Postcolonial Studies, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 317–334, 2010

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Editorial

Communitarianism, or, how to build East Asian theory

Maps, fevers, and furores: thinking theoretically in East Asian studies

At a recent conference, I gave a paper which began with the question: 'What does it mean to think "theoretically" in contemporary East Asian studies?' In theory, the answer to this question seems quite straightforward. It means thinking metaphysically rather than just empirically; it means scrutinizing why and how East Asianists till their fields in the manner that they do; and it means writing about the region in ways that, rather like the Peters Projection world map, challenge the very cartography of global knowledge. My particular focus in this essay is the creative humanities—by which I mean literary, cinematic, philosophical, and cultural studies—and it is surely fair to say that theoretical thinking has reconfigured the terrain of these disciplines in the East Asian field over the last couple of decades, largely to their enrichment. Yet to move back to maps and their metaphors—to take an aerial rather than a worm's eye view, in other words—it would be very moot indeed to claim that theoretical thinking in East Asian studies has had a decisive cartographic impact.[1] The reason for this, too, seems reasonably plain, and one might think it has been rehearsed stringently enough already.

Leaf through the key journals of the field, attend its major conferences, name-check its seminal monographs, and the message is clear: scholarship that strives to think theoretically continues to take many of its key cues from Michel Foucault, Walter Benjamin, Fredric Jameson, and Benedict Anderson—to name an especially popular quartet. The result is a curiously composed epistemological picture. Its foreground is busy with all the lively details of local cultural life, often scrupulously sketched: Chinese writers, Korean filmmakers, Japanese philosophers, Taiwanese performance artists. But it is the 'old masters' of Western theory who continue to describe the broad contours and grand features of the intellectual landscape, and whose influence is writ large all over the canvas. Indeed, many of the basic terms of reckoning and address which frame the study of contemporary East Asian culture—keywords like power, metropolis, postmodernism, nation—are routinely glossed via reference, and thus deference, to their Euro-American 'originals'. The fact that only a small proportion of these Western writings refer to East Asia in any consistent way themselves makes this indebtedness all the more intriguing.

It is, of course, well understood now that scholars who work in and on East Asia will regularly avail themselves of Western theory. At the very least, there is an element of 'if the cap fits, wear it' to these borrowings: if Freud or

ISSN 1368-8790 print/ISSN 1466-1888 online/10/040317–18 © 2010 The Institute of Postcolonial Studies
DOI: 10.1080/13688790.2010.526538

Foucault illuminate the case in point, then why spurn their insights? A quixotic disavowal of Western theory makes no more sense than a blinkered infatuation with it; but more to the point, perhaps, any such disavowal is pretty impractical anyway. To attempt a root-and-branch expunging of Western theory from the interpretation of East Asian culture would be tantamount to pretending that the Opium Wars and Commodore Perry never happened, that the region never had its bruising showdowns with the Occidental machine. The relevance of Western thought to East Asian modernity was carved in blood and stone by these traumatic encounters, and their legacy is as palpable in the epistemology of culture as it is in the ructions of political nationalism. Indeed, the fierce desire to 'know thine enemy' that has driven China's self-strengtheners, Japan's Meiji oligarchs, and countless East Asian intellectuals on the search for modernity ever since demonstrates, quite transparently, how the impact of the West is indissociable from local philosophies of culture. One only needs to consider the successive bouts of theory 'fever' (*re*)—the Jameson *re*, the Weber *re*—that have swept the Chinese scene (and, to a lesser extent, that of Taiwan and Hong Kong) over the last few decades to see both that Western theory is part of the air that intellectuals breathe, and that plenty find it refreshing. The days of griping about 'Western theory' seem long gone, and the furore that greeted its arrival in East Asian studies during the 1980s and 1990s has now largely abated into an acceptance that these epistemologies are part of the academic furniture.[2] Already by 2000, Rey Chow felt able to state that, 'The hostility towards "Western theory", which merely a decade ago was still predominant in the field of China studies, has apparently all but become marginalized to the point of insignificance'.[3]

Yet despite only ever scotching the snake they feared so much, the anti-Western theory lobby and their protests remain in some ways instructive. At base, their resistance to Western theory was protectionist: they saw the sanctity of their object of study—Chinese poetry, Japanese art—as somehow violated by the application of extrinsic knowledge which was devised for other worlds and other times. This notion of extrinsic knowledge is a core concern of the present essay too. Or to reframe things slightly, if there remains something slightly worrisome about the application of Western theory to East Asian cultural texts, it lies not in the exteriority of these ideas *per se*, but in the internal void that the routine recourse to other interpretive traditions cannot help but imply. Scholars of contemporary East Asia across the world turn to Western theory because the latter is richer, bolder, better than the thinking that has been worked out within the region itself—this, at any rate, is the unmistakable message that our field transmits to the academy beyond. It conveys it through scholarship which subjects contemporary Chinese literature to close focus, but only nods at contemporary Chinese philosophy; through approaches which still assume that key terms such as 'civil society' or the 'avant garde' can travel eastwards just as they are; and above all, perhaps, through a reluctance in some quarters to commit hard intellectual resources to the notion that 'East Asia' is a community of ideas in much the same way that 'Western theory' is. And rather than engage in the slightly

odious process of 'naming and shaming' other researchers here, it might be fairer and more transparent to admit at this early juncture that my own published work so far displays all of these shortcomings; so what follows is as much a self-criticism as it is a commentary on anyone else.

East Asian theory: around the corner or already arrived?

It is precisely a growing awareness of these shortcomings that has sparked interest in 'hybrid', 'local', or what, for the sake of simplicity, I will call 'East Asian' theory, both in the region itself and across the Western academy over the last few years. This recognition that East Asian contexts act transformatively upon Western theory, that these sites are not just the destination but also the origin of pertinent theoretical thinking, and that the interventions they produce constitute a body of thought in their own right has—as it were—established itself as a kind of 'theory' within East Asian studies, a concept to which many either nominally or concretely subscribe. Up to a certain point, this 'theory' has made its way into praxis, a process to which I will return in due course. But my basic point in the pages that follow is that this praxis is at best still a fledgeling one, and that there is a great deal more to be done if East Asian theory is to become a redoubtable nexus of intellectual resources. Part of the problem, perhaps, lies in the fact that there is a subtle sense of deferral in some quarters about the 'when' of East Asian theory. Hauling East Asian studies out of the mire of geopolitically-driven area studies—replacing what we might call 'espionage empiricism' about our 'others in Asia' with more self-reflexive and less positivistic work—has been a job enough in itself. East Asian theory, by these lights, is on its way, just around the post-Cold War corner.

