymous narrator, his disciple, from beginning to end, and Sensei's closest friend and rival for love is named K, an initial letter of his real name. Rereading the 'incipit' of *Kokoro*, we notice an important message within it: the narrator says that "yosoyososhii kashiramoji nadowa totemo tukau kiniwa narenai".⁽³⁰⁾ The English version reads: I can't bring myself to write of him in any other way (S.K. 1). By omitting to render some parts into English, the translation doesn't transmit the real meanings of the text and lacks the subtle nuances of the original text. 'Yosoyososhii' means cold and distant, or formal and cold, while 'kashiramoji' the first letter of a word.

When we compare the expression with the fact that Sensei is the very man who calls his closest friend K in his death note, we sense in the expression of *yosoyososhii kashiramoji* a narrator's implicit criticism against his master: he should not have used a 'cold and distant' kashiramoji K to introduce his devoted friend.⁽³¹⁾ The Japanese rarely call a person with his or her initial letter except when there is some

岡崎 桂 二

complicated or inexplicable reasons for hiding his or her real name. The logical conclusion drawn from this interpretation is that the disciple has developed his discretion and cultivated mature discernment. In short, the disciple has transcended his master in writing his remembrance.

When the young man, the narrator, begins to narrate, or to write, his acquaintance with Sensei some time after his death, he recognizes how immature and inexperienced he was in his youth, how little he understood the world around him including Sensei. He recollects the conversation between the three: Sensei, his wife, and "I".

"It would be so nice if we had children," Sensei's wife said to me. "Yes, wouldn't it?" I answered. But I could feel no real sympathy for her. At my age, children seemed unnecessary nuisance. (S.K. 17)

The narrator confesses his lack of sympathy with the mistress. Indeed, an unmarried young man rarely takes an interest in marital problems, or rather conjugal love is too subtle to be understood by a youngster. Though these passages show an innocent young man, they also suggest his development, the possibility of having his children, because "at my age" implies that at this time when he is writing the confession, he might be blessed with children.⁽³²⁾ We, ordinary readers, expect the disciple to pay a visit with his wife (other than the widow), or a child, to Sensei's grave one day, and tell that there lies his master and how sincere he was. The reverence the disciple holds for his master will last in his mind for ever.

He may be a bad student because he doesn't keep the mentor's promise, but he has been maturer, and proved himself to be a better human being influenced by Sensei, realizing the importance of the communication, and the sincere and honest human relationship between each other. The disciple learns a lot from his master and transcends him.

3. French school master in dilemma

Daru, the protagonist of the Camus's novel, shares many traits with Sensei: he is moral-oriented, living in total isolation, feeling himself culturally and socially an exile. Daru is a schoolmaster, which makes him more closely resemble Sensei, who is revered as a master by a young man. Accordingly, *The Guest* involves the same plot of the master-disciple relationship as *Kokoro* does along with that of fraternity. But besides

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

the basic difference of the two novels in the length of stories and the narration, a significant difference lies in the fact that in *The Guest*, the object of fraternity and pedagogue is an identical person, which gives the different ending to *The Guest* from that of *Kokoro*.

The story is set in a school in the Algerian countryside where Daru teaches Arab children. He not only gives lessons to the Arab students, but distributes daily rations shipped from France to their families suffering from a chronic famine, who manage to survive by them. One day a local gendarme brings an Arab to Daru, who is ordered to keep him overnight and conduct him to jail – the police are understaffed to do this themselves, for there is a rumour of the uprisings against the French government. In this way, the schoolmaster gets involved in the colonial task. Camus is so ingenious as a novelist – he materializes the reciprocal relationship of a policeman and a teacher, and readers will be induced to remember that schools, police and prisons are modern institutions of the state.⁽³³⁾ A policeman and a teacher are two sides of a coin; the former resorts to forces, the latter, to ideology.⁽³⁴⁾ The map of four French rivers drawn in colored chalk on the blackboard symbolizes that Daru imposes French ideology on his students; he controls the native people intellectually, physically, and culturally. The school master, in short, is a lonely lord in this isolated kingdom, but he feels exiled anywhere but in this deserted land. Daru, the teacher, insists on the division of labour.

"Good," said Daru. "And where are you headed?"

Balducci withdrew his mustache from the tea.

"Here, son."

"Odd pupils! And you're spending the night?"

"No. I'm going back to El Ameer. And you will deliver this fellow to Tinguit. He is expected at police headquarters."

Balducci was looking at Daru with a friendly little smile.

"What's this story?" asked the schoolmaster.

"Are you pulling my leg?"

"No, son. Those are the orders."

"The orders? I am not. . ." Daru hesitated, not wanting to hurt the old Corsican. "I mean, that's not my job."

"What! What's the meaning of that? In wartime people do all kinds of jobs."

