

“The Extranational Flow of Japanese Language Texts, 1905-1945,” *Sai: Kan* (Seoul: Kukche Han'guk Munhwa Hakhoe) 6 (May 2009): 147-76.

Errata found as of 14 October 2010:

165: "on the order of 240,000 subscribers" should read "on the order of 340,000 subscribers"

Please note that in the printing process, a number of characters were mistakenly replaced by question marks. I have found them in the following two entries:

173: Okita Shin'etsu 沖田伸悦, *Shokuminchi jidai no furuhon'ya-tachi: Karafuto Chôsen Taiwan Manshû Chûka minkoku kûhaku no shominshi* 植民地時代の古本屋たち (Sapporo: Jurôsha, 2007).

174: Shôji Tokutarô 荘司徳太郎 and Shimizu Bunkichi 清水文吉, *Nippai jidai-shi: Gendai shuppan ryûtsû no genten* 日配時代史— 現代出版流通の原点 (Tokyo: Shuppan Nyuusu-sha, 1980).

The Extranational Flow of Japanese-Language Texts, 1905-1945 *

Edward Mack**

- I. Introduction
- II. Sales Abroad
- III. Uchiyama Shoten
- IV. Sanseidô in Taiwan
- V. Ôsakayagô
- VI. Bandô Kyôgo
- VII. Non-Japanese Readership
- VIII. Conclusion

I. Introduction

Particularly since the rise of Cultural Studies (however defined), the field of literary study has shifted its center away from what Wellek and Warren referred to as the "intrinsic" elements of literature, and moved toward those they referred to as the "extrinsic" elements, including the function of literature in society.¹⁾ This shift should come as no surprise at a time when the Humanities are constantly forced to justify themselves. By making assertions regarding the impact of literary works, scholars are able to claim a social and historical relevance for literature that some might have been unwilling to grant in the past. To the extent, however, that literature scholars claim not that a given writer provides us with a fresh insight through a literary work, but instead that a work had an impact on a readership, a leap is often made to reception that has not

* My sincere thanks to Michael Kim, Kwon Changgyu, Mi-Ryong Shim, Kim Soohee, and everyone else who gave me so much help prior to the INAKOS conference. Special thanks to John Frankl, for his detailed response to my paper, which helped tremendously in sharpening the argument presented here. Please note that all kanji have been rendered in their simplified forms.

** Univ. of Washington

1) Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1956.

been fully substantiated.

This is not a new observation. The deepest and most interesting investigations of this question have been done in the field of reception theory. These theorists have pointed out the complex ways in which readers interact with texts, producing readings that often diverge significantly from those intended by the author, if such intention can ever be clearly established. This question -of what a reader may or may not take away from the act of reading- is of course at the heart of the problem in any study of the function of texts in society. Its complexity need not, however, led us to a self-imposed limitation to textual analysis. Instead, it demands that we approach the problem incrementally, establishing a material history that allows us at least to rule out inaccurate assertions of impact and at best ascertain a narrative of social function that is probable, if not certain.

Such an approach is, I would argue, particularly salient to anyone who approaches individual literary texts through the prism of a national literature. To argue that texts should be linked in a discourse of textual interrelation(that they should be given what I have termed elsewhere a "textual identity") such as "Japanese literature" or "Korean literature" requires either a faith in ethnic essentialism or the support of just such a material history.²⁾ National literatures are, of course, easily defensible if one adheres to ethnic essentialism; in such a case, a given text is always a manifestation of the author's immutable ethnic identity. The problems with ethnic essentialism, however, are legion, and the scholarship problematizing such a philosophy is too extensive for me to summarize here. Attempting to use material history to establish a national identity is similarly a fraught effort, as such a conclusion(if even arguable) would all too readily be absorbed into a discourse of ethnic essentialism, rather than remaining in the realm of historical contingency.

2) See Edward Mack, "Tekusuto no aidentitii, arui wa, tekusuto no sôkansei ni kansuru disukuuru(テキストのアイデンティティー、或は、テキストの相関性に関するディスコース)" and "Textual Identity: Discourses of Textual Interrelation," Morii Masumi 森井マサミ, ed., *The Materiality of Literature*, Tokyo: Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu, 2007, pp.100-11.

One might, however, approach the problem differently, arguing for a historicized discourse of textual interrelation, one based on a concrete flow of material texts to and from specific actors, which produced a textual web of sufficient coherence(if only for a limited historical span) to justify a claim of textual identity. As William St. Clair wrote in his 2004 book, *The Reading Nation*:

Although there has always been much interest in the meaning of certain texts, how they came to be written, and in the lives of their authors, little attention has been paid to the processes by which the texts reached the hands, and therefore potentially the minds, of different constituencies of readers.³⁾

St. Clair contends that most studies of literature(and print in general) work under the assumption that "reading helped to shape mentalities and to determine the fate of the nation"; he believes that such a conclusion is premature. An approach that which begins with

3) William St. Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, p.1.

4) A note on terminology: in order to clarify the information about distribution, I will use terms that oversimplify the sociopolitical order during the colonial period(1895-1945). I will use "nation-state" or "the main islands" to signify the area referred to as *naichi*("inner territories") during the colonial period, which is largely(but not entirely; consider the shifting status of Okinawa and Hokkaidô) equivalent to what we think of as Japan today. I will sometimes use "the colonies" to refer not only to the formal colonies(*gaichi*, or "outer territories"), but also to Manchuria, the concession areas in China, and other areas that had significant populations of native-speaking Japanese in Asia; the term will occasionally also encompass Brazil, despite the extremely problematic usage of the term in that circumstance. Finally, I will attempt to use the term "native speaker of Japanese" rather than the ethnic identifier "Japanese" in order to skirt the problem of forced assimilation during the imperial period, in full awareness that even "native speaker" could(and should) be problematized during this period of mandatory Japanese-language education. In certain cases, however, for the purposes of clarity I will revert to the conventional "Japanese," "Taiwanese," and "Koreans" despite these reservations. In the case of texts, I am using "Japanese-language" to include any texts written in Japanese, including translations of materials originally written in other languages.

establishing material access to books(even as it defers such questions as linguistic access, actual consumption, individual reception, and social impact), is particularly necessary when the reading community was ethnically heterogeneous reading community, as was the case for Japanese-language texts during the colonial period.⁴⁾ What if the "constituency of readers" is not coterminous with the ethnic nation or the nation-state?

In the case of Japanese-language texts during the imperial period, such a study is profoundly challenged by the variety of sources to which one must turn. In the pages that follow, I will summarize the state of textual circulation as can be ascertained from Japanese-language sources predominantly from the field of publishing history, most of which focus on the economics of book production and distribution. Even as I present this summary, however, I hope to identify certain biases and limitations in this archive; what I believe will become clear is that a thorough study of the conditions of textual circulation cannot be written using only these sources, and that an accurate picture will only become possible through the triangulation of Japanese-, Chinese-, and Korean-language sources.