Rather more commonplace, however, is the conviction that East Asian theory has, in fact, already arrived—a point I discovered when presenting this paper. Several conference participants assured me, *inter alia*, that modern and contemporary Japanese literary studies are now thoroughly immersed in the various currents of twentieth-century intellectual life in Japan; that Sinocentrism, not Eurocentrism, is the real bogeyman in the woods; and that journals such as *positions: east asia cultures critique* have ensured that East Asian studies now thinks theoretically on its own self-standing, self-referential terms. In short, mine was a *passé* critique for a field that has now shrugged off its subaltern epistemological status, so much so that parts of it have developed colonizing ambitions themselves. Certainly, it is true that harping on about Eurocentrism can be unfashionable nowadays. As Shu-mei Shih has put it,

> it appears that the critique of Eurocentrism in general has exhausted itself, that one only needs to show awareness of it because it is predictable. Instead of working through the problem, one gives recognition to it [...] Charges of repetition and yawns of familiarity, then, may be hazards one must anticipate in insisting on continuous dissections of Eurocentrism.[4]

Yet as Shih also points out, this 'ennui' cannot change the fact that Eurocentrism 'still exists in old and new forms'; and just because East Asian

theory is now on the rise does not mean that it has knocked older habits of mind off their perch.

Western theory: still on top of the world

Sinocentrism and the degree to which Japanese literary studies have grappled with modern Japanese thought are topics which will be touched upon later in these pages, so for now I will dwell briefly on the third of the above-mentioned points: *positions*, and its embrace of East Asian theory. As it happens, I would be the first to concur that *positions*, ever since its inception in 1993, has done more than any other publication, serial or otherwise, to foster metaphysical habits of mind across the field; indeed, it would be difficult to imagine a 'theoretical' East Asian studies without it. As such, therefore, it is also the perfect testing ground for the linked hypotheses that East Asian theory has arrived, and that over-dependence on Western thought is dead in the water. Rather than impressionistic speculation, which leads only to *impasse*, hard bibliometrics must be the order of the day here—and a systematic review of citation practices in *positions* reveals, somewhat contradictorily, that East Asian theory is indeed championed in its pages, but that the work of Western thinkers still takes pride of place.[5]

Positions is both impressive and valuable for the home it offers to work which engages in punctilious ways with key critics, theorists, and thinkers from twentieth-century East Asia (although some work in the Western academy). Amongst them, the highest bibliometric scorers include Rey Chow, cited 34 times during the journal's history; Naoki Sakai, who makes 28 appearances; Karatani Kôjin, whose work is referenced on 25 occasions; and Dai Jinhua, who secures 18 mentions. Also doing well in the citational stakes are Maruyama Masao (17), Wang Hui (15), Nishida Kitarô (13), Takeuchi Yoshimi (12), Watsuji Tetsurô (12), Li Zehou (11), Wang Xiaoming (11), and Tsurumi Shunsuke (10). And one might also mention Ueno Chizuko (7), Liu Zaifu (7), Chen Kuan-hsing (5), Maeda Ai (5), and Gan Yang (5). Overall, however, this showing contrasts rather poorly with the performance of the quartet of Western thinkers mentioned above: Foucault (110 citations), Benjamin (82), Jameson (55), and Anderson (43). Equally remarkable is the volume and density of citational attention garnered by a range of other Western thinkers who (unlike Jameson, for example) have only a passing interest in East Asian culture—even if several possess sterling postcolonial credentials. These include Gayatri Spivak (61), Sigmund Freud (60), Edward Said (53), Jacques Derrida (51), Homi Bhabha (51), Jacques Lacan (38), Roland Barthes (36), Gilles Deleuze (34), Jürgen Habermas (29), Max Weber (28), Louis Althusser (27), Antonio Gramsci (26), Stuart Hall (26), Theodor Adorno (26), Michel de Certeau (25), Slavov Žižek (24), Julia Kristeva (23), Martin Heidegger (22)—and the list runs on. Nor can one argue that this imbalance is a feature of the past, since citational practices over the last five years reveal the same habits, approximately adjusted to scale: Foucault (38), Benjamin (27), Freud (22), Spivak (22), Chow (15), Sakai (14), Dai (11), Karatani (8).[6]

The purpose of this 'numbers game' is not particularly to critique *positions* itself; indeed, its founding and prevailing premise rests in many ways on the utter salience of East Asian theory and thought. As Tani Barlow, the chief editor of *positions*, has noted in the pages of the present journal: 'the very conditions that enabled [*positions*] as an intellectual project, the dissolution of the discursive binary of East and West, also meant reconnecting contributors to critical traditions outside the North American University'.[7] Yet as Barlow also observes, somewhat ruefully, 'The reality that we cannot pay translators has made this difficult to achieve.'[8] At the time when she was writing—1999—the problems of translation were unarguably daunting. But the last decade has seen something close to an efflorescence of translation in the 'critical' disciplines across a range of publishing venues (a foundational point to which I will return later); and in this sense it is the fault of 'us'—many of the contributors to *positions* and the field at large—if these opportunities for reconnection with local traditions have not always been leapt upon.

An equally feasible explanation is that this ongoing preference for Western thought is only intermittently self-aware and self-questioning. It is, after all, one thing to set out with a defined purpose to interpret a text the Freudian way. Perhaps the text in question battles with unspeakable desires; perhaps its author studied in Vienna during the 1910s and devoured *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Either way, it is not the specific rationale that counts here so much as the considered intention to explore a text through the prism of Freudian psychoanalysis: and this intention is, of course, perfectly justifiable. Indeed, it is the very consciousness of this intent which justifies it. What is more, this intent can itself be transformative, as Freud's ideas are of necessity reconstituted in an array of ways through their encounter with East Asian texts.[9] The problem, to my mind, relates to the unreflective, untransformative, almost inadvertent recourse to Western theory that occurs whenever *grands récits* and big ideas are discussed. To name-check Freud in analyses of the psyche is a scholarly habit so widely practised within contemporary East Asian studies that this custom has little incentive to ponder its motivations.

Essentially, what this habit makes manifest is the prevalence of a quasi-tiered system in the production of cultural analysis in the East Asian creative humanities. Its first rung consists of primary sources in Chinese, Japanese, or Korean, and these, as is only proper, occupy the major energies of the scholarly 'producer'. The next tier is composed of secondary sources, in both East Asian and Western languages, which deal with varieties of knowledge rising from the micro- to the macro-levels. Perched above this is the tier of what might be called 'meta' knowledge: a small but potent space of authority which is occupied more often than is arguably necessary or commonsensical by the work of Western thinkers. Thus an entirely putative case study might break down like this: the fiction of a Japanese woman writer (primary source); a range of dedicated articles on her work in English or Japanese (micro secondary source); studies of postwar Japanese feminism by Ueno Chizuko, Ehara Yumiko, or Matsui Yayori (macro secondary sources); and reference, often quite brief or sporadic, to Julia Kristeva's ideas on abjection (meta source).

