

優秀修士論文概要

A Study of *Pygmalion*

Eri OHASHI

Introduction

Pygmalion (1916) is one of the most successful works by George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950). This thesis examines Eliza's role in *Pygmalion* when the play is interpreted as a Christmas pantomime. When *Pygmalion* was first published in English in 1916, Shaw added a sequel stating that Eliza married Freddy rather than Higgins, and this ending strongly emphasised the difference from the London premiere in 1914. Shaw revised the text again in 1941 for the 1938 film adaptation. These revisions provide deeper characterisation that supports the further interpretations. Charles A. Berst and other scholars often describe *Pygmalion* as a *Cinderella* story, with Eliza transforming from a street flower girl into an elegant lady (5). This transformation is close to Shaw's concept of the superman, who often appears in various Shaw plays. His passion for social reform, especially regarding the working class and women's rights, is distinctive throughout his superman characters. According to Tatsuo Yamamoto, a superman possesses a Puritan spirit's self-reliance and self-reflection and lives a disciplined life without expressing hardships (40). In *Pygmalion*, Yoshikazu Shimizu considers Higgins as a superman (186). Most of the superman-represented characters are men, but is it possible to divide a woman's and man's roles in Shaw's works? Shaw's passion creates attractive characters who reform society, regardless of sex. This thesis attempts to conclude by re-examining Higgins's and Eliza's positions as superman in *Pygmalion*.

1. Eliza as Cinderella

Chapter 1 examines the correspondences between *Pygmalion* and *Cinderella* and investigates how Shaw employs elements of *Cinderella* in his work. *Pygmalion* has a similar structure and implications to *Cinderella*; *Pygmalion* can be seen as Eliza's success story. Eliza is forced to work without her reliable family, and the extraordinary events brought her a new idea. In addition to the similarities with *Cinderella*, *Pygmalion* shows Eliza as a spiritually independent character who possesses high ambitions, even economically independent before her transformation. Eliza establishes the world of *Pygmalion* by herself, not love and romance like *Cinderella*. The other elements of *Cinderella* work irony in *Pygmalion*. Eliza's achievements in her speech and manners are due to her efforts, not supernatural power. When Eliza returns from the ambassador's garden party, the clock strikes twelve. Higgins shouts, "[t]hank God it's over!" (Shaw 74), and then Eliza turns "stonily" (Shaw 74), which

reminds us of Galatea. In *Pygmalion*, Higgins shapes and breathes life into Galatea until Act 3. However, the irony lies in that he transforms her back into stone. The glass slippers that Eliza throws at Higgins are supposed to symbolise marriage in *Cinderella*, but in *Pygmalion*, they lead to her rejection of marriage to him and her declaration of marriage to the unemployed, poor Freddy. Even though she ascends in class, she cannot escape from labour, unlike Cinderella, whose marriage frees her from labour. After becoming a lady, she realises she possesses nothing except herself, but self-respect. All these differences and implications highlight Eliza's hardships as a woman, but she does not show distress about working or making efforts to support herself, unlike typical Victorian women.

Doolittle also has elements of the *Cinderella* story, which emphasises Eliza's character. The more challenging Eliza's work on her transformation becomes, the easier Doolittle's class ascension seems. Doolittle complains about middle-class morality, arguing that middle-class gentlemen are surrounded by duties and must live for others. While Doolittle decides to marry for appearance, Eliza, as a middle-class lady, has only marriage for survival. Even though their attitudes toward marriage differ, the loss of Doolittle's freedom emphasises the irony of *Cinderella's* dream.

However, the main element of *Pygmalion* is not the marriage but the romance as fiction. *Pygmalion* has the subtitle, "a Romance in Five Acts." *Pygmalion* is constructed by five fictional acts about Eliza's transformation, focusing on Eliza's unwomanly and Freddy's unmanly aspects. As *Cinderella* was a well-known theme in Christmas pantomimes, a gender-reversed popular tradition, *Pygmalion* incorporated elements of *Cinderella* to break the stereotypes of traditional gender roles.