II . Sales Abroad

We begin with the scale of the market for Japanese-language texts outside of the main territories(内地, *naichi*, which corresponds more-or less to the nation-state) during the imperial period. According to Ôno Magohei(大野孫平, 1879-1963) of the distribution company Tôkyôdô(東京堂), at the peak of sales -around 1941- nearly twenty percent of Japanese-language texts were being sold outside of the main islands.⁵⁾ At that point, an estimated 1.8 million Japanese -not including soldiers- were in

Korea, Manchuria, Taiwan, or China.⁶⁾ The omission of the military from that statistic is problematic, particularly given the fact that sales outside of the main islands increased during the 1930s primarily as a result of its mobilization.⁷⁾

Whatever took these native Japanese readers abroad, they seem to have exhibited an even greater appetite for texts than their countrymen back home.⁸⁾ Suzuki Tokutarô(鈴木徳太郎), also of Tôkyôdô, cites a 1939 survey of readers that he was involved in, which showed that individuals in Korea, Manchuria, China, and Taiwan read a great deal, whereas even in Tokyo only 50-60% of the population were regular readers.⁹⁾ Some statistics from the period July 1941-June 1942 suggest the relative size of the markets: during that period, the wholesaler Nippai(日配) made 27.2% of its net book sales and 17.2% of its net magazine sales in Tokyo; during that same period, 18.6% of its net books sales and 19.5% of its net magazine sales were made outside of the main islands(with roughly one-quarter the population, according to the 1939 census.)¹⁰⁾ Though book sales in the imperial metropole exceeded those in the colonies, then, in

5) Hashimoto Motome(橋本求), ed. *Nihon shuppan hanbai-shi*(日本出版販史), Tokyo : Kodansha, 1964, p.123.

6) Hashimoto, p.123.

7) Hashimoto, p.123.

8) Given compulsory education in Japanese, non-ethnically Japanese readers may have possessed "native" proficiency in the language, and many likely possessed a high level of proficiency, if not native. This issue will be addressed toward the end of this paper. For the purposes of this discussion, I am not including these readers in this formulation of "native readers."

9) Hashimoto 509. This is an unfortunately phrased quote, and I have not yet found the survey to verify what precisely he means. What Suzuki says is this: "In Korea, Manchuria, China, and Taiwan, generally speaking each person reads three or four books. In naichi, even in Tokyo, only 500-600 people out of 1000 read. Perhaps it is because there are so few sources of entertainment in the colonial areas, the rate is so much higher, with one person reading multiple books." First, the period is not specified; second, although the last sentence implies the reading above, it is also possible that he means that only 500-600 people out of 1000 read as much.

10) Shôji Tokutarô(莊司徳太郎) and Shimizu Bunkichi(清水文吉), *Nippai jidai-shi: Gendai shuppan ryutsu no genten*(日配時代史—現代出版流通の原点), Tokyo: Shuppan Nyuusu-sha, 1980, pp.120-21. The statistics I am giving for "outside of the main islands" reflects a combination of the statistics for *gaichi*(外地, including Korea, Taiwan, Sakhalin, the south Pacific, and the Kwantung Leased Territory) and for *gaikoku*(外国, broken down for magazines into China and Manchuria.) The census figures do not reflect the military, which as mentioned before was a significant number.

relative terms, the colonies bought more magazines.

It is clear from publisher's newspaper advertising budgets that they took such markets seriously. In August 1937, for example, roughly equivalent amounts were spent on advertising in the *Manshû nichinichi shinbun*(滿州日日新聞) as was spent on the *Hokkaidô taimuzu*(北海道タイムズ), despite having only slightly more than one-third the population; similarly, the *Keijô nippô*(京城日報) received roughly as much advertising as did *Kokumin*(国民).¹¹⁾ Publishers bought nearly 50% (46.5%) as many lines in the *Manshû nichinichi shinbun*(42,724 lines) as they did in the top venue for advertising, the *Tôkyô nichinichi*(91,830 lines.)

The magnitude of this market is particularly noteworthy given the barriers that existed to consumers outside of the main islands. One such barrier to the circulation of Japanese-language books was shipping. Unlike domestic shipments, which could often benefit from a single, nation-wide shipping charge, the shipping cost of books to Taiwan(for example) was 5-7% of the book's retail price, with magazines costing 2%.¹²⁾ (The shipments also often took more than two weeks.) This led to the contentious creation in 1922 of a *Taiwan baika*(台湾売価), which set the price of books(not including textbooks and books published in Taiwan) at 10% over their *teika*(定価, fixed price).¹³⁾ Similar conflicts arose throughout the colonies. Fixed prices, therefore, which had been such a boon to retailers on the main islands, became a bane to retailers

11) *Shuppan bunka*(「出版文化」) 4, 1937, 9, p.3. Reproduced in Ôkubo Hisao (大久保久雄), ed., *Shoseki zasshi-shô shiryô: Naichi, shokuminchi*(書籍雑誌商資料: 内地・植民地) 1937-41, vol. 1, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bumpokaku, 2004, p.21. It should be noted that these rankings and statistics vary from month to month.

12) Kawahara Isao(河原功), *Taiwan shûbungaku undô to tenkai: Nihon bungaku to no setter*(台湾新文学運動の展開: 日本文学との接点), Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan, 1997, p.260.

13) Kawahara, p.261.

14) Uchida Yûsuke(内田勇輔), "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai(ぶらり散策・私の出版業界(sono 3))" *Shuppan kurabu dayori*(出版クラブだより) 199, 1981. 8, p.4. See also Edward Mack, "Pure Art as Mass Culture: Industrialized Publishing and 'Modern Japanese Literature,'" ed. Wilt L. Idema, *Books in Numbers*, Cambridge: Harvard-Yenching Library, 2007, p.311-55, and Edward Mack, "Diasporic Markets: Japanese Print and Migration in São Paulo, 1908-1935," *Script & Print: Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand* 29(2006), p.168.

outside them. As a result, retailers outside of the main islands were forced to function within a system that was effectively *kai-kiri*(買い切り, final sale with no returns), and were not allowed to enjoy the benefits of *itaku-sei*(委託制, the consignment sales system) that had allowed such dramatic growth among book retailers in Japan.¹⁴⁾ Not only would such a change have restricted the expansion of book retailing, it likely also would have had a significant impact on the composition of stock and buying strategies of existing retailers. Despite these obstacles, a substantial number of book and magazine retailers appeared throughout the colonies.

As will be noted in detail below, multiple avenues existed for the circulation of Japanese-language texts; retail sales of new texts in fixed-location stores were only one such option. Nonetheless, the numbers of such retailers give us one more rough measure of the magnitude of the market. In 1941, some 1110 booksellers(not necessarily specialized bookstores) outside of the main islands were registered with Nippai, the centralized distribution company established by the government that year.¹⁵⁾ This number can be compared with the roughly 16,000 retailers that existed in Japan in early 1944, before various exigencies caused that number to rapidly contract to 10,000 by the end of March.¹⁶⁾ That number would continue to contract immediately after the war, to the point that there were only 6261 bookstores in Japan in 1947.¹⁷⁾ In considering the size of individual markets outside of the main islands, we can turn to a similar Nippai list, dated 31 January 1942, which breaks down the

15) Hashimoto, p.123.

16) Hashimoto, p.598.

17) Uchida Yusuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai(sono 3)" 4. Needless to say, the 1947 statistic would likely reflect a drop from prewar rates; compare that number with, for example, the 10000 retail stores that are said to have existed by 1927. See Takahashi Masami, "Shuppan ryûtsû kikô no hensen: 1603-1945," *Shuppan kenkyû* 13, 1982, pp.206-13.

18) Cited in Uchida Yusuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyokai(sono 3)", p.4.

19) Okita Shin'etsu(仲田伸悦), *Shokuminchi jidai no furohon'ya-tachi: Karafuto Chôsen Taiwan Manshû Chûka minokoku kûhaku no shominshi*(植民地時代の古本屋たち), Sapporo: Jurôsha, 2007.

totals.¹⁸⁾ Those statistics will be given below.