Undergirding this typology of knowledge is a suggestive set of expectations about the sort of service which these discrete source materials should provide to the scholar. Perhaps most striking is the fact that the work of Western thinkers and theorists is not *de facto* spatially dominant, despite the citational density described earlier in this essay. Yet this relatively minimalist presence actually functions in counter-intuitive ways, since what it really signals is the extent to which referencing the West operates as shorthand for—or shortcut to—a nexus of universal and authoritative ideas that everyone is expected to understand already. Thus they need no proper gloss, and glancing, box-ticking reference will do the job: 'As Freud says…', and so on. While apparently offhand and off-the-cuff, *passim* citations of this kind actually convey the continuing dominance of Western ideas far more evocatively than an engaged application of dream theory ever could, for the simple reason that they are used as casual ballast in much the same way as quoting from the catechism might help you make a point in Elizabethan England. After all, everybody in those days was supposed to have learned the words.

Obviously, then, we need to consider the institutional histories of East Asianists, and the role that these pasts might play in hampering the growth of East Asian theory. A good many scholars of contemporary East Asian culture nowadays—whatever their nationality, linguistic background, and current base—have made their way through the ranks of comparative literature and cultural studies departments, where Western theory circulates so potently that its doctrines, if not exactly biblical in their authority, can indeed become a kind of received wisdom that accrues its power through long-learned familiarity. And those numerous others who have progressed through East Asian studies departments have often been keen to learn the drills too, since the crude academic capital of Western theory—publishability, tenurability—is well understood. This is essentially Rey Chow's point when she observes that Western theory offers East Asianists, wherever they are, the opportunity to be at once local and global, since the 'generality' of Western theory interacts with the specificity of China, Japan, or Korea in ways that allow for multiple circles of address and recognition.[10] Yet the problem here is not so much the assumed terminological equivalence between 'global'/'general' and 'Western'—that point surely needs no further reiteration—but rather the obstacles that this assumption sets up for the progress of East Asian theory. Indeed, even if it is fairly obvious that Western theory is one of those 'naturalized' backdrops that succeeds via everyone's complicity with the illusion, it is another thing altogether to start switching the scenery, and grounding work in local ideas instead.

Journals such as *Traces*, *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* and *positions* itself have done crucial work here, and as a result East Asian epistemologies do figure more prominently now in both the regional and the global picture of the contemporary humanities. Yet much more clearly needs to be done, and by a broader range of scholarly constituencies. I have already suggested that 'East Asian theory' is essentially a portmanteau term for all kinds of regionally-rooted thinking, from hybrid reworkings of Euro-American thought to the minting of fresh academic currency. Yet the very term 'theory'

can, perhaps, be distractingly grandiloquent, since at base it evokes the brilliance of the conjurer and the intellectual magic which he or she performs. In this essay, I would like to suggest that 'thinking theoretically' means much plainer things besides, and is, in fact, a labour in which everyone who works on the cultures of the region can and even should be engaged. Indeed, practical, small-scale, workaday strategies—such as reading, teaching, citation, and curriculum design—are just as crucial to the emergence of East Asian theory as any wizardry. Such strategies have the potential to make the East Asian creative humanities a terrain of study which is fully invigorated by theoretical thinking—from East, West, and all the spaces in between—rather than slightly sapped by the open secret that a sizeable slab of its ideas base is shipped in wholesale from somewhere else.

'Western theory' and the sociology of academe

If we are to give 'theoretical thinking' a more open-ended definition, it might also be instructive to ask what the fixed and resonant couplet, 'Western theory', really means—not semantically, but rather in terms of the sociology of academe. What the term *connotes*, of course, is something Leviathan in size and reach: cohesive, integrated, commensurately intimidating. Yet at base this is just mythology; and behind the myths lie a simple set of working practices. Let us take, as a prominent example, Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, a neat exposition of theory and its rise which is now bread-and-butter reading for English literature majors across the world. This may seem a perverse place to start, but Eagleton's text has a great deal to say to scholars of contemporary East Asian culture, despite declining to include them in its address. *Literary Theory* is, most obviously, a deftly compiled crib for undergraduates and laypeople—'a kind of *Cliff's Notes*'[11] on a thorny theme, in the words of one of its many detractors. For East Asianists, however, the book's instructiveness lies not in its easy parsing of tricky thinkers, but rather—and in a more truly deconstructionist sense—in what it tells us about Western theory as a socio-institutional praxis. The fact that Eagleton's text—hailed by some, scorned by others—remains the closest thing theories of culture have to a bestseller a full 25 years after its first publication only makes the lessons it offers all the more valuable.

Interdisciplinarity . . .

These lessons start with the book's table of contents, headed by a chapter entitled 'The Rise of English' (by which Eagleton means 'English literature'), followed in concisely telescoped fashion by further chapters on phenomenology, semiotics and structuralism, post-structuralism, psychoanalysis, and political criticism.[12] Two things cry out for attention here, and I will approach them in turn. First, there is the relaxed and fertile union between literature and all kinds of philosophical thinking, plain for all to see in the very rubric of the book. Western theory, as Eagleton makes clear, is the story of how literary studies got together with other disciplines, and did wonders for its

own status as a consequence; everything else is narrative detail. We can go further than Eagleton and observe that it is not just literature's receptiveness to other ideas, but interdisciplinarity *per se*, cross-pollinating from field to field, which has allowed 'Western theory' to grow into a system of thought that confers prestige on all of its component parts. Thus *Tel Quel* may be famous for its frictions and fallings-out, but it was the group's closely collaborative ways and disregard for tidy taxonomies that really mattered, and which allowed its expositions to carry the day for a while. As François Dosse observes, *Tel Quel* 'did not emanate from any particular discipline among the humanities and as such reflected the profound concern for synthesis during this period'.[13] Western theory is the offspring born from the miscegenation of ideas, and this broader gene pool is integral to the intellectual mystique which it has gathered so skilfully to itself.

