

Drew University  
College of Liberal Arts

Exporting and Reconstructing Imagined Communities: Global Literature, Translation, and Kazuo  
Ishiguro

A Thesis in English Literature and French

by

Nicole Sydor

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor in Arts With  
Specialized Honors in English Literature and French

December 2024

## Abstract

Kazuo Ishiguro, Nobel Prize winning novelist, is considered to be a global author who introduces his audience to characters who exist within nations struggling to reconstruct their national identities after periods of crisis. His works are widely translated and have become a part of an international literary discourse, making these novels accessible to a wider audience. However, the global success of Ishiguro's novels which focus on highly specific and stereotyped cultures raises questions about how his writing makes imagining the nations about which he writes more exportable. In his novels *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day*, Ishiguro presents his readers with the nations of Japan and England respectively through the eyes of his narrators Etsuko and Stevens, who have deeply flawed and deliberately constructed representations of the nations they inhabit, or think they inhabit. Despite the fact that Ishiguro is presenting incredibly nuanced nations with deep histories and traditions to the world, he manages to create nations that are easily accessible and exportable to an international audience. Analyzing his novels *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day*, and their translated French counterparts *Lumière pâle sur les collines* and *Les Vestiges du jour* respectively, reveals that Ishiguro uses stereotypes and mythic constructions of the nation via language, text, and imagined landscapes to make the notion of the nation migratory for his readership via translation. In this thesis, the construction of the French texts, in conjunction with discourse regarding translation and histories of linguistic colonialism, is analyzed to evaluate how Ishiguro's constructions of Japan and England in English migrate into another language deeply connected to a history of colonialism and imperialism: French. This thesis aims to understand how Ishiguro deconstructs

national stereotypes and myths to render the nations he focuses on exportable for his readers, so they may in turn then reconstruct the nation he portrays to them.

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	5
<b>Chapter 1:</b> “Imagined Communities,” Translation, and Global Literature	15
<b>Chapter 2:</b> A Pale View of Hills, Translatese, and Using the Text to Construct a Nation	33
<b>Chapter 3:</b> The Remains of the Day, Englishness, and the Landscape	56
<b>Conclusion</b>	81
<b>Bibliography</b>	85
<b>Appendix A:</b> English Summary of Ishiguro, <i>Loti</i> et <i>Madame Chrysantheme</i> ou <i>Madama Butterfly</i>	90
<b>Appendix B:</b> English Summary of Translating British Greatness and Maintaining it in French	92

## Introduction

Benedict Anderson<sup>1</sup> defines a nation as “an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (49). He clarifies that the nation is imagined in that the citizens of a nation may never meet those who exist within the same nation, yet they still feel a shared sense of community and identity. They have the communal experience of national identity to unite them, and the opposing nations around them to confine them (Anderson 49).

The distinction between national and international takes on new meaning with the rise of global literature and its intensified dependence on interaction and exchange between nations and cultures to produce literary products. Anderson clearly articulates that the nation is limited, and that it struggles to be exported beyond national borders. It is bound by citizens who exist within the nation, and external nations halt the extension of other national identities into their respective territories. The blocking of extension separates a national identity from a more extensive transnational identity.

Much of Anderson’s commentary focuses on the nation as the limit of the imagined community. Linguistic and geographic confinement serves as a boundary in creating incredibly far reaching communities, especially one that can unite all of mankind. However, global literature can breach those boundaries by engaging with multiple cultures through the use of multiple languages and perspectives. This new landscape of cultural interaction led to the rise of international competition for intellectual capital, pitting nations against one another. Goethe and Casanova both discuss the development of a world literature based on exchange and interaction

---

<sup>1</sup> Benedict Anderson was the foremost scholar on nationalism and the role it plays in relation to the text. He was an Irish political scientist, himself from a very international background, and wrote primarily in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. His most famous work is *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, on which this essay focuses.

that allows a particular location or language to claim supremacy in terms of literary prowess. In Casanova's case, Paris became a center for cultural and literary discourse, with writers bowing to French linguistics and literary standards for a chance to enter the global literary scene, or as she puts it *The World Republic of Letters*. However, in an ever changing worldscape in terms of technology and trans-continental interaction that is moving beyond colonialism (however slowly), more languages are interacting and exchanging ideas. Some novels even enter into the literary space with the intent of being translated. Rebecca Walkowitz's classification of translated novels (those written for an international audience with multiple languages and the translation of language in mind) enlarges the potential audience for a novel and the scope of imagined communities to contain individuals that initially were not accessible to it. Walkowitz names these texts written simultaneously in multiple languages or written using language that is easily translatable as "born translated." Its intention, upon being written, is to extend beyond the language of departure or language of origin.