Another extremely useful resource has recently become available on this topic: Okita Shin'etsu's *Shokuminchi jidai no furohon'ya-tachi*. This book, based on articles he originally serialized in the *Zen Kosho Ren nyûsu*(「全古書連ニユ日ス」) between March 2005 and May 2006, is the result of exhaustive research into the used bookstores in Sakhalin, Taiwan, Korea, Manchuria, and Shanghai.²⁰⁾ Thanks to Okita's research, we have a detailed picture of these markets.²¹⁾ What follows are summary descriptions of each major region, based on these two sources.

In Sakhalin, which had a population of 339,357(almost entirely *naichi-jin*) in 1938(as compared to 72.2 million on the main islands, for example), the Zenkoku Shoseki-gyô Kumiai(全古書籍業組合) had 93 members that year, though it should be noted that not all of them would have been specialized bookstores.²²⁾ By 1943, there were at least 17 used booksellers operating in Sakhalin, 7 of which were located in the city of Toyohara(豊原, population 38,606 in 1940).²³⁾ As would be expected, this market was dwarfed in size by those in Korea, Taiwan, and Manchuria.

Taiwan, with a population of 310,777 *naichi-jin*(out of a total

population of 5,746,959) in 1938, had 106 retailers that year(growing to at least 123, according to the 1942 Nippai list), and at least 43 used bookstores in 1941(though this number may reflect a sudden increase,²⁴⁾ including only recently converted from new book and magazine sales.) According to Kawahara Isao, most of these members in Taiwan(and probably the other colonies as well) carried far more magazines than books.²⁵⁾ An article in the trade publication *Shuppan bunka*(「出版文化」), dated September 1937, describes a bleak picture: "Taiwan, a place that is both geographically removed and lacking in stimuli, is truly an ill-fated place for readers. Because there isn't even a proper bookstore in Taihoku(台北, Taipei), you can imagine how bad things are outside of the city."²⁶⁾ The article goes on to say that special orders take three weeks to arrive, though it does praise the reading societies on the island, such as the Taiwan Aisho-kai(台湾愛書会) and the Taihoku Shomotsu Dôkôkai(台北書物同好会), and a locally produced journal dedicated to reading, *Aisho*(「愛書」), which ran from June 1933 until August 1942.²⁷⁾

Without a doubt, Korea was the largest marketplace for Japanese-language texts outside of the main islands. A 1928 article by the bookseller Senba Yaematsu(仙波八重松) of Tokyo, recounting his trip to Qingdao, Dalian, Shenyang, Andong, and Seoul, described Seoul, which he thought seemed poorer than other cities he had visited, as possessing amazing bookstores, and seeming to have a larger reading population than any other colony.²⁸⁾ Unlike Taiwan, in which the growth in the market is described as happening in the late-1930s, a 1931 article by the bookseller Yanagida Bunjirô(柳田文治郎) of Gunshodô describes the

20) Okita Shin'etsu, "Gaichi ni watatta furohon'ya-tachi 外地に渡った古本屋たち," *Zen Kosho Ren nyûsu* 385-92(March 2005-May 2006). *Zen Kosho Ren nyûsu* is the bulletin of the Zenkoku Koshoseki-shô Kumiai Rengô-kai.

21) Work has also been done on circulation to North and South America. On North America, see Wada Atsuhiko(和田敦彦), *Shomotsu no Nichibeî kankei: riterashii-shi ni mukete*(書物の日米関係:リテラン一史に向けて), (Tokyo: Shinchôsha, 2007) and Hibi Yoshitaka(日比嘉高), "Nikkei Amerika imin issei no shinbun to bungaku(日系アメリカ移民一世の新聞と文学)," *Nihon bungaku*(日本文学), 53:11(2004. 11), pp.23 -34; also, Mack, "Seattle's Little Tokyo"(2007). For Brazil, see Mack, "Diasporic Markets"(2006) and "Textual Identity"(2007).

22) For population figures here and below, Naikaku Tôkei-kyoku(内閣統計局), ed., *Dai Nihon teikoku tôkei nenkan*(大日本帝国統計年鑑) 518(1939), p.7. For bookstore numbers, Okita 2007, 17. Note that in most of these statistics, the term *naichi-jin* includes both Koreans and Taiwanese when describing areas other than Korea and Taiwan; in the case of Korea, *naichi-jin* includes only Japanese; in the case of Taiwan, *naichi-jin* includes Koreans.

23) Okita 2007, p.10-11.

24) Ôkubo Hisao and Fukushima Jûrô. *Shoseki zasshi-sho shiryô: naichi, shokuminchi, 1937-41*. Vol. 2, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bunpokaku, 2004, pp.352-68 and Okita 2007, pp.44-45, p.50.

25) Kawahara, p.255.

26) Ikeda Toshio(池田敏雄), "Taiwan dokushokai no kinjô(台湾読書会の近状)," *Shuppan bunka* 4(September 1937), 3. Reproduced in Ôkubo Hisao, ed., *Shoseki zasshi-sho shiryô: Naichi, shokuminchi 1937-41*, vol. 1, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bunpokaku, 2004, p.21.

27) Ibid. and Okita, 2007, p.42.

28) Okita, 2007, pp.79-80.

29) Okita, 2007, p.61.

market at that time as already extensive. According to Yanagida, by 1931 there were already more than 30 bookstores in Seoul, and stores that carried books (even if they did not all specialize in book sales) were spread all over the country.²⁹⁾ Korea, with a population of 633,288 *naichi-jin* (out of a total population of 22,633,751) in 1938, had 358 retailers, and at least 60 used bookstores that operated in Seoul alone by 1938, with 15 in Taegu, 13 in P'yôngyang, and 10 in Pusan.³⁰⁾ The total number of retailers grew to at least 549 according to the 1942 Nippai list. Like Taiwan, Korea possessed at least one reading society, the Keijô Shomotsu Dôkôkai (京城書物同好会), which existed from 1937 until 1943 and published twenty issues of its journal, the *Shomotsu Dôkôkai kaihô* (「書物同好会会報」).³¹⁾

According to imperial statistics for the Kwantung Leased Territory, with a population of 185,185 *naichi-jin* (out of a total population of 1,225,570) in 1938, the area had fewer bookstores, and contemporary sources describe them as smaller and less impressive than the operations in Korea.³²⁾ According to the 1942 Nippai list, there were 23 retailers in the Leased Territory and 13 in Mongolia. These statistics must be considered in conjunction with the number of bookstores in Manchuria, which would have been under the jurisdiction of Manpai (滿配).³³⁾ When the number of stores in Manchuria peaked, around 1938-39, the Manshû Shoseki Zasshi-shô Kumiai (滿州書籍雜誌商組合) had 189 members.³⁴⁾

According to the 1942 Nippai list, northern China had 124 retailers, central China had 52, and southern China had 16. Okita gives four contemporary records of the market for Japanese-language texts in

Shanghai. Unlike Nanjing, which had fewer than 10,000 Japanese residents and no stores specializing in books (two or three carried them along with other items), there were three Japanese bookstores in Shanghai in 1937: Shiseidô (至誠堂), Nihondô (日本堂), and Uchiyama Shoten (内山書店).³⁵⁾

As the statistics above show, these were large-scale operations involving not only a large number of retail stores, but also organizations for both retailers and readers. Limiting our discussion to statistics such as these, however, fails to recreate the texture of the historical marketplace. In order to understand more fully the nature of this market, then, let us focus briefly on four very different operations, beginning with Uchiyama Shoten.