Needless to say, there are 'indigenous' ideas aplenty in contemporary East Asia, and numerous arenas for their exchange. For a start, the region makes much of its public intellectuals: whether incarcerated in gulags or enshrined as talkshow hosts, literati in East Asia matter a great deal, just as they always have done. And public intellectuals, as they popularize the academy and academize the popular, are crucial to the emergence of precisely those terms of reckoning and address that can travel meaningfully between disciplines and prepare the ground for the growth of 'theory'—which is, of course, nothing other than a systematized approach to the interpretation of culture. But what Eagleton's book also tells us, rather more inadvertently, is that ideas and their mobility are not enough. Theory, after all, frequently boils down to the flash of insight around which an extensive and plausible discourse can be built. Derrida's *différance*, Baudrillard's simulacrum, Anderson's imagined communities, Habermas's civil society: all important theorists are coupled to their catchphrases, although they themselves might be irked by the *reductio ad absurdum* of it all. The business of discourse-building, meanwhile, falls to the scholarly community, more broadly defined: the writers, teachers, and academic professionals who get on with the job of turning theory into practice, seeing if it works, doing the necessary fine-tuning, or rejecting it as unfit for purpose. East Asian thinkers have just as many Damascene moments as their counterparts in the West, but scholars of the region's creative humanities—and perhaps most particularly those based in the West—are not yet doing enough to bed them down in the wider intellectual field.

In a way, then, it is all too easily cathartic to bash the injudicious application of Western theory to non-Western texts. People have been doing this for years now, and the pious glow it generates can easily distract attention from the graver problem at hand. What really requires critique is not simply neo-imperialism in the epistemological realm, nor even the merry readiness of many East Asianists to go along with it, but the altogether less-noted reluctance of our scholarly community to get on with the hard graft of turning the region's thinkers, theorists, and philosophers into shining icons who can shed their light across our fields. What does it take to make the crossover from 'just' a thinker, to a thinker with his or her own dedicated

adjective—Derridean, Foucauldian, Lacanian? Surely, this transition is brought about not simply by coruscating brilliance, but via the skein of discourse that others create, over time and often laboriously, around rare and resonant ideas. It is this discursive web which ties ideas and their inventors into culture, and thus turns them, over time, into crucial resources for the study of everything from literature to *manga*.

This brings me back to my conference interlocutors and the claim that modern and contemporary Japanese literary studies are now expertly versed in twentieth-century Japanese intellectual life across the swath. Certainly, it is true that academics who work on Japanese literature turn in nicely axiomatic ways to local literary theorists and critics as eclectic as Kuriyagawa Hakuson, Etô Jun, Kobayashi Hideo, Maeda Ai, and Karatani Kôjin these days; and it is equally true that the field of Japanese philosophy, for example, has also been enjoying something of a boom in recent years. Both are thoroughly cheering trends. Yet the academic custom, so ingrained as to be second nature, which prompts scholars of Western literature (and scholars of Japanese literature too!) to cite a diverse and extensive range of Euro-American philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, and public intellectuals in their work is still only patchily mirrored in Japanese literary studies. And by the selfsame token, it is not enough simply to draw on the work of Wang Hui, Dai Jinhua, or Cui Zhiyuan in specific discussions of China's New Left political philosophy; scholars of contemporary Chinese literature, film, and media need, as a matter of fully naturalized habit, to absorb, cite, and ingrain their ideas too. Whether the topic is Yu Hua's *Brothers*, the new documentary movement, or even the smash hit series *Super Girl*, New Leftist arguments about the what, when, and how of Chinese modernity have pertinence for the field at large. In a way, this is Chen Pingyuan's slightly acerbic point when he observes that, 'What the Chinese intellectual world most lacks at present is not first-rate scholars who can express their own ideas [...] but second-rate scholars who will embark on a conscientious process of reading and substantive training.'[14] Although most East Asianists might prefer to substitute the appellations 'thinkers' and 'academics' for Chen's 'first-rate scholars' and 'second-rate scholars' respectively, his point that good ideas need well-read, industrious intermediaries if they are to achieve critical mass is very salutary.

Much of the problem, at least for Western scholars, is that reading the dense writings of Wang Hui, Dai Jinhua, and Cui Zhiyuan can be tough work. Fredric Jameson, for all his fruity prose, is a good deal easier to digest. In much the same way, it is quicker and more user-friendly to read Ozu Yasujirô in terms of André Bazin than it is to roam the library stacks and cut a systematic swath through journals such as *Eiga geijutsu* or even *Kinema junpo*. The easier route is further expedited by the very reasonable argument, made elegantly by David Bordwell in a recent essay, that the Hollywood style was assimilated everywhere, even by the selfsame director who pioneered the so-called *tatami* shot.[15] This argument can, of course, be extrapolated every which way, and with the same approximate validity. Any cultural impulse—from *fin-de-siècle* decadence to socialist realism—which

first sprang to life outside East Asia, but later became inspirational within it, seems almost to solicit its own interpretation via Western theory. The Opium Wars, Commodore Perry, and global history ever since provide such interpretation with a very decent, very defensible rationale. What is more, plenty of intellectuals in East Asia seem to agree, hence the appetite for Western theory which ranges from mild to ravenous depending on the time and place.

Ultimately, however, the nub of the problem for many East Asianists in the West remains language, and what Alan Tansman has termed 'the drudgery of the archive' in an incisive essay. As he puts it:

> To write on Natsume Sôseki [. . .] one would, in good conscience, read all, or certainly most of his own writing, totaling over thirty closely packed volumes. In addition, one would need to familiarize oneself with the bulk of secondary literature about him, in English and Japanese, numbering in the hundreds of books and articles, as well as the theoretical and contextual material, in both English and Japanese, needed to make an argument of interest to peers in the American academy [. . .] Now, nobody who has written about Sôseki has done all this—nor should anyone be expected to. All scholarship requires carving out a manageable corpus from a morass of material.[16]

And the fact of the matter is that the most popular strategy for creating a 'manageable corpus' nowadays is to 'prune' the archive, and to compensate this loss of sheer bulk with theoretical approaches which proffer a highly distilled 'acumen' instead.[17] More cynically, of course, these approaches are also less time-consuming and 'increasingly prestigious' (which explains their appeal to native readers of Japanese too). It is refreshing indeed to encounter such a candid acknowledgement that the difficulties of linguistic mastery cannot but dictate the very shape of Western scholarship; but quite apart from this, the shift from thick description to thinner theory is far from problematic in itself anyway. The difficulties arise—as Tansman also notes—when the archive is thinned in favour of theoretical approaches which are overwhelmingly Western in origin, since this process effectively doubles the sense of knowledge 'loss'.