(C.G. 91)

岡崎 桂 二

The gendarme, however, doesn't admit the teacher's insistence, but rather he emphasizes the importance of the unity as a governing body in the French colony. Daru confronts an existential choice as Sensei does in a different context—either to deliver the Arab to a jail, following the order, which he rejects intuitively as a humanist: "He is a humanist in an inhuman or dehumanized world", as Showalter argues,⁽³⁵⁾ or to let the prisoner free according to his morals and ethics, which is treason against the French government. Whether he acts for the French or the Arabs, in either case, Daru will be condemned from the other party.⁽³⁶⁾

Daru is disgusted at the brutal murder the youth has committed. Camus depicts the teacher's inner self when he is told how savagely the Arab killed his cousin with a billhook.

Daru felt a sudden wrath against the man, against all men with their rotten spite, their tireless hates, their blood lust. (C.G. 93)

The expression fully betrays Daru's humanistic personality and his profound hatred of violence. However, he treats the Arab with kindness, untying his hands, kneeling down to let him drink a hot coffee, sharing food, and making his bed. The school master offers the prisoner uncommon generosity.

At first, the Arab could not understand the intentions of what the French school master did to him, which sharply contrasts the gendarme's harsh treatment.

He put on the light and served the Arab. "Eat," he said. The Arab took a piece of the cake, lifted it eagerly to his mouth, and stopped short.

"And you?" he asked.

"After you. I'll eat too."

The thick lips opened slightly. The Arab hesitated, then bit into the cake determinedly. (C.G. 99)

Hunger compels the Arab to grab the food Daru has served, but his conscience tells him to wonder why the Frenchman serves him a meal of hotcake, cheese, milk, and omelette – a feast for the poverty stricken man, murdering his cousin because of a family squabble over grain (C.G. 93) – without eating it himself. Daru's answer saying that after you, I'll eat too, suggests his implicit intention of entertaining him as a guest. So the incredulous Arab tries to reaffirm Daru's resolution.

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

"Why do you eat with me?"

"I'm hungry."

The Arab fell silent. (C.G. 99)

Daru's sincere humanity must be confirmed by the answer saying that he is hungry. These words convincingly demonstrate Daru's insistence on the Arab's equality with him, and his intention of treating the murderer as humankind, as an honorable guest, not as a wild beast, a humiliated prisoner. In this way, his status as a ritual guest is established, and soon a strange kind of fraternity is formed between the Arab and the Frenchman. Camus depicts the complicated and inexplicable working of human mind as Sōseki does in *Kokoro*.

In this room where he had been sleeping alone for a year, this presence bothered him. But it bothered him also by imposing on him a sort of brotherhood he knew well but refused to accept in the present circumstances. Men who share the same rooms, soldiers or prisoners, develop a strange alliance as if, having cast off their armour with their clothing, they fraternized every evening, over and above their differences, in the ancient community of dream and fatigue. (C.G. 102)

Sharing meal and bed symbolizes an embryonic communion, Camus's ideal communion of the colonist and the colonized which has been portrayed in *The Outsider*.⁽³⁷⁾ But the school master values solitude above solidarity; he keeps himself aloof from worldly affairs, which is the reason he applied for the teaching profession after the war. He was appointed teacher of a school farther and more solitary than expected (C.G. 97). There he leads a life like a lord, controlling the ingenious people, which relieves him from the necessity of making a decision. His attitude towards the Arab is something like bored indifference, for he believes that "no man has the right to infringe upon the personal liberty of another".⁽³⁸⁾ He doesn't like to be involved in any other kind of social institutions except teaching, nor wants to play the role of a jailer. Daru, therefore, gives the prisoner every chance to escape, freeing himself from the constraint of responsibility, so that he is erupted with the possibility of the prisoner running away.⁽³⁹⁾

Daru, on the other hand, doesn't neglect his duty to teach the Arab who shows no remorse over the murder. Teachers should prepare their students for civic life by teaching ethics such as "obedience, duty, and proper deference",⁽⁴⁰⁾ along with necessary

岡崎 桂 二

knowledge, training, and skills for occupation. He teaches the guest by his own deed: he puts the revolver the gendarme gave in his desk drawer (C.G. 99). The action reveals his natural propensity for humanity and gives the Arab a moral lesson as to the treatment of other human being. Daru also tries to educate the prisoner by asking questions; why did you kill him? The murderer either pretends to be innocent of the meanings of the questioning or answers that "He ran away [,] (so) I ran after him" (C.G. 100). He doesn't seem to take the responsibility of the crime. So Daru induces the Arab to feel remorse for the murder he has committed. He attempts to make him a member of a civilized society, which is the colonists' mission, but to no avail. The Arab, on the contrary, asks Daru to accompany him to the police station the following day, to which the teacher doesn't give a definite answer. The Arab can't distinguish a teacher from a policeman. He asks Daru if he is a judge. He implores Daru's accompanying second time before going to sleep.

"Is the gendarme coming back tomorrow?"

"I don't know."

"Are you coming with us?"

"I don't know. Why?"

. . . The Arab opened his eyes . . . trying not to blink.