2. Eliza as Harlequin

Chapter 2 explores *Pygmalion* within the framework of a Christmas pantomime structure. Christmas pantomimes were the popular theatrical form with moral lessons for middle-class families and were commercially successful during Shaw's lifetime. Some researchers, such as David Mayer, point out the influence of Christmas pantomimes in Shaw's works, but Mayer misses *Pygmalion*. In other words, there is a gap for further research. Victorian Christmas pantomimes were typically divided into two scenes: a pantomime and a harlequinade. The two scenes are connected to Harlequin's magic of transformation. *Pygmalion* represents not only Eliza's transformation but also the play's structure; Acts 1 to 3 are seen as a *Cinderella* pantomime, and Acts 4 to 5 are seen as a harlequinade. Acts 1 to 3 of *Pygmalion* could be considered a success story of *Cinderella*, a common theme in Christmas pantomimes. One of the traditions of Christmas pantomimes is cross-dressing. Eliza plays Cinderella in Acts 1 to 3 as the principal girl. Although her exterior is female, her interior is cross-dressed as her corrected speech by Higgins develops her masculinity. Even though Eliza demonstrates strong communication skills, her Cockney accent leads middle-class men to consider her ignorant and childish. Eliza physically transforms into a lady and "cross-dresses" her way of speaking; in other words, like characters in Christmas pantomimes, Eliza's inner and outer gender become unmatched. The gap between exterior and interior falls on Eliza, an outsider of British society.

Acts 4 and 5 represent a harlequinade, with Eliza playing the role of Harlequin since her throw-

ing of the slippers causes the end of *Cinderella*. In the sense that Harlequin traditionally creates the transformation scene himself, Eliza could be read as fulfilling this role. The harlequinade part of *Pygmalion* shows an irony of Ovid's *Pygmalion* myth, revealing that Higgins's ideal woman is different from what Eliza wants to be. Instead, Eliza establishes her own ideal and transforms herself. Following the traditional harlequinade pattern, Eliza escapes from Higgins, just as Harlequin traditionally escapes from Clown. Eliza transforms both herself and the play's structure with Harlequin's magical power. The argument between Eliza and Higgins passes each other by because Higgins does not recognise that his ideal woman is already gone. When the ideal woman, Galatea, is seen as Columbine, Eliza takes her away from Higgins when she escapes. The relationship between Eliza and Higgins in Acts 4 and 5 reflects the escape-and-chase motif common in traditional harlequinades.

There may be another reason behind the utilisation of Christmas pantomimes in *Pygmalion*. According to Jim Davis, Christmas pantomimes were often used in British society's political propaganda with a conservative message (8-9). Therefore, Shaw attempts to critique the stereotypes, traditions, and conservative influence of Christmas pantomimes as a means of social reform.

3. Eliza as Trickster

Chapter 3 examines the effect of transformation in *Pygmalion*. Through Eliza's transformation, various social boundaries are unveiled, including linguistic hierarchies, gender constraints, and traditional class distinctions. First, the relationship between Eliza and Higgins highlights the linguistic hierarchical boundary that deepens the spiritual divides. As Higgins explains, "[i]t's filling up the deepest gulf that separates class from class and soul from soul" (Shaw 65), linguistic differences represent more than pronunciation. Second, the interaction between Eliza and Clara exposes the social boundary for women. As Eliza's behaviour shocks Clara, Clara transforms from a passive girl into an active New Woman. Ann Heilmann defines the New Woman as a social phenomenon that represents women as highly educated, ambitious, and having feminist convictions, especially among middle-class (Heilmann ix). Clara starts to work, speaks up despite being mocked, and gets out of upper-class customs. Third, the marriage of Eliza and Freddy reveals the boundaries of traditional class distinction and gender limitation. While Freddy, a poor upper-class gentleman, lacks the background for working, Eliza does not hesitate to work. As the sequel describes, both open their own store and transcend the customs boundaries, even though working is not considered suitable for Eliza as a middle-class woman. Thus, as Harlequin, Eliza not only helps others unveil or overcome the boundaries but also creates her own position. She faces the reality that she is an outcast in British society due to the contradiction between her working-class origins and upper-class speech, which leads her to establish her own position to maintain her self-respect.