Tansman argues that 'No easy solution can be offered to this problem'.[18] Yet here, once again, the actual praxis of Western theory may contain the kernel of an answer. The present essay has referred regularly to the privileged 'quartet' of Foucault, Benjamin, Jameson, and Anderson; but it might be just as accurate, if not more so, to speak in terms of a tetralogy of privileged *texts*. Whether in East Asian studies or elsewhere, a striking but little-noted feature of theoretical approaches is their reliance on a core hub of incessantly cited sources: *Discipline and Punish*; *Illuminations*; *Postmodernism*, *Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*; *Imagined Communities*. Indeed, if reading theoretically-driven scholarship is occasionally rather dull, it is at least in part because such work chants the same passages from the same sutras over and over again, and thus operates by a law of diminishing intellectual returns. By this token, perhaps what the study of contemporary Japanese, Chinese, and Korean culture requires is its own compulsory 'reading list' of theoretical

writings: intensively interdisciplinary within the humanities, taught to graduate students using the original materials, even 'canonized' in textbook form so that every department can drum the message home.[19] Doubtless some institutions already offer such courses; but if every centre of expertise made it a matter of absolute pedagogical policy to do so, this perennial dilemma between 'archive' and 'theory', between 'thick' and 'thin', might find some form of mitigation. And, of course, it would take many years, and many thousands of citations, before this 'reading list' began to provoke the ever-so-slightly stale sense of *déjà vu* that yet another reference to the 'big four' can sometimes trigger.

. . . and internationalism

If, as I have tried to argue above, reading far and wide within national traditions does not always come easily, then it should be even less surprising that engagement with critical traditions further afield in East Asia is rarer still. Bibliometrics in *positions* over the last 17 years certainly proves the anti-trend: I found only three articles on China, Taiwan, and Korea which cited Karatani Kôjin, and only three on Japanese/Japanese American culture which made reference to Rey Chow. Yet one could argue that their less than stellar showing in contrast to Foucault, Benjamin, Jameson, and Anderson stems in very significant part from the fact that these East Asian thinkers are so seldom cited outside their national niches. Meanwhile, the Western quartet glides effortlessly—and, by and large, indifferently—above the entire field, picking up citations here, there, and everywhere. This brings us round to the other lesson encoded in the basic packaging of Eagleton's *Literary Theory*: namely, that a corpus of potent texts, broadly recognized as such, is produced not just via interdisciplinarity, but through an energetic and open-minded internationalism too. Indeed, this notion of a meta-text—as academic edifice and not just fond fantasy—has no other option than to build itself, brick by brick, around these twin cornerstones of collaborative work.

Interdisciplinarity, as I have suggested above, can and should proceed at the national level, via readings of contemporary culture in Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and all the rest which consult—closely, punctiliously, and ever more as a matter of habit—the writing of local philosophers, thinkers and public intellectuals. If we imagine local theory as a field of depth and breadth—or, perhaps, as a fabric with warp and weft—then bringing the interpretation of culture back home like this is probably the best way of deepening its requisite verticality. But local theory, if it is to bed itself down in culture, needs a horizontal axis too: it needs to draw strength in numbers, to marshal its more distant troops. So-called 'Western theory', that entity which always seems so clean-cut and monolithic when it is invoked in scholarship on East Asia, is a messy, disparate thing if we stop to scrutinize it for a second. What has allowed it to loom like an obelisk over the study of contemporary East Asian culture is the mythology I referred to earlier: that myth of

cohesiveness which has been fostered by practices that are much more about communitarianism than they are about intellectual heft.

Derrida, Benjamin, Bakhtin; French, German, Russian: we all know that Western theory is a citizen of many nations, and is seemingly conversant in many tongues. More crucially, it is predicated on a notion of culture-as-civilization (Graeco-Roman, Judaeo-Christian, Marxist-capitalist) which has allowed thinkers across the span of Euro-America to address each other in a meta-language that everyone concerned is happy to learn and speak. Translations are, as I will discuss below, essential from place to place. Yet in ways that recall Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole*—in which the former denotes the grand collective abstractions of a language and the latter refers to its quirkier individual utterances—it is the belief, mistaken or otherwise, in a Western cultural 'we' which transcends nationality that has brought 'Western' theory to the fore. Thus we know that modernism, for example, may speak in different *paroles*, that its articulations vary from France to Russia; but as a basic term of engagement, 'modernism' belongs to a more grandiloquent *langue*, intelligible and salient across borders. In many ways its salience derives precisely from a collective, unspoken decision to invest in its intelligibility: to make it hard fact through reams of scholarship that adumbrate the meanings of modernism by drawing on everyone from Baudelaire to Nietzsche as if this were the most natural thing in the world.

It is just as clear that East Asia, both in the past and nowadays, has a cognate civilizational consciousness, an awareness of itself as a cultural whole greater than its parts. This is not to deny, of course, that to talk of 'Asia' at all is to enter into a very vexed and protracted conversation. Takeuchi Yoshimi's pithy point that 'What made Asia possible lies within Europe' captures only one dimension of the term's many-faceted problems.[20] No doubt thornier is the way in which 'Asia' has served shifting agendas of identity and imperialism in Japan,[21] whether it is the utopian ideologuing of Okakura Tenshin and his 1903 dictum '*Ajia wa hitotsu nari*' (Asia is one), or Fukuzawa Yukichi's earlier treatise 'Datsu-A ron' (Goodbye Asia, 1885) which, *prima facie* at least, articulated Japan's need to define itself over and against the floundering land-mass across the sea. And the jitteriness about Sinocentrism mentioned earlier in this essay stems, of course, from a widely felt sense that China may be gearing up to pick up the imperialist baton—and in the process will produce 'theory' which assists it in the race to power. This sense of shifting morphology characterized the political and cultural shape of 'Asia' throughout its twentieth-century history:[22] alternately a dark continent that only Japan could lead into the light, and a Sinosphere that has long borne witness to China's civilizing mission, 'Asia' has arguably been reified as much from within as from without. As Naoki Sakai and Shu-mei Shih note in their respective contributions to this volume, the West-versus-the-Rest binary has proved just as useful to local imperialists and state-builders as it was to their counterparts in the Occident. Meanwhile, what all too often gets frittered away in these ceaseless struggles to command the regional space is the rich theoretical potential of 'Asia'. Indeed, the very fact that the selfsame term can be pressed into service by both Chinese revolutionaries (Li Dazhao and

Sun-Yatsen) and Japanese would-be war criminals (Ôkawa Shûmei) suggests ultimately that the idea of 'Asia' is less a zone of politics and culture than an open episteme.[23]

Perhaps, in fact, it is precisely this tense contestation that surrounds the term which makes it so seductive to theorists and theoretical thinking. 'Asia' as episteme is as alive now as ever it was, a truth vividly shown by the recent scholarly efforts by intellectuals such as Chua Beng-Huat, Naoki Sakai, and Sun Ge—to name just a few—to foster new forms of intellectual dialogue about it: the former two through the founding of *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* and *Traces*, and Sun through her establishment of the so-called 'Asia Knowledge Community' (*Yazhou zhishi gongtongti*).[24] Chen Kuan-hsing, moreover, has given this dialogic process hard theoretical form in an important essay entitled 'Asia as Method', which expounds and elaborates on the work of Mizoguchi Yûzô (himself a key figure in Asia-centric exchange), and his notion of 'China as method' (*hôhô to shite no Chûgoku*) in particular.[25] In his later essay, Chen argues eloquently that East Asian intellectuals must prize their conversations and communitas with each other if they are to forge a new and salvationary sense of self.[26]