"Come with us," he said. (C.G. 100-101)

The Arab fails to educate himself to be civilized, but, instead, his sense of fraternity is promoted through Daru's hospitality to the extent that he begs Daru's guardianship. His entreaty to accompany him sounds as if Daru's uncommon hospitality alleviated his suffering. But the fraternity a chance meeting fostered between them doesn't last long.

The next morning, Daru takes the Arab to the cross-roads in the barren plateau. After providing him with money and food, the French school teacher gives the prisoner two options – he may take the road to the Nomads and be free or he may walk toward the police headquarters. Daru eschews his own responsibility and makes the murderer decide his fate. Accordingly, the Arab confronts the existential decision as Daru does – either to utilize the given opportunity of freedom or to admit his crime and put himself on trial as a civilized man.

When Daru is asked to transport the Arab to the prison, he promptly rejects the gendarme's order. He decisively says three times that "[he] won't hand him (the Arab) over" (C.G. 95). He genuinely sees a brother in the Arab. Some critics argue that Daru

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

and the Arab prisoner are the psychological doubles, as Sensei, K, and "I" in *Kokoro*.⁽⁴¹⁾ The two are isolated from the society of their own people; Daru is voluntarily, while the Arab involuntarily. Since they are inhabitants of the deserts, they could not survive if long kept from the habitat. The narrator reports that "Daru had been born here. Everywhere else, he felt exiled" (C.G. 88). So does the Arab.

Irony arises from the choice the Arab makes. Against Daru's implicit expectation, the criminal takes the road to the jail instead of that to freedom. This noble action smashes Daru, who believes that he has done what he thinks is right, leaving the burden to the Arab without making a decision himself. "What is ironic at the end is that the murderer should exhibit more self-discipline than the school master".⁽⁴²⁾ Daru is put in the same psychological situation of Sensei when he and his closest friend vie for love of a landlady's daughter: Sensei betrays his friend by asking her to marry him. He doesn't consult his friend, nor does he let him know anything about the arrangement. But soon he is haunted by guilt, bitter remorse. Sensei admits that "Through cunning, I have won. But as a man, I have lost" (S.K. 228).

Likewise the French school master betrays his brother and eschews his responsibility. The last night before going to bed, the Arab asks him to accompany him to the jail twice, but Daru gives him no definite answer. So the prisoner takes it as an implicit consent. The Arab must have had steadfast faith in Daru, but at the last moment, he is abandoned. So the murderer shows 'a sort of panic' and says 'listen' to the host, but Daru silences him. The guest misunderstands the host. In looking at the helpless Arab, "Daru felt something rise in his throat . . . Daru, with heavy heart, made out the Arab walking slowly on the road to prison" (C.G. 108-109). Daru, just like Sensei, recognizes the mistake he made and regrets his own irresponsible attitude, but it is too late.

Did Daru fail to teach the prisoner the basic social ethics, or the necessity of guilt and remorse for a crime? Or did he neglect his mission as a teacher? McCormick and others argue that "[Daru] has betrayed his mission as teacher by not conveying to the young criminal the importance and inviolability of freedom, by not attempting to communicate, either in pedagogical or in human terms, abhorrence against murder and prison alike".⁽⁴³⁾

These kinds of conclusions are drawn from the innocent and savage figure of the Arab prisoner, who is taken as ignorant, passive, and helpless. Camus describes the Arab in racist terms: "Daru noticed only his huge lips, fat, smooth, almost Negroide"(C.G. 90), or "He could see nothing but the dark yet shining eyes and the animal mouth" (C.G. 100). The author, moreover, reduces the ingenious Arabs into

岡崎 桂 二

natural objects such as grasses, rocks, and animals.

But it would be hard to forget that poverty, that army of ragged ghosts wandering in the sunlight The sheep had died then by thousands and even a few men, here and there, sometimes without anyone's knowing. (C.G. 87-88)

It is wrong to blame Camus for these stereotypical expressions of the Arab(s), for the literary convention of interpreting texts dictates that we should discern the author from the text, or, more precisely, author's intentions from textual truths.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The gist of what the text says is that these apparently biased words serve to worsen the image of the Arab to the readers and the critics, who insist that his innocence and passivity lead him to the jail.⁽⁴⁵⁾

But the Arab is not as innocent as they claim; he is attentive to the words exchanged between the police and the teacher and he shows diffident look at the gimmicks of the police(C.G. 93). He is more ashamed than terrified; too embarrassed at being treated like a beast to face Daru at the initial encounter. The prisoner fully recognizes his humiliated appearance. The Arab, therefore, never looks up toward the school master (C.G. 90).