Global literature and born translated novels make it theoretically possible for readers to engage with a more potent language through which multiple cultures can understand each other and intersect. It exports a kind of community that is then reconstructed in some way via translation into a new, formerly inaccessible cultural demographic. This model suggests Walter Benjamin's notion of a true or pure language that seeks to enhance the meaning of the original text via translation. For Paul Giles<sup>2</sup>, this is global English, in which all other cultures find themselves and can be equally transmitted and exist in a heterogeneous container (Giles 389).

Jing Tsu calls this Globish, a style of writing that transcends the realm of the nation to

---

<sup>2</sup>Giles focuses on the role English, or what he calls global English, is changing in the world of literary exchange, with particular options opting to be a part of a language that gives them access to a greater audience.

encapsulate the globe (Tsu 122). Out of this context emerge novels that are born translated and function within a global market. Potentially heterogeneous and intermixed, these novels function as a vessel for mutual exchange and understanding. However, with this exchange comes the consolidation of identities and perceptions to fit into one language or box in an attempt to reach a larger audience and there is often a cosmopolitan superpower that dictates what makes it out into the world state while deciding how it is presented. Especially after the French Revolution in 1789, Paris became the foremost authority on what deserved to be constructed, and how nations were constructed; by selecting particular works and excluding others, it makes it easy for nations to create stereotypes and myths with what they produce into the world. These skewed depictions are more accessible because they play with common understandings, yet they prevent a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the nations and identities from which they stem. Portrayals from literary super powers that function in this way, selecting particular images of cultures and nations that they send out into the world, creates a discourse that also disregards or discredits other works that do not conform to the stereotypes proclaimed to be the reality. Alternate perspectives are negated and devalued by world powers that control the literary scene in their literary hierarchy, simultaneously constricting how a nation can be presented and which nations even are able to be presented. The stereotyped nation and its identity are used to connect with external identities, inherently limiting the extent to which external identities can be represented and encapsulated in a text. The representations that are propagated by these superpowers curtails the level of interaction and connectivity between texts and the nation because of their reductive nature, providing flat and incomplete national renderings that can not redefine themselves

outside of the texts that are disseminated by the deciding powers and are therefore inherently limited. In an attempt to be hyper inclusive, the texts and language become hyper exclusive.

The works of Kazuo Ishiguro, British-Japanese author and Nobel Prize winner for his 1989 novel *The Remains of the Day*, help illuminate this contention within a multicultural literature that extends beyond its target audience. He uses highly specific and condensed national identities, i.e. stereotypes, and compresses the identities of his readers to create a reading experience that is more widely applicable, especially to readers who do not fit the identities he compresses them into. His novels take place in countries like Japan, England, and China and engage with questions of national identity, patriotism, and post-war reconstruction. His works, although they are mostly hyper localized geographically, interact with an international audience, having been published in 40 languages, extending far beyond his English readers.

Ishiguro's position as a multicultural author<sup>3</sup> who is intentionally conscious of his use of myths and translatable language in his work often raises questions among readers and critics about the cultural origins of his work and himself. Rebecca Karni's article "Made in Translation: Language, "Japaneseness," "Englishness," and "Global Culture" in Ishiguro," draws attention to the way Ishiguro writes about culture, which she calls "translational realism" allows Ishiguro to demythologize and subvert stereotypes regarding culture. She breaks down how reviews discuss Ishiguro's works as being incredibly "Japanese" or incredibly "English," almost overbearingly so, and analyzes Ishiguro's style of prose and mimesis of the Japanese film style *shomingeki* and other seemingly Japanese styles in *The Remains of the Day*, *A Pale View of Hills*, and *An Artist*

---

<sup>3</sup> Ishiguro was born in Japan and moved to England at the age of five years old.



*of the Floating World* to unpack how Ishiguro achieves this “translational realism” and also breaks down a readers preconceived notions regarding culture.