Chen's thesis is genuinely compelling; but its quasi-exclusionary focus on East Asia is reminiscent, albeit in counter-intuitive ways, of Tu Wei-ming's oft-cited call to 'Cultural China'. Tu dubs the latter 'a continuous interaction of three symbolic universes': the Chinese-speaking territorial heartlands; the diaspora; and the 'scholars, teachers, journalists [. . .] and writers, who try to understand China intellectually and bring their conceptions [. . .] to their own linguistic communities'.[27] I would argue that Tu's notion of a third constituency, reworked to refer to East Asia and all those who work on the region across the globe, can also contribute meaningfully to the production of Chen's 'Asia as method'—not least because this methodology is a utopia to which only some intellectuals within East Asia itself subscribe, as Inaga Shigemi has shown.[28] To make this contribution, though, East Asianists—wherever, whoever—would need to show a good deal more communitas, and engage in a great many more conversations. Vital to recent Asia-centric moves is precisely the sense of a cultural 'we' referred to earlier, which is itself nothing other than the communitas that emerges through conversation, and thereby produces keywords for culture in a *langue* that is recognizably regional in its semantic tone. The problem for contemporary East Asian studies, both in the West and in the region itself, is that it is a field still dominated by a steadfast allegiance to *paroles*. Indeed, East Asian studies seldom pays more than lip service to the idea of *langue*, preferring as it does the methodology of culture-as-nation and its customary monolinguism. In practice, this means that key interpretive texts such as, for example, Matei Calinescu's 1977 study *Five Faces of Modernity*, which does indeed travel from Baudelaire to Nietzsche in its quest to probe the aesthetics of the modern, simply do not have sufficient counterparts in East Asian studies. Once again, the local theories are there, awaiting circulation, but the supporting scholarly apparatus is only partially in place.

The golden labour of translation

East Asian studies is, or so we are told, congenitally incapable of helping to produce the apparatus that could help to make the region's 'cultural we' a more palpable and persuasive discursive reality. Its languages are too difficult, its politics too obdurately hostile to permit this kind of open-door policy on the flow of ideas. Maybe so; but all-out conflict in Europe—twice—did not lead to a total battening down of the intellectual hatches, and it would be naïve nonsense to assume a harmonious community of Western polyglots who habitually perused Bakhtin, or even Saussure, in the original. This brings us, inevitably, back to translation, and to the hard historical fact that intellectual journeys—whether from continent to continent, or simply from France to Germany—require the good offices of translation if they are to make sustained contact with the locals. The academic community in the West has tended to read everything from Barthes to Bakhtin in translation—as, of course, do East Asianists. And if East Asianists can read translated versions of Barthes and Bakhtin, then scholars of China can read Karatani, and specialists on Japan can read Wang Hui in just the same linguistically mediated way. And, of course, pretty much everyone can read East Asian theorists who choose to write in English.

It is extremely encouraging in this regard that Li Zehou's far-reaching work on Chinese aesthetics—to give a very recent example—has appeared in English translation.[29] A translation of Wang Hui's *magnum opus*, *The Rise of Modern Chinese Thought* (*Zhongguo sixiang de xingqi*, 2004), is also in the works. Brill, meanwhile, has inaugurated a new series entitled 'Humanities in China Library', which 'makes available in English translation the work of humanities scholars who are shaping academic discourse in China',[30] and so far includes important volumes by Chen Pingyuan, Chen Lai, and Hong Zicheng.[31] Cambridge University Press, too, has launched a series called 'China Library', with a cognate but even broader interdisciplinary remit. Just as heartening are the moves made by Columbia, Hawaii, and Duke University Presses to bring philosophy and criticism from modern East Asia to a larger audience. A series of landmark volumes either published or forthcoming provide both translation and analysis of the work of thinkers such as Natsume Sôseki, Takeuchi Yoshimi, Maruyama Masuo, Kang Sangjung, Maeda Ai, Takamura Kôtarô, Nishitani Keiji, Kuki Shûzô, Watsuji Tetsurô, Karatani Kôjin, Yi T'aejun, Ng Kim Chew and many others.[32] Large-scale, monograph-length projects such as these complement the quiet but immensely important effort spearheaded by journals in recent years to showcase translations of philosophical and theoretical work from East Asia. M E Sharpe's *Contemporary Chinese Thought*, launched in 1997, blazed something of a trail here, publishing quality translations of a gratifyingly catholic range of thinkers. This endeavour has been pursued by *positions* and *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, too, both of which have stepped up their publication of theoretical writings translated from multiple languages in recent years. Most impressive of all, perhaps, is *Traces*, which has published issues in a range of languages, both to speed the transfer

of knowledge, and to pay a more symbolic kind of deference to the indispensability of translation as a scholarly labour.

But the very fact that these texts are openly billed by their publishers as daring, rare, or innovative tells its own story. The brisk and busy thoroughfares for translated texts that are such a given of Euro-American theoretical enquiry shrink to narrow, little-trodden footpaths when it comes to the transfer of big ideas from East Asia into Western languages. And this is, at least in part, because most specialists on China, Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong make it no matter of urgency to read the work of the Japanese thinkers listed just above; and few specialists on Japan are much better either. The majority are far more likely to be found thumbing the pages of Gayatri Spivak or Homi Bhabha than consulting the increasingly broad corpus of writings produced by intellectuals across the region which ponder colonialism as a theoretical, and profoundly local, problem.[33] Our empirically provable reluctance to read regionally, despite the swelling number of translated works and the tough work put in by their translators, demonstrates that the problem is not practical so much as temperamental and systemic. The truth of the matter is that many East Asianists, as an 'academic community', remain dispositionally disinclined to extend their collegiality across borders.

It is around these two focal points, interdisciplinarity and internationalism, that the possibilities for future East Asian theory cluster. And this is in no small part because both are habits of mind that can display themselves, in both dedicated and dilettante ways, across all the everyday academic practices of reading, thinking, writing, teaching, citation, and curriculum design. To take the last example as a final case in point, if every teacher of Lu Xun, both in East Asia and elsewhere, required his or her students to delve into the Chinese, Korean, or English translations of Takeuchi Yoshimi by Li Xinfeng, Sô Gwang-dôk and Paek Ji-un, and Richard Calichman respectively[34]—a reading process that is both interdisciplinary and international—then a generation of students who work on China would come to realize that its twentieth-century literature operates within a theoretical field which is regional as much as it is national or global. And if every teacher of Takeuchi prescribed the fiction of Lu Xun to his or her students, this would have cognate and compelling implications for the kind of theoretical parameters which students of Japan might set for their work too. The fact that Takeuchi himself was one of Lu Xun's most noted Japanese translators only underscores the point.