What we tend to overlook in reading *The Guest* is that all the information we get comes from the third-person narrator from Daru's viewpoint, and that his information, or Daru's observation, is often off the marks. The school master doesn't realize his biased point of view. Daru misinterprets the Arab twice when he thinks that the prisoner tries to escape. We have to read what is left unsaid, or unnoticed, by the narrator. He doesn't explain why Daru wants the Arab to flee. Therefore, there is no other way but to conjecture about what is in the teacher's mind. This is the main reason why *The Guest* is generally considered an ambiguous novel, which resembles *Kokoro* as explained above.⁽⁴⁶⁾

Daru does educate the Arab through hospitality, and the prisoner is enough affected by the fraternal deeds to recognize his responsibility as a guest. But the problem with Daru is that "his rituals of hospitality succeeds altogether too well".⁽⁴⁷⁾ The Arab knows well how to behave as an honorable guest towards the host. To understand this, the reader should remember the meaning of the title, L'hôte, which, as explained elsewhere, signifies both the guest and the host in French: Daru is a host as a school master, but to the eyes of the colonized, he is an unwelcome guest. After Daru forsakes his responsibility at the cross-roads, their situations get overturned; the unwelcome guest, the Arab, turns into the host, who wields a life-and-death power

over the school master, and the humane host, Daru, the guest.

For the inhabitants of the deserts, the rite of hospitality is sacrosanct, not one-way, but reciprocal, exchange.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Once the guest accepts the host's hospitality, he, conversely, is bound by its iron law. The ritual hospitality is conducted on the basis of give-and-take. What is exchanged between the host and the guest is honour. If the host fails to be generous towards the guest, he loses his face, and vice versa. This is the accepted as social norms in the Arab's indigenous culture.⁽⁴⁹⁾ The Arab has no other choice but to choose the way to the police station; that is the only way of honouring and praising the host. He is honour-bound to do so.

Many critics agree that the twin themes in *Exile and the Kingdom*, in which *The Guest* is included, are isolation and lack of communication.⁽⁵⁰⁾ The tragedy strikes Daru because of the lack of communication. The school master doesn't recognize the fact that his natural humanity makes him treat the Arab as his honorable guest, but that the counter part takes his action for a ritual hospitality conducted among the indigenous peoples. The tragic irony emerges when the same behaviour is interpreted differently from each other.

According to Grimauld, "the Arab will accept death in the name of the same kind of ideal Daru exemplifies The Arab becomes a man with the highest individual moral values, a perfect clone of Daru".⁽⁵¹⁾ The irony with Daru is that "[While he] is a good man, he is an even better teacher".⁽⁵²⁾

Daru has decided not to surrender the prisoner promptly, but his ambiguous attitudes lead to the misunderstanding. Both Daru and the Arab respond to the other party's questions, saying he doesn't know, and, still worse, Daru silences him at the last moment. They should have expressed themselves candidly and fully. The French school master and the Arab prisoner live in a totally different culture, and their chance encounter incurs tragedy. When Daru returns to the school with a heavy heart, he finds threatening words on the blackboard saying that "You handed our brother. You will pay for this" (C.G. 109). He is exiled from his kingdom as the title of the collection suggests. The scrawled letters beside the French rivers conceptualize the moral dilemma Daru is put in. He stands between the colonists and the colonized. There is no way of compromising between them.

Daru looked at the sky, the plateau, and, beyond, the invisible lands stretching all the way to the sea. In this vast landscape he had loved so much, he was alone. (C.G. 109)

岡崎 桂 二

Camus is more pessimistic about human condition than Sōseki, perhaps a total pessimist. *Kokoro* is a tragic story of a person in the modernizing era, while *The Guest* is a story of a pied-noir: a Frenchman born and bred in Algeria and cut off from the main land. Both Sensei and Daru are the victims of the changing society, trapped in the ultimate dilemma, and are forced to make an existential decision: their egoistic choices induce them to death or death threat.

4. Conclusion

Analysis of the texts has shown that despite various differences in narration, structure, and the length of a story, Sōseki's *Kokoro* shares the similar characterization of the protagonists and the twin themes of individualism and lack of communication with Camus's *The Guest*. The endings of the two novels are bleak and gloomy; the former ends with Sensei's death note to his disciple and the latter, threat of death from an unknown party. But *Kokoro* gives us some measure of hope for the future, because the master transfers his message, candidly and unreservedly to his follower. *The Guest*, on the other hand, impresses us with its description of the harsh truth of life: every moment we confront the decision we have to make, and nothing leads us to the right decision. The novel is Camus's declaration of existentialism and absurdism. The school master has done what he thinks is good according to his individualism, which results in his total destruction. There is no hope and nothing can improve the situation. Lack of communication forces the protagonist into total isolation from the society. Camus values communication and warns us of possible isolation from the society without it.

Kokoro and *The Guest* are the psychological novels about the masters and disciples, whose agony and dilemma reflect the novelists' philosophy of individualism. In Sōseki's famous lecture addressed at Gakushūin, he expressed his view of the individualism and the isolation arising from it.