III. Uchiyama Shoten

The first type of operation to consider is the independent retailer. Given its long history and the scale of its operations, it is possible that Uchiyama Shoten is too exceptional to function well as the representative of an extranational retail operation that did not originate in Japan and was not a branch of a Japanese company. Nonetheless, it is worthwhile to spend a moment on some of the descriptions that exist of the store.

Uchiyama Shoten, founded in Shanghai in 1917, is described as depending on the population of Japanese in the city, a population that had grown to 26,000 by the mid-1920s.³⁶⁾ At that time, there were already three bookstores for Japanese in Shanghai; Uchiyama Shoten initially differentiated itself by carrying a significant stock of Christian books. The

30) For population figures here and below, Naikaku Tôkei-kyoku, ed., *Dai Nihon teikoku tôkei nenkan 518* (1939) 7. For bookstore numbers, Ôkubo and Fukushima 352-68 and Okita 2007, p.70.

31) Okita 2007, 78. In 1944 the group changed its name to the Chôsen Bunka Kenkyûkai (朝鮮文化研究会), but soon after it shut down.

32) Okita 2007, pp.102-19.

33) Uchida Yûsuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai (sono 3)" p.4.

34) Ôkubo Hisao and Jûrô Fukushima, *Shoseki zasshi-sho shiryô: naichi, shokuminchi, 1937-41*, Vol. 2 (Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bunpokaku, 2004), pp.352-68.

35) Okita 2007, pp.132-39.

36) Oda Mitsuo dates the opening to 1920 (Oda 2003, p.143), but Ozaki Hotsuki (and the current Uchiyama Shoten's own company history) dates it to 1917. Ozaki Hotsuki (尾崎秀樹), *Shanghai 1930-nen* (上海1930年), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989, p.26. More on Uchiyama Shoten will be available in the recently released Ôta Naoki (太田尚樹), *Densetsu no Nicchû bunka saron: Shanghai Uchiyama Shoten* (伝説の日中文化サロン上海・内山書店), Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2008; unfortunately, I have not yet been able to obtain a copy.

historian Oda Mitsuo, working from Uchiyama's own writings, describes the main customers as being Christians, employees of Japanese banks and trading companies, students at the Tôa Dôbun Shoin(東亞同文書院), and faculty at Beijing University; he then goes on to say that Lu Xun(魯迅) himself was a customer.³⁷⁾ Uchiyama Kanzô(内山完造), quoted here by Oda, claimed that at the time of the *enpon*(円本, one-yen book) boom(roughly 1926-31), "there was not an employee at a Japanese trading company, bank, or factory in all of Shanghai who was not a customer of Uchiyama Shoten."³⁸⁾ Oda then goes on to say that in this, Uchiyama Shoten could be considered a model of the expansion of Japanese-language book distribution outside of the nation-state.

Contemporary descriptions illuminate the store's centrality to the readership in Shanghai. Of the bookstore, the poet Kaneko Mitsuharu(金子光晴, 1895-1975) wrote that "bitter enemies elsewhere, [at Uchiyama Shoten] alone Chinese and Japanese could argue their opinions without reservation and truly communicate heart-to-heart."³⁹⁾ Kaneko continued, writing, "Uchiyama Shoten was not merely a place of friendship toward Chinese intellectuals, it also functioned as the 'teat' from which they drew their nourishment," as Japanese -which relied on Chinese characters- was an easy medium through which to absorb the knowledge of the world.⁴⁰⁾ From around 1924, Uchiyama Shoten became the home for the Bungei Dan'wakai(文芸談話会), which involved both Japanese and Chinese members(many of whom had studied in Japan). The Bungei

Dan'wakai also published its own journal, *Mangekyô*(万華鏡).⁴¹⁾ Despite these details and Oda's reference to Lu Xun, he seems hesitant to suggest that Chinese were significant consumers of Japanese-language texts, and instead allows those claims to be made in citations of others' writings. Writing in 2003, Oda notes that the bookstore carried Chinese translations of both socialist thought and modern Japanese literature, implying that these might have been the primary draw for non-native readers and thus mildly discounting the possibility that Chinese were significant consumers of Japanese-language texts.

Whoever the patrons of Uchiyama Shoten were(and we will return to that question), it is clear that the store played a key role in enabling and perpetuating a reading community for Japanese-language texts in Shanghai, as presumably other independent retailers did for readerships elsewhere in the colonies.

IV. Sanseidô in Taiwan

Another independent bookstore, Shinkôdô(新高堂), played a similarly central role in Taiwan during the early decades of its colonial period.⁴²⁾ Shinkôdô was founded in 1898 and functioned not only as a retailer of Japanese-language books, but also as a distributor to smaller retailers throughout the country. Apparently, Shinkôdô, which specialized in textbooks, handled more than half of the books imported onto the island at any given time during this early period.⁴³⁾ This domination, however, came to be challenged by Sanseidô(三省堂), a bookseller that -unlike Shinkôdô and Uchiyama Shoten- was based in Tokyo. As such, it represents a second form that retail operations took

37) Oda Mitsuo(小田光雄), *Shoten no kindai: hon ga kagayaite ita jidai*(書店の近代 : 本が輝いていた時代, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2003, p.145.

38) Uchiyama Kanzô 内山完造, *Kakôroku* 花甲録(Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960); as quoted in Oda, pp.145-46.

39) Kaneko Mitsuharu(金子光晴), *Dokurohai*(どくろ杯), Tokûdô: Chuo Kôronsha, 1976; as quoted in Oda, p.147. His trip to China was one of a number of trips he took abroad, which may have contributed to his strong distaste for nationalism, imperialism, and war. During World War II, Kaneko is famous for having been the only famous poet to publish anti-war poetry. See Donald Keene, *Dawn to the West*, vol. 2, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1984, pp.358-63.

40) Oda, p.148.

41) Ozaki, pp.29-30.

42) Thanks to the 1946 book by Mochida Taturô(持田辰郎), *Tôto Shoseki Kabushiki Kaisha Taihoku shitenshi*(東都書籍株式会社), cited in Kawahara, p.253, we know a great deal about bookstores in Taiwan during the imperial period, including primarily Chinese-language bookstores that also carried Japanese-language books. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate a copy of this text.

43) Kawahara, p.254.

outside of the main islands: retail operations that were dependent on a parent company based in Japan.

Sanseidô, which had been founded in 1881, established a retail branch in Taiwan in 1915. It subsequently formed the distribution company Tôto Shoseki Kabushiki Kaisha(東都書籍株式会社) in 1930, which expanded its operations into Taiwan in 1933.⁴⁴⁾ It quickly became a central player in the Taiwan market. By the time that distribution operations in Taiwan were absorbed into Nippai, Tôto controlled roughly one-third of the distribution in Taiwan. Sanseidô's expansion was not limited to Taiwan. In addition to Taipei, Sanseidô had stores in Seoul, Changchun, Shanghai, Singapore, and Malaysia.⁴⁵⁾ Sanseidô was of course not the only Tokyo-based retailer that established branches outside of the main islands. Mitsukoshi(三越), Kinbundô(金文堂), and Maruzen(丸善) were all enlisted to open stores in occupied areas. Maruzen opened stores in Taipei, Seoul, Changchun, Shenyang, Java, and Jakarta.⁴⁶⁾ The Kinbunkai(Kinbundô), based in Kyūshū, opened branches in Seoul and Jakarta.⁴⁷⁾ The increased capitalization and established business plans of these Japan-based companies allowed them to expand readily into the new markets and become dominant concerns.