Eliza's actions resonate with the role of the trickster who can cross boundaries and blur borders. According to Lewis Hyde, a trickster is given something valuable, but a restriction is imposed on its use. As time passes, a trickster eventually breaks the restriction due to hunger, and as a result, loses many things (Hyde 40). Comparing Eliza to the trickster's actions reveals that she values a respectful

mindset. She remembers that when Pickering called her "Miss Doolittle," it was "the beginning of self-respect for [her]" (Shaw 95), and she realises that respecting others and oneself is significant. However, care work is imposed on her to maintain this sense of value; she works as a maid at Higgins's place in addition to her lessons. Then, she develops a desire to be respected as an individual. The desire to be treated with kindness, not as a servant or a working-class girl. Although she tries to break the restriction by escaping from Higgins, she ultimately has to accept that the relationship between Higgins and Eliza never changes. As a trickster, Eliza unveils the social limitations that confine her and instead creates her own position.

While Eliza transforms herself, Higgins does not. This suggests that Eliza, rather than Higgins, embodies the superman figure that often appears in Shaw's works. Thus, the statement that the definition of superman can be applied to Higgins based on previous research is debatable as Higgins does not accomplish creating a new notion. As Pygmalion, Higgins becomes obsessed with an ideal woman, which is connected to Carl Jung's concept of the Great Mother Archetype. A Great Mother Archetype is interpreted as motherhood, representing the idealised female figure (Jung 108). While Eliza is created as the ideal woman in Galatea by Higgins, she transcends this role by becoming a trickster and breaking the Great Mother Archetype. This transformation represents a departure from the traditional *Pygmalion* narrative and demonstrates Eliza's success in breaking free from prescribed the Great Mother Archetype. The difference between them lies in their self-awareness. Although Higgins accepts Eliza's transformation, he does not tolerate the change in the circumstances. As previously discussed, Eliza has already taken away Galatea, and the Great Mother Archetype is disappeared. On the contrary, Higgins is a clown who assumes himself to be a godlike creator figure. While Eliza accepts her position as an outsider in British society, Higgins merely recognises her change without understanding how to create a new social order.

Conclusion

This research may extend the possibilities of Shaw's further studies, especially Shaw's other free and independent female characters. Shaw's superman figure does not exclude the female characters. Through the representation of *Pygmalion* as a Christmas pantomime, Eliza plays the roles of Cinderella, Harlequin, and a trickster. She transforms not only herself but also the stage setting as an outsider. The androgynous aspect not only encourages women's rights but also paves the way for changes.

Works Cited

- Berst, Charles A. *Pygmalion: Shaw's Spin on Myth and Cinderella*. Twayne Publishers, 1995.
- Davis, Jim, editor. *Victorian Pantomime: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Heilmann, Ann, editor. *The Late-Victorian Marriage Question: A Collection of Key New Woman Texts*. Routledge / Thoemmes Press, 1998.
- Hyde, Lewis. *Trickster Makes This World*. 1998. Translated by Chikai Ito, et al., Hosei UP, 2005.

A Study of *Pygmalion*

- Jung, Carl Gustav. 元型論 [*Genkeiron; The Theory of Archetypes*]. Translated by Michiyoshi Hayashi, 紀伊國屋書店, 1999.
- Mayer, David. "The Case for Harlequin: A Footnote on Shaw's Dramatic Method." *Modern drama*, 1960-05, vol. 3, no. 1, 1961, pp. 60-74.
- Shaw, George Bernard. *Pygmalion*. 1916. Penguin Books, 2000.
- Shimizu, Yoshikazu. バーナード・ショー ファンタジーの世界：ワーグナーからサルトルまで [*Bernard Shaw Fantasy no Sekai: Wagner kara Sartre made; Bernard Shaw The World of Fantasy: From Wagner to Sartre*]. 文化書房博文社, 2001.
- Yamamoto, Tatsuo. バーナード・ショー：虚構と現実 [*Bernard Shaw: Kyoko to Genjitsu; Bernard Shaw: Fantasy and Reality*]. 開文社出版, 1981.

優秀修士論文概要

Different Loyalties in *Richard II* and *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2* — Priorities That Outweigh the Divine Right

Shiyu GUI

Shakespeare's history plays have drawn significant attention from scholars; their profound engagement with power struggles, human nature, and gender awareness has made substantial contributions to the field. However, research focusing on the theme of loyalty between the king and the subjects remains relatively sparse. In Shakespeare's history plays, people from both high and low class have their own priorities, which often outweigh their loyalty to the king.