Individual freedom is absolutely essential for the individuality that I have described to develop. Since the development of this individuality will have a very significant effect on your happiness, it seems to me that we must establish a form of freedom that can be exercised without hindrance until it begins to affect others, a freedom in which I can go left and you can go right, a freedom which we can attain for ourselves and which we can concede to others. This, more or less, is what I mean when I talk about individualism.⁽⁵³⁾

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

[I]ndividualism replaces political sectarianism with notions based on Good and Evil, Reason and Unreason. It recommends that we do act inconsiderately within political groupings or factions that favor the power or influence of money. Underlying these ideas is a solitude, of which others cannot be aware.⁽⁵⁴⁾

Sōseki attaches as great value to unity or harmony as to individualism. We can do whatever we would like to so long as it should not conflict with others. Sensei is trapped in egotism in his relationship with his closest friend, which induces him to kill himself. With more communication with K, the result would have been otherwise. After his friend's suicide, Sensei lives isolated from society, full of guilt over the death. But Sōseki is not totally pessimistic. He introduces a young man into the story, a follower and disciple of Sensei, who can inherit his master's will. Sensei is given an opportunity to pay the debt for his egoistic behaviour and summons up all his courage through the young disciple. For him, death is a victory, through which he can purge his guilt, taking a full responsibility.⁽⁵⁵⁾

The situation where Daru finds himself is different from Sensei's. Sensei is an unemployed intellectual called *kōtōyūmin* – an idle rich – a typical intellectual in Meiji Japan, and, accordingly, can make a decision by his own will. But Daru is a schoolmaster, an agent of the colonists' government, and confronted with two options: neither of which relieves him from condemnation. Daru resembles Camus in being trapped in an existentialists' decision.

The novel may reflect Camus's own sense of helplessness against the Algerian conflict and "his loyal efforts to do justice to the two sides – that of his mother . . . and that of the Algerian Arabs",⁽⁵⁶⁾ though it scarcely refers to the real political crisis. Camus's noncommittal attitude over the war of liberation incurred harsh criticism even from his close friends and comrades, especially Sartre, a former ardent advocate for his literary activities.⁽⁵⁷⁾ But political interpretations will lead to a mistake. "[Daru's] problems [are] those of all conflicts, in all ages and in all places, between all sorts of people and for all sorts of reasons".⁽⁵⁸⁾ As with other stories assembled in *Exile and the Kingdom*, *The Guest* is the affirmation of the novelist's philosophy of life: the futility of human existence.

Daru's tragedy is that he doesn't know that doing nothing, making no decision, is a disguised decision.⁽⁵⁹⁾ He is given no chance of vindicating his honour, because the Arab plays the double roles of friend and disciple. In Camus's novel, every character, Daru, the gendarme, and the nameless Arab, misunderstands the other party and is misunderstood by them.

岡崎 桂 二

Camus, as well as Sōseki, shows us the significance of individualism and communication through writing fraternity and master-disciple relationship, though their literary approaches are different and unique in their own ways. Beyond the confine of disparate cultures, one Japanese, another French-Algerian, the two great novelists explicate the universal problem, the strange and inexplicable working of our heart (*kokoro*).

References

- Camus, A., *Exile and the Kingdom*, trans., J. O'Brien, New York, Penguin, 1989.
- Cryle, P. *Bilan critique: L'Exil et le royaume d'Albert Camus-essai d'analyse*, Paris, Minard, 1973.
- Curzon-Hobson, A., "Between Exile and the Kingdom: Albert Camus and empowering classroom relationships," *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35(2003).
- Dodd, S., "The Significance of Bodies in Sōseki's *Kokoro*," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 53 (1998).
- Doi, T., *The Anatomy of Dependence: The Key Analysis of Japanese Behavior*, Tokyo, New York & San Francisco, Kodansha International, 1973.
- Festa-McCormick, D., "Existential Exile and a Glimpse of the Kingdom," in *Critical Essays on Albert Camus*, ed., B.L. Knapp, Boston, G.K. Hall, 1988.
- Fitch, B.T., "Le paradigme herméneutique chez Camus," in *Albert Camus 1980*, ed., R. Gay-Crosier, Gainesville, University Presses of Florida, 1980.
- Fortier, P.A., "Le Décor symbolique de 'L'Hôte' d'Albert Camus," *The French Review*, 46 (1973)
- Genette, G., *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*(*Literature, Culture, Theory*, 20), trans., J.E. Lewin, Cambridge, Cambridge UP., 1997.
- Grafflin, D., "Second Thoughts on *Kokoro*," *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 18 (1983).
- Griem, E., "Albert Camus's '*The Guest*: A New Look at the Prisoner," *Studies in Short Fiction*, 30 (1993).
- Grimaud, M., "Humanism and the 'White Man's Burden': Camus, Daru, Meursault, and the Arabs," in *Camus's L'Etranger 50 Years on*, ed., A. King, London, Macmillan, 1992.
- Grobe, E.P., "The Psychological Structure of Camus's '*L'Hôte*,'" *French Review*, 40 (1966).
- Guers-Villate, Y., "Rieux et Daru ou le refus délibéré d'influencer autrui," *Papers on Language and Literature*, 3 (1967).
- Hibbett, H., "Natsume Sōseki and the Psychological Novel," in *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture*, ed. D.H. Shively, Princeton, Princeton U.P., 1971.