V. Ôsakayagô

In addition to retailers, the significance of distributors must also be stressed. Although Sanseidô functioned as a distributor(as did other

companies) prior to the formation of Nippai, perhaps no other distributor was as important outside of the main islands as Ôsakayagô(大阪屋号), which was founded by Hamai Matsunosuke(浜井松之助, 1874-1944) in 1904.⁴⁸⁾ When Hamai, who was working as an assistant surveyor in the Government-General of Taiwan, heard of the declaration of war against Russia, he purchased a large quantity of gloves, socks, and lanterns and headed to Yingkou, where he opened a store(originally named Ôsakaya) in November 1904. Meeting with almost immediate success, Hamai transitioned into selling books and magazines from Osaka and Tokyo. When the publishing giant Hakubunkan(博文館) began exploring business opportunities in the region, Ôsakaya was able to become an official agent(代理店, *dairiten*) of the company. An advertisement, dated 9 January 1906, shows the extent to which the company -which also sold medications, tea, and sundries(雜貨, *zakka*)- highlighted this relationship. The company quickly established similar relationships with other important publishers.⁴⁹⁾ An advertisement for the Tokyo-based publishing company Shun'yôdô, dated 11 March 1907, shows that the company had become a special agent(特約販売店, *tokuyaku hanbai-ten*) of the publisher.⁵⁰⁾ Another ad, dated slightly more than two years after the founding of the company, also reveals that Ôsakaya already had at least four locations: Yingkou, Tieling, Shenyang, and Liaoyang. In the spring of 1908 he opened a store in Dalian, which already had at least two bookstores. As an aside, it was in this store, in 1913, that the company introduced the model of resupply slips in books(補充カード, *hojū kaado*), which has now become the industry standard.⁵¹⁾ At this point the stores purchased books through Maruzen or directly from publishers, magazines through Tôkyôdô(the distribution arm of Hakubunkan), or acquired general stock on buying trips to Japan by Hamai. In the spring

43) Kawahara, p.254.

44) Kawahara, pp.264-65.

45) Kawahara, p.282.

46) Kawahara, pp.272-74, pp.281-82.

47) Matsubara Ryôji 松原良治, ed., *Kinbunkai 80-nenshi: hitosuji no nagai michi* (金文堂八十年史・一筋の長い道), Kinbunkai, 1994.

48) Suzuki Tetsuzô(鈴木徹造), *Shuppan jinbutsu jiten*(出版人物事典), Tokyo: Shuppan Nyuusu, 1996, 243, presents a brief biography of Hamai, but the information here was drawn from Uchida Yūsuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai(sono 2)" *Shuppan kurabu dayori* 198, 1981. 7, pp.4-5.

49) *Manshū nippō* 満州日報, 1906. 1. 9.

50) *Manshū nichinichi* 満州日日, 1907. 3. 11.

51) "Keijō Ôsakayago no shin'an 'Hojū kaado' (京城大阪屋号の新案「補充カード」)," *Shoten bunka*(書店文化) 1, 1937. 10), p.8. Reproduced in Ôkubo Hisao, ed., *Shoseki zasshi-sho shiryô: Naichi, shokuminchi 1937-41*, vol. 1, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bumpokaku, 2004, p.30.

of 1911, Hamai opened a buying office in Tokyo to support this growing network. After this he opened stores in Lushun, Anshan, Shenyang, and Changchun(though the branches in Tieling and Liaoyang closed during this time.)

These were non-trivial concerns; according to Uchida Yūsuke, at their peaks the branches in Shenyang and Dalian alone sold 7000-8000 copies of the two most popular women's magazines each month.⁵²⁾ When the company opened a branch dedicated to *bunkobon*(文庫本) in Dalian, they had a standing order for 100 copies of each new release.⁵³⁾ By 1920 this operation had expanded to include book publishing. Their Chinese conversation texts were their best sellers. In 1942, they published a three-yeen, 287-page *Taiwan bungaku-shû*(台湾文学集), edited by Nishikawa Mitsuru(西川満), which contained essays, poems, fiction, and popular ethnography. Ôsakayagô was not alone: the Taipei branch of the Tôto Shoseki company, mentioned previously, published 70 titles.⁵⁴⁾ Having said this, there is some evidence that such books were often produced in very small runs, of 50-300 copies.⁵⁵⁾

It was around 1920 that Ôsakayagô began to expand their distribution operations, both increasing their own retail presence in the colonies(opening a store in Seoul, for example) and distributing to independent retailers throughout the colonies. This distribution grew until it was a dominant force in the circulation of Japanese-language texts throughout the colonies; almost every bookstore in the colonies dealt with them. Based on a 1936 catalog from Ôsakayagô and the 1935 and 1938 *Zenkoku Shoseki-gyô Kumiai-in meibô*(「全国書籍業組合員名簿」), the company distributed texts as a wholesaler to upwards to seventy retailers in Manchuria(and neighboring areas) and more than one hundred in Korea.⁵⁶⁾ Although the distributors Tokyodô, Hokuryûkan, and Tôkaidô were the dominant magazine distributors, books and textbooks

were mostly handled by Osakayagô's *gaichi*(外地)-specialized distributor in Nihonbashi.⁵⁷⁾ This dominance continued until the Nihon Shuppan Haikyû Kabushiki Kaisha(日本出版配給株式会社, Nippai) was formed in May 1941, unifying the more than 230 distributors throughout Japan.⁵⁸⁾ The government's goal with the creation of Nippai(and its subordinate partner in Manchuria, Manpai) was to eliminate all middlemen and create a single distribution system.⁵⁹⁾

VI. Bandô Kyôgo

One final company, Teikoku Tosho Fukyûkai(帝国図書普及会), and its founder, Bandô Kyôgo(阪東恭吾), deserve mention as they represent another important vehicle of text distribution through the empire: traveling booksellers and other occasional retailers.⁶⁰⁾ In September 1931, Bandô Kyôgo, a reseller of discounted books and magazines, was approached by representatives of the semi-governmental South Manchuria Railway Company to sell books throughout Korea and other locations where large numbers of SMR workers resided; according to Bandô, the company even paid to ship the stock.⁶¹⁾ His first trip, to Dalian in late 1931, was such a success that he decided to stop in Seoul and attempt to

57) Mochizuki Masaji(望月政治), *Wagakuni shuppanbutsu yushutsubutsu no rekishi* (わが国出版物輸出の歴史), Tokyo: Nihon Shuppan Boeki Kabushiki Kaisha, 1971, p.29.

58) Kawahara, p.280.

59) Hashimoto 567; See Hashimoto 566-606 for a full account of the company. For more on Manpai, see Mochizuki, p.33.

60) For more, see Edward Mack, "Marketing Japan's Literature in its 1930s Colonies," *Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand* 28:1/2(2004), pp. 134-41.

61) Different sources date the various trips differently, ranging from 1931 to 1933; I have yet been able to find any objective evidence to corroborate one date(or even to corroborate the claims that the trips took place at all.) As I note in the above article, the various sources that describe the activities of the company in the colonies all rely on Bandô's own accounts(made over a roughly fifty-year span). Having said this, I have corroborated(through newspaper advertisements, etc.) that the company existed and was involved in this sort of sales on the main islands.

52) Uchida Yūsuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyokai(sono 3)", p.5.

53) Uchida "(sono 3)", p.5.

54) Kawahara, pp.283-86.

55) Ikeda, "Taiwan dokushokai no kinjô."