The historical background undoubtedly influenced the creation of contemporary plays; while the Queen in the real world was yearning for loyalty from her citizens, one of the most famous playwrights in London was composing works filled with betrayers and rebellions. Elizabeth I demanded loyalty from anyone who received 'your highness's fee or wages within this realm' (Stephenson 345) through the re-enacted *Act of Supremacy*. One reason the Queen placed such emphasis on securing loyalty was that she had once been declared illegitimate after her mother Anne Boleyn's execution. Also, her gender would not have any positive effect on her authority. Furthermore, Elizabeth I cut ties with the Catholic Church which made by her predecessor Mary I, asserting her own supremacy over the English Church. Towards the end of Elizabeth I's reign, concerns about legitimacy and authority gradually gave way to speculations about her successor. Supporters of the Catholic Church likely found a convenient pretext to express their expectations for a Catholic king as a successor. The succession crisis emerged in 1590s—the very period when history plays flourished. Additionally, following the victory over Spain in 1587, the London audiences had developed a strong desire for war scenes on stage (Gurr 161). Although censorship grew increasingly strict, the history plays nonetheless thrived in the public theatre, and faded away with the Queen's death at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

Rebellions recur both in history and on the stage. Loyalty has long been regarded as a noble and honourable virtue; yet in practice, it often goes astray. Debates about whether loyalty is present or absent become pointless; every character has their own position and justifications for interpreting loyalty as they wish. Loyalty to the king forms an essential aspect of a subject's identity within a monarchical framework, it is usually advantageous and necessary for subjects to pledge loyalty to the king. But the nature of this interaction is inherently ambiguous, as the king and the subject are not always conduct this in a reciprocal way.

Richard II provides compelling material through which to show these conflicting interpretations, especially for the question of whether subjects should stay loyal when the throne is occupied by a

tyrant. Shakespeare's depictions of tyrants share mutual traits with that of early modern scholars, who borrowed largely from medieval thought. In *Chapter Seven* and *Chapter Eight* of *De Republica Anglorvm*, Thomas Smith identifies three key traits of a tyrant: first, a tyrant does not seek or respect the counsel of open advisors or the representative bodies of people like the Parliament, preferring the advice of private favourites; second, a tyrant exploits and oppresses the people through excessive taxation, confiscation of property, and other abuses of power, leading to widespread suffering and poverty; third, a tyrant acts arbitrarily, ignoring established laws and prioritising their personal will over justice, thereby destabilising the legal order (Smith 6-9). John Fortescue, a medieval jurist, shares similar opinions; additionally, he asserts that it is a disgrace for a citizen to honour a poor king, and an even greater disgrace for a king to reduce a wealthy nation to poverty (Fortescue 139).

King Richard II in Shakespeare's play embodies all of the tyrants traits. Yet his abdication is due not only to tyranny, but also to his misguided confidence in the doctrine of the divine right. He holds as absolute the theological argument that the king is Christ's substitute on earth, and this existence outside both the law and constitution—this 'substitute' status—defines the king's very *Being* (Kantorowicz 58), equating him entirely with God. A dramatised medieval king would well have believed that his subjects possessed an innate knowledge of how to obey; early modern English audiences would have been familiar with *The Homilie against Disobedience and Wylfull Rebellion* (1571), which was presented to congregations in English churches, telling people the orderly creation of heaven and earth and the universal establishment of obedience (Campbell 216-17).

However, the king must understand that the divine right has to be upheld through action, it is not something that all citizens instinctively or completely believe. Within *Richard II*, the King's subjects represent a range of attitudes. There are constant loyalists like Bishop of Carlisle and John of Gaunt, who fully embrace the doctrine of the divine right just like the king himself. But there are also pragmatic realists like Duke of York, Scroop, Aumerle, as well as open challengers like Bolingbroke and his supporters, recognising that the King's power is not absolute but bound by the law. Although the king's body politic is seen as immortal and as divine as God, his body natural remains secular and subject to legal constraints. Richard II's voluntary abdication, though seemingly humble, constitutes a profound violation of both law and divine duty. Bolingbroke catches the moment's political vulnerability and Richard's fall from power, seizing the throne with precise calculation.