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

- Hirakawa, S., and T. Kinya (eds.), *Soseki no Kokoro: Dōyomuka, dōyomarete kitaka*, Tokyo, Shinyōsha, 1992.
- Hurley, D.F., "Looking for the Arab: Reading the readings of Camus's 'The Guest,'" *Studies in Short Fiction*, 30 (1993).
- Ishihara, Ch., *Kokoro no Oidipusu – hanten suru katari*," in *Soseki sakuhinron shūsei*, eds., T. Tamai and H. Hujii, Tokyo, Ōhūsha, 1991.
- "Tekisuto wa machigawanai," *Sōseki kenkyū*, 6 (1996).
- Sōseki to sannin no dokusha, Tokyo, Kōdansha, 2004.
- Komori, Y., *Kōzō to shiteno katari*, Tokyo, Shinyōsha, (1988).
- "Watashi to iu tashasei – *Kokoro* wo meguru ōtokuritikku," *Bungaku*, 3 (1992).
- Komori, Y. and Ch. Ishihara (eds.), *Soseki Kenkyū*, vol. 6, *Kokoro*, (1996).
- Komori, Y., M. Nakamura, and T. Miyagawa (eds.), *Sōryoku Tōron: Soseki no Kokoro*, Tokyo, Kanrinshobō, 1994.
- Levi-Valensi, J (ed.), *Les critiques de notre temps et Camus*, Paris, Garnier, 1970.
- McClellan, E., *Two Japanese Novelists : Soseki and Toson*, Boston and Tokyo, Tuttle Publishing, 2004(Reprint of 1969, University of Chicago).
- McDermott, J.V., "Camus' Daru: Just How Humane?" *Notes on Contemporary Literature*, 15(1985).
- Merivale, P., "Silences: Soseki Natsume's *Kokoro* and Canadian Elegiac Romance," in *Nature and Identity in Canadian and Japanese Literature*, eds., K. Tsuruta and Th. Goossen, Toronto, University of Toronto, 1988.
- Miller, O.J., "*L'Exil et le royaume* : cohérence du recueil, " *Albert Camus*, 6 (1973).
- Miyagawa, T., "Saiwa sareta *Kokoro*," in *Sōryoku Tōron: Soseki no Kokoro*, eds., Y. Komori, M. Nakamura, T. Miyagawa, Tokyo, Kanrinshobō, 1994.
- Muhlestein, D.K., "A Teacher and His Student: Subversion and Containment in Camus's 'The Guest,'" *Studies in Short Fiction*, 36 (1999).
- Natsume, Sōseki, *Kokoro*, trans., E. McClellan, Tokyo, Charles E. Tuttle, 1969.
- My Individualism and The Philosophical Foundations of Literature*, trans., S. I. Thunematsu, Boston and Tokyo, Tuttle, 2004.
- Okazaki, K., "An Arabist View of the Arab in Camus's *L'hôte*," *Shitennoji kokusai bukkyō daigaku kiyō*, 56(2006). (in Japanese)
- Oshino, T., "'Shizuka' ni koewa arunoka – *Kokoro* ni okeru yokuatu no kōzō," *Bungaku*, 3(1992).
- Perrine, L., "Camus' *The Guest*: A Subtle and Difficult Story," *Studies in Short Fiction*, 1 (1963).
- Peyre, H., "Presence of Camus," in *Critical Essays on Albert Camus*, ed., B.L. Knapp, Boston, G.K. Hall, 1988.
- Riche, D., *Japanese Literature Reviewed*, New York, Tokyo, Osaka & London, ICG Muse, 2003.

岡崎 桂 二

- Rigaud, J., "The Depiction of Arabs in *L'Étranger*," in *Camus's Étranger Fifty Years on*, ed., A. King, London, Macmillan, 1992.
- Rimer, J. T., *A Reader's Guide to Japanese Literature*, Tokyo, New York & London, Kōdansha International, 1999.
- Roelens, M., "Un texte, son «histoire» et l'histoire *《L'Hôte》* d'Albert Camus," *Revue des Sciences Humaines*, 42 (1977).
- Showalter, E., Jr., *Exiles and Strangers: A Reading of Camus's Exile and the Kingdom*, Columbus, Ohio State UP., 1984.
- Takahashi, H., "Teiban wo motomeru kokoro," in *Sōseki Kenkyū*, 6 (1996).
- Tamai, T. and H. Hujii(eds.), *Sōseki sakuhinron shūsei*, vol.10, *Kokoro*, (1991).
- Viglielmo, V.H., "An Introduction to the Later Novels of Natsume Sōseki," *Monumenta Nipponica*, 19 (1964).
- Walker, D., "De *L'Exil et le Royaume au Premier Homme*," *Equinoxe*, 13 (1995).
- Wright, J.L., "Plato's Socrates and Sōseki's Sensei: Living the Sovereign Life," *Asian Philosophy*, 15 (2005).