Karni argues that “through manipulation of traditional narrative categories—especially unreliability and realism—as well as through recycling of images and the language of the mass media [Ishiguro] constructs an inherently mediated fictional world of “global culture” and that “[the novels] are intrinsically translated and even cliched precisely to point to, and thereby critique, the translation processes and cliches that they, as well as their readers’ assessments, build on” (320). It is the way in which Ishiguro uses language and plays with ideas of Englishness and Japaneseness, making them incredibly overt, that Ishiguro breaks down and forces his readers to push back with and engage with the stereotypes. This subversion in the way Ishiguro creates his novels causes critics to make claims about *A Pale View of Hills* as an authentic Japanese novel and that *The Remains of the Day* is a novel written in a Japanese style (322).

Ishiguro’s works are considered so Japanese, in fact, that he is even credited by Karni as being a transporter of ‘the Japanese soul’ to the West (323). Ishiguro is reclaiming, whether that be intentional or unintentional, the ability to convey Japanese culture from a semi-de-orientalized perspective. However, bridging two worlds as an individual himself, the Occident and the Orient, Ishiguro is potentially inadequate in a dual sense in his ability to articulate what Englishness and Japaneseness are. Ishiguro is a testament to the lack of reality in these conceptions, and his self-conscious and self-reflexive practices as a writer in his translational realism help illustrate that to the reader (Karni 331).

In looking at Karni's commentary, her statement regarding Malcom Bradbury's claim that "thinking of the 'Japanese' qualities of Ishiguro's writing, imagined the translation of *Pale* as an easy task for the Japanese translator, said translator is said to have replied, 'On the contrary, it is very hard because it is such an English book'" (Karni 321). Ishiguro managed to produce what critics call an "'authentic' Japanese fiction" in *A Pale View of Hills* and "a novel more English than the English" in *The Remains of the Day* (Karni 324). How is it that a novel some consider to be Japanese, is simultaneously considered overbearingly English, indubitably easy to translate and also impossible to translate?

What Karni seems to argue without saying it, is that Ishiguro's "Japaneseness" and "Britishness" actually suffuse in his works to create a kind of translatable identity that transcends both "cultures" while simultaneously augmenting one another. The Japanese quality of *A Pale View of Hills* estranges its readers emotionally, and *The Remains of the Day* also estranges its readers while engaging them in terms of cultural conceptions (Karni 331). It is the cultural ambiguity of Ishiguro's work and the quality of his language that simultaneously impedes cultural ambiguities, breaks them down, and then rebuilds them upon translation that makes Ishiguro's writing exemplify the elements of the "born translated" novel coupled with hyper-reductivity within global literature.

Ishiguro's novels *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day* give his readers access to a global discourse. Both novels play with language in such a way that draws the readers' attention to its grammatical plainness, devoid of character or apparent complexity, better lending itself to translation. Likewise, the novels engage with national identity and image relating to stereotypes and idealizations rooted in historical conflict. The narrators project their

contentious relationship with nations onto their reader, stripping the reader of their identities and placing upon them assumed understanding.

In conjunction with original ideas of world literature stemming from Goethe and Casanova, Ishiguro presents a new direction for culture in the landscape of global literature. In this thesis, I analyze the works *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day* with the intent to discover how Ishiguro constructs language and his characters to engage with the concept of the nation. I focus on myths composed in relation to language, the butler, the landscape, and the text that in some way are symbolic of larger national questions. After establishing Ishiguro's uses of stereotypes to build these nations, I conduct an analysis of the French translations of these texts, *Lumière pâle sûre les collins* and *Les vestiges du jour*, in an attempt to evaluate how well these symbols and representations of national identity translate outside of their language of origin. Can these identities really be constructed; and if so, can they be exported into other languages to allow external nations to create conceptions of imagined communities of which they are not a part.

Coupling Karni's perspective with Edward Said's helps illuminate new understandings of seemingly arbitrary passages in Ishiguro's texts. In Chapter 2 "Consolidated Vision" of *Culture and Imperialism*, Said unpacks the notion of the empire, consistently lurking under the text of nineteenth and early twentieth century European literature. He primarily mentions British and French novelists as failing to discuss the presence of imperialism and the empire in their works, despite being able to proliferate countless texts focusing on other subjects (Said 64). He calls for a "contrapuntal reading" of these texts, to bring out subjects that reframe the discussion of great European works. He calls for a decentralization of Europe as the sole perspective in literary