Contemporary East Asia, in theory

Interdisciplinarity and internationalism lie at the heart of this special issue, too. Harry Harootunian's essay probes local strands of thought (the philosopher Takeuchi Yoshimi, the folklorist Yanagita Kunio, the Marxist economist Yamada Moritarô, the liberal publicist Hasegawa Nyozekan) in insightful ways to explore concepts of modernity and the time-lag in both inter-war Japan and more recently. Chua Beng Huat, meanwhile, theorizes the strictures of the party-state in Singapore from various disciplinary

perspectives to show persuasively how its policies—and most particularly those in the realms of language, race, and culture—are suggesting an alternative developmental blueprint to other East Asian nations, especially the People's Republic of China. Other essays in the issue take internationalism as their basic point of departure, and seek to problematize, realign, or stretch the parameters of their respective fields. Koichi Iwabuchi takes up the theme of the media cultures which now energetically speed their way across the nation-states of East Asia; but he subjects the triumphalism that often attends this relatively new discourse to critical, nuanced enquiry, and thus encourages us to think more deeply about the challenges these cultures might mount to Euro-American dominance. In an innovative piece on avant-garde theatre, Rossella Ferrari explores how intensifying collaboration between dramatists and performers from Hong Kong, Taiwan, China, Korea, and Japan is creating a transnational praxis in the theatrical arts which moves in 'rhizomatic' ways. Nayoung Aimee Kwon's contribution probes a half-forgotten archive of Japanese-language writings from colonial Korea to argue convincingly that imperialism in East Asia, and its manifold legacies, demand a re-making of the current paradigms for understanding colonial experience. In a searching essay on the apparently oxymoronic relationship between 'Asia' and 'theory', Naoki Sakai argues that the sense of strangeness that invariably meets this pairing is nothing other than a civilizational spell, which weaves itself almost imperceptibly betwixt and between the 'micro-physics' of power relations. Shu-mei Shih, meanwhile, conducts an equally striking exercise in deconstructive archaeology via a contribution which assesses the disruptive potential of the Sinophone, and re-reads key texts from the modern Chinese literary canon to uncover the affective histories of the 'Nanyang', or Southeast Asia, that lie buried within them. Finally, my own contribution attempts to theorize the ersatz nostalgia craze that has swept every nation-state in East Asia by tracing its impulses back to an acute sense of placelessness across the region over the last few decades.

Collectively, the essays gathered together in this volume try to 'think theoretically' in a range of different ways. Most do indeed coin new terms and devise new paradigms for the study of the East Asian creative humanities, and their insights are commensurately exciting. But others (by which I principally mean my own contribution) seek to be interdisciplinary and international in rather more prosaic and humdrum ways: by peering over the disciplinary wall, by trying to identify when 'East Asia' is as illuminating a site of enquiry as are its discrete nation-states, and by using translations when a lack of training across the broad spectrum of East Asian languages makes them necessary.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to John Treat, Michel Hockx, Ruth Maxey, and Young-hae Chi for their insights and kind help in the preparation of this essay.

Notes

[1] Naoki Sakai provides an eloquent exposition of these problems in his contribution to this volume.

[2] For examples of the critique of Western theory in East Asian studies, see John M Rosenfield, 'Japanese Art Studies in America in 1945', in Helen Hardacre (ed), *The Postwar Developments of Japanese Studies in the United States*, Leiden: Brill, 1998, pp 161–194, p 189; Perry Link, 'Ideology and Theory in the Study of Modern Chinese Literature', *Modern China* 19(1), 1993, pp 4–12, pp 7–8; and Michael S Duke, 'Thoughts on Politics and Critical Paradigms in Modern Chinese Literature Studies', *Modern China* 19(1), 1993, pp 41–70, pp 63–66.

[3] Rey Chow, 'Introduction: On Chineseness as a Theoretical Problem', in Chow (ed), *Modern Chinese Literary and Cultural Studies in the Age of Theory*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000, pp 1–25, p 1.

[4] Shu-mei Shih, 'Global Literature and the Technologies of Recognition', *PMLA* 119(1), 2004, pp 16–30, p 16.

[5] In order to keep this review within manageable bounds, the analysis below is restricted to citations of Western thinkers whose major work was published during the twentieth century. Naturally, the citational volume would increase if the parameters were brought back to include, for example, thinkers such as Immanuel Kant and Karl Marx.

[6] These statistics naturally exclude instances of self-citation.

[7] Tani Barlow, 'Founding *positions*', *Postcolonial Studies* 2(1), 1999, pp 19–28, p 22.

[8] Barlow, 'Founding *positions*', p 22.

[9] This process is sometimes controversial, of course, since local re-makings of Western theory may assume forms that some East Asianists find distasteful in politico-personal ways. One is reminded here of the indignant response to Zhang Fa, Zhang Yiwu and Wang Yichuan's 1994 manifesto 'Cong "xiandaixing" dao "Zhonghuaxing": xin zhishi de tanxun' (From 'Modernity' to 'Chineseness': In Search of a New Epistemology). This piece deploys the tenets of 'post'-thinking to rebut Western modernity in favour of a recrudescent Sinocentrism, and it was decried in many quarters as a conservative revanche that took sinister aim at pro-democracy intellectuals. See Zhang Fa, Zhang Yiwu, and Wang Yichuan, 'Cong "xiandaixing" dao "Zhonghuaxing": xin zhishi de tanxun', *Wenyi zhengming* 2, 1994, pp 10–20. For well-known critiques of the manifesto, see Zhao Yiheng, '"Houxue" yu Zhongguo xin baoshouzhuyi', *Ershiyi shiji* 27(2), 1995, pp 4–15; and Ben Xu, 'Postmodern-Postcolonial Criticism and Pro-Democracy Enlightenment', *Modern China* 27(1), 2001, pp 117–147, pp 123–127.

[10] Chow, 'Introduction', p 2.

[11] Peter A Muckley, '"Why Don't They Do Something Else?": Terry Eagleton and Some Symptoms of 20th Century Literary Theory', *A Parte Rei* 32, 2004, pp 1–16, p 1.

[12] Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1983, p i.

[13] François Dosse, *History of Structuralism: The Rising Sign, 1946–1966*, vol. 1, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998, p 276.

[14] Quoted in Gloria Davies, *Worrying about China: The Language of Chinese Critical Inquiry*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007, p 190.