Assessing this transfer of power from the perspective of the English commonwealth, one may contend that Bolingbroke's actions do not necessarily signify a loss of loyalty. While Richard II perceives his kingship as unbreakable and keeps a deliberate distance from the lower classes, Bolingbroke adopts a contrasting demeanour. He presents himself with humility and kindness—one of the strategies Bolingbroke uses to construct his legitimacy and maintain his authority. This can be found both in historical records and in Shakespeare's history play texts: one of the most effective ways for a king (or a prince) to win the loyalty of the subjects is not to isolate himself from them. Historically, Henry IV was often victorious in the tournaments during his time as the Duke of Hereford;

Different Loyalties in *Richard II* and *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*
— Priorities That Outweigh the Divine Right

in *Richard II*. When the King discusses Bolingbroke with his favourites, he says, '[o]rself and Bushy, Bagot here and Green /Observed his courtship to the common people— /How he did seem to dive into their hearts /With humble and familiar courtesy' (*R2* 1.4.23-26). Later, when Bolingbroke has become the King, he tells Prince Hal, '[o]pinion, that did help me to the crown, /Had still kept loyal to possession' (*IH4* 3.2.42-43). However, after his coronation in 1399, the real Henry IV no longer entered the tiltyard, and Shakespeare's character Henry IV never leaves the court except to suppress the rebellions. A performative personality is often a practical strategy for a king—or even a pretender to gather loyalty from the people. Henry IV also admits that he 'stole all courtesy from heaven' and dressed himself 'in such humility,' so effectively that he 'did pluck allegiance from men's heart' (*IH4* 3.2.50-52).

Another essential prerequisite for Henry IV's seizure of the throne is his royal background. Medieval England operated under a feudal system with a strict hierarchical structure in which the king was at the summit of the whole society. Kings regularly invoked loyalty from their subjects, especially those with esteemed titles such as dukes, who were among the highest-ranking nobles and held significant territories, which granted them semi-autonomous power and a degree of independence in managing local affairs. Thus, by virtue of their status, the dukes held considerable military power and influence in their own right. At the same time, the dukes also received their titles and territories through royal grants, which came with obligations which included the provision of military support to the king if needed and the contribution to the overall stability of the kingdom. Though such a power could also pose a great threat to the kingship, most of the nobles did not attempt to claim the crown for themselves, but instead chose to find another royal member as pretender to replace the current king. Northumberland, Ross, and Willoughby in *Richard II*, as well as Hotspur, Glendower and other objectors to the King in *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*, all form alliances out of mutual interests in the same way—by selecting another royal prince and making him king.

Nevertheless, Henry IV is eventually betrayed by the very alliances that once made him king. People of higher social rank are often more self-directed in choosing in who their loyalty should be placed than those from the lower class—but it does not mean loyalty to the king is absent. Loyalty exists in every stratum of society, but undeniably, the further one is from the court, the more fragile loyalty becomes. The Gardener and the Groom in *Richard II* are part of the court, which may explain why they are not entirely indifferent to the fate of the King. The Gardener's tone of condemnation when comparing his own gardening to the ruler's mismanagement shows his dissatisfaction with Richard II's governance. According to Elizabethan law, his complaint against the King's misrule and discussion of the King's deposition could already have been considered an attempt at treason. However, his actual thoughts are not directly expressed here. Shakespeare may have hinted at the ambiguity in the Queen's lines, drawing an analogy between the Gardener and Adam. The Gardener seems to prefer a powerful king rather than a rightful king. In contrast, the Groom reflects a clearer stance that he is loyal to the rightful king. His consistent loyalty in both the past and present perhaps comes from a personal belief in the king's divine right. Ironically, it is precisely this pure belief in the

sacredness of the monarchy that leads many of Richard II's supporters to allow his lawless behaviour to go unchecked, ultimately contributing to his downfall.

For ordinary citizens without ties to the court, the king is often a remote, almost mythical figure; episodes in the court are like performances on the stage. Most common people never see their king in their lifetime. This is why Henry V in disguise can easily elicit honest opinions from ordinary soldiers before the battle of Agincourt. It is difficult for people to form personal attachments to individuals they have never met. The king as a relatively exceptional existence, can only connect with the common people through religion. Even so, loyalty is almost invisible when it extends to the lower classes. In *Henry IV Part 2*, only one out of every five yeomen on the farm is willing to join the military and fight for the king; alewives usually brew beer for the neighbourhood where the tavern is; Mistress Quickly probably cares more about the acquaintances in her tavern than the people in the court.