Notes

- (1) Hibbett, p. 329.
- (2) Quotations are taken from the translation by E. McClellan. Figures in parentheses refer to the page numbers of this version. In Camus's *L'Hôte*, citations are from the English version translated by J. O'Brien. S.K. stands for Sōseki and *Kokoro* respectively, and C. G. for Camus *The Guest*.
- (3) Genette defines the 'paratext', *seuil* in French, as a 'threshold' or a 'vestibule'. "It is a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also transaction: a privileged place of pragmatics and strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that . . . is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it". Genette, p. 2. Paratexts (titles, forewords, epigraphs, notes, and the like) serve to induce the reader into a certain pattern of reading.
- (4) The motive of his friend's suicide is not so clear as Sensei feels. There seem to be reasons other than the shock of the unrequited love, because K betrays his loneliness and mental agony before committing suicide. The limited perspective of the narrator defies readers' interpretation. The reason for Sensei's suicide, as well, invites various kinds of interpretation, and many critics refer to its relation with General Nogi's ritual death(*junshū*), which is

Master-disciple Relationship in Sōseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

- disclosed in Sensei's death note. Cf., Koizumi, Matsumoto in *Sōseki sakuhinron shūsei*.
- (5) The later trilogy is generally considered to consist of *Higan sugi made* (Until After the Spring Equinox), *Kōjin* (The Wayfarer), and *Kokoro*, all of which were written after Soseki's mental as well as physical breakdown, and published as the serialized fictions in the most famous newspaper in Japan, the *Asahi Shinbun*. The trilogy shares the same themes of modern man's isolation and loneliness. Cf., Ishihara (2004), pp. 198-201.
 - (6) Miller indicates the importance of the titles given to each novel and their order in the compilation, and examines the opinions posed by Cruickshank, Picon, Gadourek, and Gélinas. Sōseki stands in stark contrast to Camus; he is rather indifferent to giving names to his novels. *Vid.*, fn. 8.
 - (7) Wright, p. 75, fn. 1.
 - (8) Grafflin, p. 149. Viglielmo maintains that Sōseki's indifference to the selection of titles is a bit excessive. He indicates that Sōseki's *Higan sugi made*, one of the later trilogy, "means nothing more than that the author intended his novel to be serialized until after the (spring) equinox". Viglielmo, p. 17. As for *Mon* (Gate), Sōseki, moreover, made his disciples select a title for this novel "by opening at random the pages of the Japanese translation of Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra*". *Ibid.*, p. 2. The title of *Sorekara*. (And Then) was merely named to reveal the author's intention of depicting the features of the former protagonist of *Sanshirō*.
 - (9) Cf., Grimaud, p. 181, fn., 6. "Camus is oddly fond of puns: the titles of most of the stories in *Exil et le royaume* are either direct puns as in '*L'Hôte*' and '*La Pierre qui pousse*' (it weighs down but also grows, being a stalactite or stalagmite) or at least plays on words as in the symbolic adultery of '*La Femme adultere*'".
 - (10) Rimer, p. 102; MacCillelan, p. 52.
 - (11) Novel interpretations on *Kokoro* began with the two leading scholars, Komori and Ishihara. On the debates on *Kokoro*, see the paper presented by Oshino at Yoshikishi Kenkyūkai (1992), and published in *Sōryoku tōron: Sōseki no Kokoro*. Cf., Oshino, pp. 41-42.
 - (12) Komori (1988), pp. 415-416. On the process of the canonization of *Kokoro*, refer to Miyagawa; Takahashi; Dodd, p. 473. Sensei's motive for suicide is explained in the story that it is related with the general Nogi's *junshi* – the practice of following one's master to the grave –, which was another reason why *Kokoro* was taken to be appropriate as an example of a moral code in the patriarchal Japan.
 - (13) Ishihara(1991), pp. 304-305; Komori (1988), pp. 415-417.
 - (14) Cf., Dodd; Wright.
 - (15) Grafflin, pp. 158-159; Richie juxtaposes the main characters of the first trilogy saying that "we see a young and inexperienced student, Sanshirō (a serious Botchan) turns into the definitely alienated Daisuke (the main character of *And Then*), who, in turn, . . . Sōsuke of