56) Okita 2007, pp.178-80.

sell books there. That trip was so successful that he then took a stock of books to Taiwan, and then a larger supply on a multiple-stop excursion along the main rail line through Korea; he stopped along the way in Pusan, Taegu, Seoul, P'yôngyang, Sinûiju, and Andong; from there, his team split up, with Bandô going to Mukden(Shenyang) and some of his employees going to Inch'ôn. In subsequent trips, Bandô traveled to Qingdao, Shanghai, Changchun, and back to Taiwan. According to his accounts, he found an audience ravenous for discounted texts.

Bandô had been something of a visionary in his business, which originally had pulped old magazines and unsold books for their value as paper. Bandô was one of the first to recognize the potential market for texts that had not found buyers in the saturated core of the growing modern readership(urban, middle-class readers); specifically, he identified a potential readership that lacked a sizable disposable income and which resided not only in urban centers, but also in rural areas of Japan. It was a natural extension, then, for him to expand his reach to similar readers beyond the borders of the nation-state in an ongoing quest for new markets. Throughout the empire, Bandô's occasional markets attracted readers who found retail prices(especially the elevated *gaichi* fixed prices) prohibitive, at least partially. There is little doubt that many of these customers were native speakers such as those promised by the SMR representatives; at the same time, however, it seems likely that non-native readers also took advantage of these deals. Along these lines, it could be noted that the single best-selling book was Nakayama Kyûshirô(中山久四郎)'s *New Chinese-Japanese(Chinese Character) Dictionary*(新式漢和辭, *Shinshiki kan'wa jiten*, 1930), which had a list price of around 3 yen but which Bandô sold for 32 sen(90% off the original price).

Bandô was able to sell stock at these radical discounts because of

the newly expanded mass publishing industry.⁶²⁾ For the first time, books had become commodities, in that they were produced under the logic of mass production, according to which the benefits of volume in terms of availability and exposure came to outweigh the cost of unsold units. As a result of this business model, publishers began to find themselves with large quantities of returns(返品, *henpin*) and remainders(残本, *zanpon*), which their established distribution systems were not prepared to absorb efficiently. Companies such as the Teikoku Tosho Fukyûkai were established to profit from this situation, particularly after the one-yen book(*enpon*) boom that swept over the publishing industry between 1926-31.

The one-yen book boom started when the publishing company Kaizôsha announced in late 1926 that it would sell a multiple-volume *Complete Works of Contemporary Japanese Literature*(「現代日本文学全集」, *Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshû*) by subscription.⁶³⁾ The series ended up attracting something on the order of 240,000 subscribers at its peak, and led to a publishing boom in which nearly every major publisher produced similar series. In all, more than 300 series were published during those five or six years. The supply of books produced by the series, however, far outstripped the demand that existed within normal, domestic retail channels. Unsold books were then sold to companies like Teikoku Tosho Fukyûkai. One estimate is that the discount book industry absorbed 20,000,000 *enpon* volumes, which then took 7-8 years to sell.⁶⁴⁾ The majority of the books that Bandô sold during his travels were one-yen volumes, with Heibonsha's *Complete Works of Contemporary Popular Fiction*(「現代大衆文学全集」, *Gendai taishû bungaku zenshû*) being the most popular of these.

Retailers such as Bandô, as hard as they are to trace today, and the

62) For more on these anthologies, see Mack, *Manufacturing Modern Japanese Literature*.

64) Yagi Toshio 八木敏夫, ed., *Zenkoku shuppanbutsu oroshi shôgyô kyôdô kumiai sanjûnen no ayumi*(全国出版物卸商業協同組合三十年の歩み), Tokyo: Zenkoku Shuppanbutsu Orosi Shgyô Kyôdô Kumiai, 1981, p.45.

62) For more on these issues, see Edward Mack, *Manufacturing Modern Japanese Literature: Publishing, Prizes, and the Ascription of Literary Value*(forthcoming from Duke University Press).

distribution networks they created, though far less obvious than the established institutions of conventional research, must be considered when we think about the flow of Japanese-language texts from Tokyo into the provinces of the main islands and the various regions of the empire. In fact, in situations in which colonial subjects may have found themselves at economic disadvantage to their colonizers, it stands to reason that it would be these informal and occasional networks that would more readily serve their demand for texts.

It must also be noted that the flow of Japanese-language texts was not unidirectional. Okita dedicates a good deal of time to discussing the routine reverse exportation of used books; many of the individual accounts that he cites come from trips through the colonies by main island booksellers looking for deals.⁶⁵⁾ In addition, there seem to have been at least two exceptional situations in which the flow of Japanese-language books and magazines reversed dramatically, with texts flowing from the colonies back into the nation-state. The first of these was in the aftermath of the Great Kantô Earthquake of 1923, when fires following the earthquake led to a biblioclasm in Tokyo. Retail store inventory, private and public library collections, and publisher's stock were destroyed in staggering quantities, leading to a demand that I have described elsewhere as a "gravitational pull," bringing texts from throughout the country into Tokyo. There is some evidence that even at this early date, stock from abroad flowed back to the imperial metropole. The second occasion occurred after 1945, when the Japanese were forced to repatriate quickly. In Manchuria, for example, a company was set up in 1944 that bought Japanese books for 60 yen per 3.75 kilograms. The organization filled a warehouse, intending to export them to Japan at a profit after the war.⁶⁶⁾ Although demand for Japanese-language books and Japanese-language publishing continued in Taiwan after the war, many

of the companies were sold to Chinese investors and changed their names to sound more Chinese.⁶⁷⁾

VII. Non-Japanese Readership

While it is useful to establish that physical texts -books, magazines, and newspapers- were circulating outside of Japan, one pivotal question remains: who was reading these texts? Until we know that, it is very difficult to discuss the impact of Japanese-language texts outside of the main islands. Many of the existing Japanese-language sources tend to dismiss the possibility that non-native speakers were regular consumers of Japanese-language texts. Most presume that the readers were colonial government workers, employees of the South Manchurian Railway, and members of the Japanese military. The general attitude of the sources presented above resembles that of Matsumoto Shôhei(松本昇平), who was in charge of Tôkyôdô's operations in Korea and Manchuria in the 1930s. Matsumoto states quite clearly that despite the fact that the army kept this secret, very few Koreans could read *enpon* and that Japanese soldiers were the best customers.⁶⁸⁾ Data suggests, however, that this statement might tell us more about the specific focus of individuals like Matsumoto -who were, after all, businessmen- and less about the actual readership of texts.

For example, in his massive history of the publishing industry, *Nihon shuppan hanbaishi*(日本出版販売史), Hashimoto Motome(橋本求) briefly addresses the sale of Japanese-language texts outside of Japan, which he attributes both to the spread of Japanese education and to the relocation of large numbers of Japanese, thus implying that the texts

65) For example, Okita, 2007, 57n3, p.79, p.109, pp.142-43, and p.155.

66) Uchida "(sono 3)", p.6.

67) Kawahara, pp.288-89.

68) Matsumoto Shôhei松本昇平, *Gyômu nisshi yohaku: waga shuppan hanbai no gojûnen* (業務日誌余白: わが出版販売の五十年), Tokyo: Shinbunka Tsûshinsha, 1981, pp.74-75.