This study analyses loyalty within a literature-history framework, combining Shakespeare's original texts with historical facts and sources to explore the complexity and significance of Shakespeare's *Richard II* and *Henry IV Parts 1 and 2*. The late medieval and early modern social and political structure was hierarchical; individuals were often bound by allegiance to regional lords and nobility, who reciprocally pledged loyalty to the king. However, everyone has their own priorities which may make people ignore or abandon their duties. Nevertheless, most of the citizens are not unwilling to obey; a competent and reliable king and a country with stable social mechanisms will not lead to constant regime changes, let alone continuous civil wars. Many studies have discussed whether Shakespeare's history plays mirror Elizabethan English society, but whether they are a metaphor or not, it is likely that most contemporary audiences at the time would have hoped that the wars they saw would stay only in the theatre.

Work Cited

- Campbell, Lily B. *Shakespeare's Histories: Mirrors of Elizabethan Policy*. The Huntington Library, 1968.
- Fortescue, John. *The Governance of England*. Edited by Charles Plummer, Clarendon, 1885.
- Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Kantorowicz, Ernst. *The King's Two Bodies*. Princeton UP, 1957.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*. Edited by Charles R. Forker, Bloomsbury, 2009.
- . *King Henry IV PART 1*. Edited by David Scott Kastan, The Arden Shakespeare, 2002.
- . *King Henry IV PART 2*. Edited by James C. Bulman, Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Smith, Thomas. *De Republica Anglorvm*. Henrie Midleton for Gregorie Seton, 1584. <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=MOME&u=waseda&id=GALE%7CU0100050110&v=2.1&it=r>.
- Stephenson, Carl, and Friderick George Marcham, editor and translator. *Sources of English Constitutional History: A Selection of Documents from A.D. 600 to the Interregnum*. New York: Harper&Row, 1972.

優秀修士論文概要

キャサリン・マンズフィールドと第一次世界大戦

長 南 直 弥

本論文は、イギリスの盛期モダニズムを代表するニュージーランド出身の短編作家キャサリン・マンズフィールド (Katherine Mansfield, 1888-1923) の後期作品のうち、詩1篇 (“To L. H. B.” [1915]) と短編4篇 (“Bank Holiday” [1920]、“Prelude” [1918]、“At the Bay” [1922]、“The Fly” [1922]) を、第一次世界大戦という歴史的暴力の痕跡を介して戦争国家体制を批判する戦略的实践として読む試みである。マンズフィールドの1914年以降の後期作品と戦争との関連は、1990年代以降、女性作家の戦争表象を再評価するフェミニスト大戦文学批評と、暴力による心的打撃の認識を精緻化したトラウマ理論を援用した研究で論じられてきた。本論文は、両者を継承しながらも、主体に把握不可能な過去を埋め込むトラウマではなく、主体を共同体の暴力からの脱却へ導く過去の痕跡の役割に着目する。すなわち、マンズフィールドにとって日常に刻まれた暴力の痕跡は、戦争国家の矛盾を露呈させ、人々に体制への従属を拒否するための契機を与えるものだと論じる。

序章では1919年の書簡と書評を検討し、マンズフィールドが、大戦の暴力の直接的表現よりも、暴力がもたらす事後的な痕跡の表現を重視していたと指摘する。マンズフィールドは書簡で大戦に対する作家の応答責任を語る一方、後期作品では大戦への明示的な言及をほとんど行わなかった。これが意図的戦略だったことはすでに指摘されてきたが、その内実は十分に論じられてこなかった。その戦略の一端は、ヴァージニア・ウルフ (Virginia Woolf, 1882-1941) の長編 *Night and Day* (1919) を批評した書簡と書評に垣間見られる。マンズフィールドは *Night and Day* の語りを持つ同時代の現実から遊離したトーンを批判し、作品を帰還する超然とした船に見立て、その船体には傷が見られないと形容する。傷のない船は、大戦がもたらした事後的な心理変化への関心の欠如の風刺的表現となっている。戦後のマンズフィールドは物語を、痕跡を介して大戦の暴力を認識し直す試みとして捉えようとしていた。