岡崎 桂 二

- The Gate*". Richie, p. 203.
- (16) Dodd, p. 493.
- (17) Grafflin, p. 159.
- (18) Doi analyses the relationship from the perspective of *amae* (dependence), and demonstrates the homosexual emotions in the young man. Doi, pp. 114-115. Grafflin explains their relationship in terms of psychological double.
- (19) Many critics refer to the role of a detective the young man plays. Cf., Komori (1992), pp. 16-17. Hirakawa tries to interpret *Kokoro* as a detective story. Sōseki is known for his distaste for the profession of detective, but in *Higan sugi made*, he depicts a mysterious story related with a detective. Cf., Viglielmo, pp. 21-22.
- (20) Dodd, p. 492. Komori defines Sensei as a tempter, who is unconsciously induced to entice the disciple to his secrets. Komori (1992), pp. 18-20.
- (21) Wright, p. 61.
- (22) Hibbett, p. 327. Viglielmo argues that, as is every profound thinker, Sōseki is of the opinion that "social evils have their root in the evil which is in man himself". Viglielmo, p. 4. Sensei refers to his friend as 'the devil', and confesses that "it is [he] who dragged [that] man into the house to live with . . ." (S.K. 164). Tragedy begins with Sensei's good will.
- (23) Merivale argues that "*Kokoro* raises two very interesting and critical questions. . . . One is, who is the protagonist? . . .The other question, then, is "Why is there no epilogue?" Merivale, p. 127. The questions posed by her are understandable, but not fully answered.
- (24) *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137.
- (25) McClellan, p. 53.
- (26) Dodd, p. 478.
- (27) Komori argues that the disciple, who has his face drenched with master's blood and new life lodges in his breast, has no other choice but to run to the widow, who has lost the only person she turned to, to relive a new life with her. Komori (1988), p. 434, p. 437. This novel interpretation arouses heated argument for or against it. Cf., fn 11. Ishihara insists that when the disciple transcends the master, or when his master means nothing to him, *Kokoro* ceases to be a story of ethics and turns into a drama of a conflict between Sensei and the young man. Ishihara (1991), p. 313.
- (28) *Sōseki Zenshū*, Iwanami Shoten, 1966, vol.6, p. 300.
- (29) Ishihara (1996), pp. 150-151. His original interpretation is confirmed by Sōseki's manuscripts. *Bungaku*, 3 (1992), pp. 7-8.
- (30) *Sōseki Zenshū*, vol. 6, p. 3.
- (31) Criticism against Sensei is demonstrated by the term 'devil', attached to a friend by Sensei. (S.K. 207). Ishihara (1991), p. 305.

Master-disciple Relationship in Soseki's *Kokoro* and Camus's *L'Hôte*

- (32) Komori (1988), pp. 435-436.
- (33) Showalter, p. 73.
- (34) Muhlestein demonstrates the fundamental similarity between a policeman and a school teacher depending on the L. Althusser's definition of the state. Cf., Showalter, p. 73.
- (35) *Ibid.*, p. 82.
- (36) Miller argues that the choice Daru has to make is concerned with the matter of infidelity(infidélité) to himself, Miller, p. 39.
- (37) Grimaud, p. 179; Cryle, p. 124; Grobe, p.357. When Meursault is locked up in jail filled with Arab criminals, "he finds real commiseration and justice . . . One can now foresee a strange communion between the two social groups; a bond between Arabs and pieds-noirs is intimated". Rigaud, p. 189. Muhlestein quotes D. Lazere about Daru's acts of hospitality saying that "[they are] the eucharistic communion", and indicates that L. Braun "emphasizes the rituals' 'evangetical overtones'". Muhlestein, p. 228.
- (38) Grobe, p. 359. 'Indifference' is the term attached to the behaviour of the protagonist of *The Outsider*: Meursault shows total indifference towards everything around him – love, friendship, business, the crime he has committed and the punishment imposed on him. Cf., Fortier, p. 542.
- (39) The prisoner is given two opportunities of escaping from the detention. When Daru senses the possibility of the prisoner's running away, he feels the unmixed joy. Camus, *The Guest*, p. 98, p. 103.
- (40) Wright, p. 65.
- (41) Grobe insists that "Daru and his guest are to a significant extent spiritual doubles. Each is victimized by the desert land. . . . Each is cut off from the society of his own people. Each comes to feel the displeasure of the other's people. Neither could survive if long deprived of the solitude . . ." Grobe, p. 357.
- (42) McDermott, p. 11.
- (43) Festa-McCormick, p. 113.
- (44) Hurley, p. 92 ; Cryle, p. 121; Showalter, p. 132, p. 135.
- (45) McDermont and Grimaud provide minute interpretations of the Arab in *The Guest*. Okazaki warns against the interpretation of the Arab without knowledge of indigeneous Arab-Islamic culture. Hurley examines the interpretations posed by critics, and refutes them. Hurley, pp. 90-91.
- (46) Showalter, p. 85, p. 86, fn., 2; Cryle, p. 124. Camus's two favorite themes, ambiguity and the lack of communication, are shown in the title, *L'Envers et l'endroit* and *Le Malentendu*.
- (47) Muhlestein, p. 233.
- (48) *Ibid.*, p. 226.

岡崎 桂 二

- (49) *Ibid.*, p.231.
- (50) Grimaud, p. 181, fn. 9; Festa-McCormick, p. 114; Curzon-Hobson, p. 368; Showalter, p. 8.
- (51) Grimaud, pp. 177-179.
- (52) Muhlestein, p. 232.
- (53) Sōseki, *My Individualism*, p. 50.
- (54) *Ibid.*, p. 51.
- (55) Wright, p. 73.
- (56) Festa-McCormick, p. 112
- (57) Camus's hesitation and ambiguous position on the Algerian question came under severe censure and aroused heated controversy among the French intellectuals. Peyre, pp. 24-26. Camus seems to be a victim of the political season of the 50's.
- (58) Showalter, p. 76.
- (59) Curzon-Hobson insists that "[Daru's] attempt[s] floundered because [he] failed to enter into relation with those around [him]". Curzon-Hobson, p. 380.