69) Hashimoto, p.123.

were consumed by both native and non-native speakers.⁶⁹⁾ Despite this nod to non-native speakers, the various individuals involved(including Hashimoto) in the 1964 history(largely an oral history of former publishing industry executives) pay the most attention to native speakers abroad. Unfortunately, non-native speakers are treated as not statistically or commercially significant by the contributors to the volume. Ôno Magohei, in fact, states that he had little hope they could cultivate a non-Japanese readership, and that bookstores overseas required a large Japanese population.⁷⁰⁾

The scholar Kawahara Isao, for his part, estimates that of the roughly 4.5 million non-Japanese living in Taiwan in 1932, around 22%(more than 1 million individuals) could understand Japanese. By 1941, this percentage had risen to 57%.⁷¹⁾ Kawahara believes, however, that non-Japanese readers did not make up a significant portion of the readership, arguing that not many Taiwanese had mastered Japanese.⁷²⁾ Having said that, Kawahara also notes that a tremendous demand for Japanese-language books was created when Taihoku Teikoku Daigaku (台北帝国大学) was established in 1928(and is now National Taiwan University); the same would have been true of the Keijô Teikoku Daigaku (京城帝国大学), which was established in 1924(and is now Seoul National University).⁷³⁾

The contemporary accounts gathered by Okita, almost entirely by professional booksellers who directly observed the markets at work, tell a mixed story. Below are four such accounts, in chronological order. The 1931 article by the bookseller Yanagida Bunjirô directly addressed the issue of non-native readers in Korea. Yanagida claimed that young people

with some means/free time do not read much, and when they do they only read new books; that most students do not have the luxury to read, and only buy textbooks and reference books; and that only a limited group of general citizens read, and they focus on novels and practical books. He adds that many readers simply rely on the Government General Library, which only cost 1 yen, 20 sen per year.⁷⁴⁾ A 1934 report by a Kyoto used bookseller describing a trip to Changchun stated that the reading population there, which was served by a library and three new bookstores, was made up of workers for the SMR(and few non-native readers, by implication.)⁷⁵⁾ According to a 1938 article, by the bookseller Noda Sukeyasu(野田祐康) of Ganshōdō(巖松堂), the market in Taiwan had long been very small, had only recently matured sufficiently to allow used bookstores, and was patronized only by a small number of *naichijin*. He added that even though Taiwanese(本島人, *hontojin*) had begun graduating from college and their level of education/cultivation was much higher, the market continued to depend on the roughly 250,000 [sic](310,777 in 1938) *naichijin*.⁷⁶⁾ Despite these negative appraisals, in the absence of native readers, a market seemed to remain. A description of 1946(published in 1950) describes the situation in Manchuria, saying that temporary bazaars had begun to spring up around the city. The author took a collection of Iwanami Shoten(岩波書店) books and was able to sell all of them to Manchurian customers.⁷⁷⁾ In the years following the war, local booksellers often bought the stocks of Japanese booksellers at deep discounts, suggesting that the companies perceived a continuing market of some size even after the Japanese had left.⁷⁸⁾

This leaves those limited to Japanese-language sources in a bind. While we might strongly suspect that the non-native readership of Japanese-language texts has been overlooked, or at least underestimated,

70) Hashimoto, pp.509-10.

71) Kawahara, p.265. Without belaboring the point here, it should be noted what an ambiguous claim "understand" represents. Whether this refers merely to spoken ability or includes literacy is unclear, much less what level of literacy this might entail.

72) Kawahara, p.250.

73) Kawahara, pp.269-70.

74) Okita, 2007, pp.67-68.

75) Okita, 2007, p.155.

76) Okita, 2007, pp.52-53.

77) Okita, 2007, p.169.

78) Okita, 2007, p.176.

we are left with few sources in Japanese that substantiate an alternate image. In other languages, however, the story is different. I have only had access to a limited amount of the ground-breaking scholarship of Ch'ôn Chông-hwan, but what I have read supports my suspicions.⁷⁹⁾ Ch'ôn describes a limited readership that took advantage of texts in multiple languages during the colonial period. According to him, as much as 90% of the population was illiterate in the 1920s, leaving only a small direct readership of texts in any language(though Ch'ôn goes to great length to note "indirect readers" who consumed texts through oral transmission); despite this, he notes that in 1930, 6.78% of the population could read both Japanese and Korean.⁸⁰⁾ Ch'ôn also notes the central role that Japanese-language texts played in the construction of an institution of literature in modern Korea.⁸¹⁾ The numbers he provides for Japanese-language texts coming into the country between 1921-30 are staggering: in 1929, for example, 2,410,321 non-Korean-language texts entered the country, with more than 98% of those being Japanese-language texts.⁸²⁾ Such research is extremely valuable for those of us who are limited to Japanese-language materials in trying to imagine a readership that is not coterminous with the ethnic nation.

VIII. Conclusion

In one sense, this returns us to the original problem, of precisely

who read the texts in which we invest so much energy. Given that we have this much difficulty establishing whether or not individuals had simple access to texts, it seems completely understandable that intrinsically oriented literary scholarship would arise, focusing on an imaginary ideal reader and avoiding the thorny question of what any historical individuals might have taken away from a given reading. At the same time, however, one might still wish to hazard an educated guess at consumption, if for no other reason than to disprove excessive claims of permeation or impact. Texts are circulating transnationally through reading populations, and these populations are not identical -spatially or ethnically- with any one nation. While texts bear an undeniable relation to the nation and the state -one can imagine the various implications of a Japanese-language text to a colonial subject, for example, whether or not that subject could read said text- that relation is multifaceted and historical, not monolithic or essential. As such, it behooves us to struggle to reconstruct the historical -and material- course of specific texts, rather than to presume any singular relation to a people, a state, a literary tradition, or any of the other interests in the service of which national literatures are so often placed.

What, then, are these Japanese-language texts, particularly the ones that circulated in Korea? While the magnitude of the ethnically Korean readership has yet to be clearly established, what is clear is that such readers did exist, whatever their percentage of the whole. Given this, then, these Japanese-language texts are simultaneously "Japanese literature"(marked by linguistic homogeneity, and spatial and ethnic heterogeneity) and "Korean literature"(marked by the inverse: spatial and ethnic homogeneity, and linguistic heterogeneity). There is no doubt that the nations of Korea and Japan profoundly influenced(and continued to influence) the extranational consumption of these Japanese-language texts, yet we must remember to historicize, rather than essentialize, that relationship between the text and it's readers, between literature and the nation; this might be possible by thinking not of reading "nations," but of historical communities of readers.

79) Cheon Jeong-hwan(천정환, Ch'ôn Chông-hwan), "The Process of the Formation and Diversification of the Readers of Korean Prose Fiction in the 1920's and 1930's," *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 15(December 2002), pp. 29-74. In Korean, see Ch'ôn Chông-hwan, *Kûndae ûi chaek ilkki: tokcha ûi tansaeng kwa Hanguk kûndae munhak*(Sôul-si: P'urûn Yôksa, 2003) and "Reading Books across the 'Korea/Tsushima Straight': Beyond Colonialism to Peaceful Acculturation" in Morii Masumi, ed., *The Materiality of Literature*, Tokyo: Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu, 2007, pp.86-99.

80) Cheon, 2002, pp.39-40.

81) Cheon, 2002, pp.57-58.

82) Cheon, 2007, p.90.