[15] David Bordwell, 'Transcultural Spaces: Toward a Poetics of Chinese Cinema', in Sheldon H Lu and Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh (eds), *Chinese-Language Film: Historiography, Poetics, Politics*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004, pp 141–162.

[16] Alan Tansman, 'Japanese Studies: The Intangible Act of Translation', in David L Szanton (ed), *The Politics of Knowledge: Area Studies and the Disciplines*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004, pp 184–216, p 196.

[17] Tansman, 'Japanese Studies', pp 198–199.

[18] Tansman, 'Japanese Studies', p 200.

[19] A tentative and provisional attempt to provide this sort of 'reading list' for modern and contemporary China can be found in Margaret Hillenbrand and Chloe Starr, *Documenting China: An Interpretive Reader in Seminal Twentieth-Century Texts*, Seattle: University of Washington Press (in press).

[20] Takeuchi Yoshimi, 'Kindai to wa nani ka', in Takeuchi, *Kindai no chôkoku*, Tokyo: Chikuma shobo, 1983, pp 4–45, p 12.

[21] For detailed treatment of this type of agenda, see the essays collected in Furuya Tetsuo (ed), *Kindai Nihon no Ajia ninshiki*, Kyoto: Kyoto daigaku jinbun kagaku kenkyujo, 1994.

[22] Wang Hui provides an extensive grounding of this process in his essay 'The Politics of Imagining Asia: A Genealogical Analysis', trans. Andrew Hale, *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8(1), 2007, pp 1–33.

[23] This is essentially Chen Kuan-hsing's point when he argues that Asia is 'not simply an object of analysis, but also the means through which knowledge can be transformed'. See Chen, '"Yazhou" zuowei fangfa', *Taiwan shehui yanjiu jikan* 57(3), 2005, pp 139–218, p 140.

[24] As Sun states, in dialogue with Mizoguchi Yûzô, the idea of a 'knowledge community' started out as a 'simple notion': 'might there be a common standpoint amongst the people of Asia and, in particular, amongst its so-called intellectuals?' The dialogue which they pursue thereafter reveals, unsurprisingly, that it is chiefly through the expression of dissatisfaction, critique, and self-critique that this community takes more concrete shape. Mizoguchi and Sun, 'Guanyu zhishi gongtongti', *Kaifang shidai* 11, 2001, pp 5–22, p 6.

[25] Chen's notion of 'method' also, of course, refers back to Takeuchi Yoshimi's *Hôhô to shite no Ajia: waga senzen, senchû, sengo 1935–1976*, Tokyo: Sojusha, 1978.

[26] Chen Kuan-hsing, '"Yazhou" zuowei fangfa', pp 200–201.

[27] Tu Wei-ming, 'Cultural China: The Periphery as the Center', in Tu Wei-ming (ed), *The Living Tree: The Changing Meaning of Being Chinese Today*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994, pp 1–34, pp 13–14.

[28] Inaga notes that, 'Of 1701 scientific papers on foreign philosophy which the Research Centre of Philosophy of the Chinese Institute of Social Sciences published between 1978 and 2000, only 87 articles treat Japan, covering no more than 5 percent of the total items.' See Inaga Shigemi, 'Philosophia, Ethica and Aesthetica in the Far-Eastern Cultural Sphere: Receptions of the Western Ideas and Reactions to the Western Cultural Hegemony', http://www.nichibun.ac.jp/~aurora/pdf/9Philosophia.pdf (accessed 24 August 2010), pp 1–8, pp 3–4. This is not, however, a uniform view. Bian Chongdao, for example, argues that intellectual interchange between Japan and China in the field of philosophy has been vibrant in recent years. See Bian, 'Chûgoku no tetsugaku to Nihon no tetsugaku no taiwa', in Fujita Masakatsu and Bret Davies (eds), *Sekai no naka no Nihon no tetsugaku*, Kyoto: Showado, 2005, pp 82–100, pp 97–99.

[29] Li Zehou, *The Chinese Aesthetic Tradition*, trans. Maija Bell Samei, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2009.

[30] Brill website, http://www.brill.nl/bhcl (accessed 23 August 2010).

[31] Hong Zicheng, *A History of Contemporary Chinese Literature*, trans. Michael M Day, Leiden: Brill, 2007; Chen Lai, *Tradition and Modernity: A Humanist View*, trans. Edmund Ryden, Leiden: Brill, 2009; Chen Pingyuan, *Touches of History: Inside the May Fourth Movement*, trans. Michel Hockx, with Maria af Sandeberg, Uganda Sze-Pui Kwan, Christopher Payne, and Christopher Rosenmeier, Brill: Leiden, 2010.

[32] See, for example, Michele Marra, *Modern Japanese Aesthetics: A Reader*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999; Maeda Ai, *Text and the City: Essays on Japanese Modernity*, translation ed. James A Fujii, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004; Richard F Calichman (ed), *Contemporary Japanese Thought*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2005; Richard F Calichman (ed and trans), *Overcoming Modernity: Cultural Identity in Wartime Japan*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2008; Yi T'aejun, *Eastern Sentiments*, trans. Janet Poole, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009; Natsume Sôseki, *Theory of Literature and Other Critical Writings*, translation ed. Michael K Bourdaghs, Atsuko Ueda, and Joseph A Murphy, New York: Columbia University Press, 2009; and Michael F Marra, *Japan's Frames of Meaning: A Hermeneutics Reader*, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2010. A forthcoming volume on Sinophone literature, meanwhile, contains translated work by the important Malaysian Chinese critic and theorist Ng Kim Chew. See Shu-mei Shih, Tsai Chien-hsin, and Brian Bernards (eds) *Sinophone Studies: A Critical Reader*, New York: Columbia University Press, forthcoming 2011.

[33] For example, a search on Google Scholar (admittedly an imperfect tool) reveals only seven English-language sources which refer in any way to Ozaki Hotsuki's key treatment of literary culture in the Japanese imperium, *Kindai bungaku no shôkon. Kyû shokuminchi bungakuron* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1991). And Komori Yôichi's equally important study *Posutokoroniaru* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2001) has scarcely fared much better outside Japan.

[34] See Zhunei Hao (Takeuchi Yoshimi), *Lu Xun*, trans. Li Xinfeng, Hangzhou: Zhejiang wenyi chubanshe, 1986; Tak'euch'i Yosimi, *Ilbon-gwa Ashia: Tak'euch'i Yosimi P'yôngnonsôn*, trans. Sô Gwang-dôk and Paek Ji-un, Seoul: Somyông, 2004; and Takeuchi Yoshimi, *What is Modernity? Writings of Takeuchi Yoshimi*, trans. Richard F Calichman, New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.