こうした作家の態度を踏まえ、第1部では、戦後社会の日常に残存する暴力の痕跡を多面的に示す作品群を論じる。第1章は、未発表詩 “To L. H. B.” を、愛する者の死を肉体の痕跡のリアリティに具現化させようと試みたエレジーとして読む。この詩の宛先となっている作家の弟は1915年に西部戦線での従軍中に手榴弾の爆発で事故死した。詩の語り手が見た夢の中で、語り手と幼い弟が歩く庭は作家の幼少期の記憶と結びついた幸福な楽園だが、同時に弟が死ぬ戦場でもある。弟が触れる瞬間に光を放つベリーは、弟の手の中で暴発した手榴弾に擬せられる。語り手は夢から覚めると、弟がベリーを差し出し、“These are my body. Sister, take and eat” と語りかける幻を夢想する (*Poetry and Critical Writings* 96)。密集する赤いベリーは、粉々になった弟の肉片の触覚的リアリティを代理表象している。先行研究は聖餐の言葉に死者である弟との交感を読み取ってきたが、弟の声は語り手の切望が生み出した幻聴であり、実際には弟の肉は体内化されない。弟の死は、聖なる犠牲として抽象化されないことで、記憶に結びついた固有のリアリティを有する痕跡として残存するのだ。

第2章は、短編“Bank Holiday”を、戦後の国家の統合・発展を支える祝祭を批判し、反復する日常に内在する死の痕跡を描く作品として読む。マンスフィールドは、1918年7月の書簡で、平和記念日の準備で華やぐロンドンが、死を発展の契機へと読み替える国家の欲望を露呈させていると嘆く。また同時期の別の書簡では、非日常の逸楽に耽る祝祭よりも、凡庸な日常の反復にこそ戦後の表現の可能性が見定められる。“Bank Holiday”はこの祝祭批判と日常性重視の物語的实践と読める。祝日の群衆が密集し、太陽の熱と音楽に浮かされて丘の頂上へ向かう光景は、総力戦から解放された市民がすぐさま戦後再建のプロジェクトへと動員される社会変化の皮肉な戯画である。また、群衆の蠢きには破綻と衰弱のイメージが与えられ、戦後の統合や発展の理想が挫折し暴力が回帰する未来を予感させる。そして、祝祭の高揚感に裂け目を入れるような個人の負の感情も描かれている。人相学者を前にした兵士たちは、禁じられた庭に侵入したことを詰問されている子供の如く恥じ入る。彼らは自身の過去の罪を想起し、祝祭が隠蔽する国家の暴力性に内省的に思い至っているのだ。また、苺を勧める兵士の剥き出しの歯に怯える少女は、饗宴の共同体が熱狂的に一つになることの暴力性を察知する。暴力の痕跡を感じ取る日常の知覚が、国家統合の装置たる祝祭の安定性を内から崩す手段として示されている。

第3章では、戦後唯一の明示的な戦争テキストである短編“The Fly”が、戦後追悼文化の隠蔽する国家の残酷な暴力性を露わにした作品であると論じる。息子を戦争で亡くした社長は六年の間、生前と変わらぬ汚れない体で永遠の眠りにつく息子の姿を想像してきた。それは戦後の国家的な追悼実践が永遠に神聖なものとして象徴化した、犠牲としての戦死という観念と照応する。象徴化にあたり戦死者の身体イメージからは当の国家による暴力の痕跡は消される。この清浄な息子の体に対して、後半では社長に繰り返しインクで汚される蠅の体が対置される。息子と蠅は修辭的に結びつけられ、蠅をインクで虐める行為は、国家が息子に課した暴力の模倣であり、息子の痛みと傷の具現化となる。蠅への暴力により、息子の死は、社長にとっての神聖な永遠の過去ではなく、暴力への加担者としての責任を社長に事後的に問い続ける経験として意味づけ直される。“The Fly”は、遺族の屈折した喪の作業のうちに、死者に暴力をふるいつつその暴力の痕跡を消し去る国家の残酷な矛盾を浮かび上がらせている。