Bibliography

- Cheon Jeong-hwan(천정환, Ch' ōn Chōng-hwan), "The Process of the Formation and Diversification of the Readers of Korean Prose Fiction in the 1920's and 1930's," *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 15, December 2002.
- _____. *Kūndae ūi ch' aek ilkki: tokcha ūi t' ansaeng kwa Han'guk k ūndae munhak*, S?ul?si: Pūrun Yōksa, 2003.
- _____. "Reading Books across the 'Korea/Tsushima Straight': Beyond Colonialism to Peaceful Acculturation" in Morii Masumi, ed., *The Materiality of Literature*, Tokyo: Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu, 2007.
- Hashimoto Motome(橋本求), ed. *Nihon shuppan hanbai-shi*(日本出版販売史), Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1964.
- Hibi Yoshitaka(日比嘉高), "Nikkei Amerika imin issei no shinbun to bungaku (日系アメリカ移民一世の新聞と文学)," *Nihon bungaku*(日本文学) 53:11, November 2004.
- Kaneko Mitsuharu(金子光晴), *Dokurohai*(どくろ杯), Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1976.
- Kawahara Isao(河原功), *Taiwan shinbungaku undō to tenkai: Nihon bungaku to no setten*(台湾新文学運動の展開: 日本文学との接点), Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan, 1997.
- Keene, Donald, *Dawn to the West*, vol. 2, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1984.
- Mack, Edward, *Manufacturing Modern Japanese Literature: Publishing, Prizes, and the Ascription of Literary Value*, forthcoming from Duke University Press.
- _____. "Marketing Japan's Literature in its 1930s Colonies," *Bulletin of the Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand* 28:1/2, 2004.
- _____. "Tekusuto no aidentitii, arui wa, tekusuto no sōkansei ni kansuru disukuuru(テキストのアイデンティティー、或は、テキストの相関性に関するディスコース)" and "Textual Identity: Discourses of Textual Interrelation," Morii Masumi 森井マサミ ed., *The Materiality of Literature*, Tokyo: Nihon Daigaku Bunri Gakubu, 2007.
- Matsubara Ryōji(松原良治), ed., *Kinbunkai 80-nenshi: hitosuji no nagai michi*(金文会八十年史・一筋の長い道), Kinbunkai, 1994.
- Matsumoto Shōhei(松本昇平), *Gyōmu nisshi yohaku: waga shuppan hanbai no gojūnen*(業務日誌余白: わが出版販売の五十年), Tokyo: Shinbunka Tsūshinsha, 1981.
- Mochizuki Masaji (望月政治), *Wagakuni shuppanbutsu yushutsubutsu no rekishi*(わが国出版物輸出の歴史), Tokyo: Nihon Shuppan Boeki Kabushiki Kaisha, 1971.
- Naikaku Tōkei-kyoku(内閣統計局), ed., *Dai Nihon teikoku t?kei nenkan*(大日本帝国統計年鑑) 518, 1939.
- Oda Mitsuo(小田光雄), *Shoten no kindai: hon ga kagayaite ita jidai*(書店の近代: 本が輝いていた時代), Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2003.
- Okita Shin'etsu(沖田伸悦), *Shokuminchi jidai no furuhon'ya?tachi: Karafuto Chōsen Taiwan Mansh? Ch?ka minkoku k?haku no shominshi*(植民地時代の古本屋たち), Sapporo: Jurōsha, 2007.
- Okita Shin'etsu, "Gaichi ni watatta furuhon'ya-tachi(外地に渡った古本屋たち)," *Zen Kosho Ren nyūsu* 385-92, March 2005-May 2006.
- Ōkubo Hisao and Fukushima Jūrō, eds., *Shoseki zasshi-shō shiryō: naichi, shokuminchi, 1937-41*, vol. 2, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bunpokaku, 2004.
- Ōkubo Hisao and Fukushima Jūrō, eds., *Shoseki zasshi-shō shiryō: Naichi, shokuminchi 1937-41*, vol. 1, Kanazawa: Kanazawa Bunpokaku, 2004.
- Ōta Naoki(太田尚樹), *Densetsu no Nicchū bunka saron: Shanhai Uchiyama Shoten*(伝説の日中文化サロン上海・内山書店), Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2008.
- Ozaki Hotsuki(尾崎秀樹), *Shanghai 1930 nen* 上海 1930年, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989.

- Shôji Tokutarô(荏司徳太郎) and Shimizu Bunkichi(清水文吉), *Nippai jidai-shi: Gendai shuppan ryûtsû no genten*(日配時代史—現代出版流通), Tokyo: Shuppan Nyuusu?sha, 1980.
- St. Clair, William, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Suzuki Tetsuzô(鈴木徹造), *Shuppan jinbutsu jiten*(出版人物事典), Tokyo: Shuppan Nyuusu, 1996.
- Takahashi Masami, "Shuppan ryûtsû kikô no henshen: 1603-1945," *Shuppan kenkyû* 13, 1982.
- Uchida Yûsuke(内田勇輔), "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai(ぶらり散策・私の出版業界) (sono 3)" *Shuppan kurabu dayori* (出版クラブだより) 199, August 1981.
- Uchida Yûsuke, "Burari sansaku: Watashi no shuppan gyôkai (sono 2)" *Shuppan kurabu dayori* 198, July 1981.
- Uchiyama Kanzô(内山完造), *Kakôroku*(花甲録), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960.
- Wada Atsuhiko(和田敦彦), *Shomotsu no Nichibeï kankei: riterashii-shi ni mukete* (書物の日米関係:リテラシー史に向けて), Tokyo: Shinchôsha, 2007.
- Wellek, René, and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1956.
- Yagi Toshio 八木敏夫, ed., *Zenkoku shuppanbutsu oroshi shôgyô kyôdô kumiai sanjunen no ayumi* (全国出版物卸商業協同組合三十年の歩み), Tokyo: Zenkoku Shuppanbutsu Oroshi Shôgyô Kyôdô Kumiai, 1981.

Abstract

The Extranational Flow of Japanese-Language Texts, 1905-1945

Edward Mack

This paper surveys some of the major resources that exist in Japanese on the history of publishing regarding the circulation of Japanese-language texts during the years 1905-45, with the goal of identifying the market for these texts throughout the Japanese empire.

This survey shows that a significant market existed for these texts outside of the current nation-state. At the same time, the paper speculates on the presence of non-ethnically "Japanese" readers, identifying apparent biases in the Japanese-language scholarship on the matter. The goal of this survey is to problematize a view of texts that identifies them solely or simply with the nation, rather than attempting to reconstruct the heterogeneous communities of their readers.

Key Words: distribution of texts, national literatures, non-native readers, colonial readerships, transnational readerships, material history of literature, historical reception of texts

국문요약

일제 강점기 일본어 텍스트의 국외 유통

에드워드 맥

본 논문은 일제시대 식민지의 일어 텍스트 유통 정도를 조사하기 위하여 1905~1945사이에 일본어로 출판된 텍스트들의 유통, 출판역사에 관해 쓰인 주요 일어 자료들을 고찰해 본다. 본 논문은 이러한 텍스트가 단순히 국가라 불리울 수 있는 범위 밖의 상당히 큰 시장에서 유통되었다는 것을 보여줌과 동시에 비일본 독자의 존재 여부를 시사하고, 이에 관한 일본어 학자들의 명백한 편견을 지적한다. 본 논문의 목적은 다양하고 헤테로지니어스한 독자사회를 재구성하기보다는 텍스트를 유일하게 또는 단순히 내이션과 동일시하는 시각의 문제점을 지적하는 데 있다.

핵심어: 텍스트의 배포, 국민(민족) 문학, 비원어민 독자, 식민지적 독자성(讀者性) 트랜스내셔널 독자성(讀者性), 문학의 물질 역사, 텍스트의 역사적 수용

• 접수 2009년 2월 28일 • 심사 2009년 3월 10일~30일 • 게재결정 2009년 4월 25일

사이間SAI 제6호 _ 별쇄본

**The Extranational Flow of
Japanese-Language Texts, 1905-1945**

Edward Mack

2009. 5.

국제한국문학문화학회(INAKOS)
International Association of Korean Literary and Cultural Studies