第2部では、大戦以前を舞台とする短編2篇が描く繁殖＝多産（fertility）への不安に、大戦での大量死の経験が反映されていると論じる。第4章では、自身の家族をモデルに描いた代表作“Prelude”を、大戦期の人口動態のアナロジーとして描かれた自然の繁殖＝多産のサイクルへの母の抵抗を示す作品として読む。三人の娘をもち、男子の出産を期待されている母親リングダは、鳥が赤ん坊に変貌する夢や、部屋に置かれた品々が膨んで生き生きしてくる幻覚に襲われる。“THEY”と呼ばれる品々の膨張は、非人稱的な繁殖＝多産の具象化と読める。また、増えていくアロエが艦隊に喩えられるなど、自然の繁殖は戦時中の国力増強政策の光景に重ねられる。再生産を規範化する家父長制と、大量死を賄うほどの人口維持を図る戦争国家の生政治は共犯関係となり母を抑圧するのだ。一方、母親リングダの夢想は、庭に伸びるアロエに様々な隠喩を託すことで、繁殖＝多産の安定性を揺るがしている。例えば、100年の歳月をかけて茎を伸ばし、花を準備している様子は、繰り返し再生産を強制し母の主体性を奪う多産性の要求から脱却した、緩やかな成長のモデルをリングダに与える。家父長制と生政治の権力に対する抵抗の契機は、脅威の対象だった生命から、繁殖＝多産に還元されない成長の可能性を読み取る想像力の働きの中に見出されている。

第5章では、“Prelude”の続編として構想された“At the Bay”を、再生産の促進と戦争での大量死の同時進行に対する疑念ゆえに戦間期に生じた、生命力そのものへの憎悪を描いた作品として読む。マ

ヌカの木の下で横になったリンダは、ひとつひとつに精緻な命が吹き込まれた花が大量に造られては大量に捨てられていく様子に強烈な不気味さを感じる。リンダ自身の意図を超えて、庭に散る花は、戦場に倒れた短命な男たちのアレゴリーと読める。ウルフの“A Society” (1921) や *Three Guineas* (1938) で示唆されているように、自分の息子が殺される未来を予感し出産を躊躇する女性たちの葛藤は戦間期の時代的症候であり、パース・コントロール運動を支えた心理的要因の一つであった。家父長制の抑圧への憤怒と戦間期の母の不安は、リンダの心理において赤ん坊に対する憎悪へと結実し、隣で寝そべる幼い息子への怨言として現れる。しかし、リンダは不意にものを言えぬはずの息子が “We know all about that!” と喋ったかのような幻聴を聞く (*Collected Fiction* 356)。この全知の顕現すなわちエピファニーは、生命を否定せずにはいられない母の不安を承認し、現実の暴力を回避させている。自己の暴力性が他者に理解されるという幻想が、現実の暴力の連鎖から母を一時的に救済するのだ。“Prelude” と “At the Bay” は、戦前の風景に大戦の比喻を散りばめ、戦争の暴力が母の心理に残した痕跡に着目し、その痕跡が繁殖=多産を管理する生政治への母の抵抗の契機となるさまを示したと言える。

マンスフィールドの後期作品は、日常に刻印された暴力の痕跡を露呈させることで、戦争体制を常態化し暴力の苛烈さを見えなくさせる統治のありように抵抗する。終章では、本論の痕跡を巡る議論が戦間期モダニズム研究に応用される可能性を、ウルフのテキストの簡単な分析を通して示す。“The Mark on the Wall” (1917)、*To the Lighthouse* (1927)、*Between the Acts* (1941)などは、戦間期における暴力の記憶と予感を物語化している。マンスフィールドの後期作品は、次なる国家的な暴力の現実化を回避するために、日常に残存する暴力の痕跡をいかに利用しうるのかと問いかける。それはまさしく二つの大戦に挟まれたモダニズムのテキストの中心的問題に迫る問いなのだ。

引用文献

Mansfield, Katherine. *The Collected Fiction of Katherine Mansfield*. Edited by Gerri Kimber and Vincent O'Sullivan, vol. 2, Edinburgh UP, 2012.

———. *The Poetry and Critical Writings of Katherine Mansfield*. Edited by Gerri Kimber and Angela Smith, Edinburgh UP, 2014.