discourse. Edward Said criticizes both nations when it comes to orientalism and the condensing of narratives to exclude, or mildly reference, these tempestuous and complicated parts of history. They were catalysts in the creation of stereotypes, and commodified national identities to benefit their own worlds of culture and art, while also using them as a way to assert their power. These cultures and their national identity is built on their abilities to exert power over and control their imperialized territories. It is when this power is ultimately removed, or shifted, that as readers we must reevaluate how these global powers forced a particular representation of these communities that they imagined for the world. This paper will examine the landscape and language as methods in which suppressive and reductive images are constructed by England and France to exert this power; and it will evaluate how language is used to create contentions amongst a wider audience between preconceived notions of a nation, and those fantasies that deviate greatly from reality, even if we can not export national identities themselves.

A wealth of scholars function within the French discourse regarding how translation conveys ideas to alternate languages. As a cosmopolitan center, Paris functioned as a starting ground for much of how we think about language and high culture, greatly influencing how we decide what is worthy of translation and how it is translated and commodified. It decided upon much of the way in which we view other nations, selecting what is worthy of being shared with a larger audience, and also making it accessible via the French language, rather than any other language in the world. Paul Giles highlights French, in conjunction with English, as being one of these primary heterogenous languages into which all cultures wished to subscribe, and the French language provides a perspective on how myths and cultures may appear in a language denoted as being a connector. French, as opposed to Polish, Portuguese, Spanish, or Arabic

provides a connecting space between many of these cultures, occupying a similar function as global English, serving as a bridge for these novels that are termed “born translated” or world literature. Paris was at the center, and to analyze these texts from a former center helps understand the former perspective, and how this new world literature alters that perspective, if it does that at all. Using the French language, I am also better able to identify as a reader how Ishiguro’s use of a global English may widen his circle of interaction when it comes to creating the English identity or Japanese identity and nation in such a way that his readers may react to them.

Part of my goal in this thesis is to help evaluate Ishiguro’s reframing of the image of the Orient in relation to the traditional European point of view, particularly in *A Pale View of Hills*’ references to *Madame Chrysantheme* by Pierre Loti,<sup>4</sup> an autobiographical work that was foundational in terms of commodifying the Orient for the occidental reader. I look at conversations regarding Pierre Loti’s portrayal of Japan in his work *Madame Chrysantheme*, later to become Puccini’s *Madama Butterfly*, as Ishiguro’s *A Pale View of Hills* plays with allusions to this tragedy. Ishiguro rewrites a well known story that was profoundly influential in establishing Japanese stereotypes, and looking at the origins of the source better helps evaluate how Ishiguro himself takes a piece of world literature and reclaims it to serve his purpose when discussing Japanese identity. In analyzing the perspectives the European powers have regarding Japan, I am better able to engage in a contrapuntal reading and understand what it means to read against these perspectives and constructions as Said suggests.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Madame Chrysantheme* was published by Pierre Loti, a naval officer who went to Japan some years after its opening to the western world, in 1887. The work is an autobiographical work following the naval officer’s relationship with a Japanese woman during his brief time in Japan (Montier 429).

Born translated novels and world literature use stereotypes to deconstruct and destroy them. Stereotypes are tangible recreations of nations from external perspectives, serving as ways for alternate nations, or citizens within the nation themselves to conceive of their own identity. They function as exporters of the nation, and without them the nation would likely be inaccessible. Translations of these novels into French deconstruct the stereotypes and mythic associations with the British and Japanese nations, to then reconstruct them in the language of arrival to give others access to these nations. However, in reconstructing them, readers are still indefinitely distanced, separated by a veil, from the nations of origin.

Highlighting the ways that nations construct their identities, conflate landscapes with heritage, conflate work with tradition, conflate language with patriotism, illuminates what makes the constructions of national identity tangible to its own compatriots. These confluations make the nation exportable, in theory, to any other nation, especially when coupled with translation. Without these confluations, these symbols, these artifacts, these pieces of art and writing, these mythic representations that contain a nation, reduce it to its stereotypes, rendering the nation inaccessible. Ishiguro creates characters who create nations, whether that be in their work as butlers, the landscapes they occupy, the texts that they read and write. He creates constructors of nations, who do so to seek their own place in this world, only to realize that the constructions they made stand on nothing. Their constructions are simply that: constructions and nothing more. An analysis of Ishiguro and the multilingual and international nature of his works reveals the ways in which his writing both challenges and reinforces Anderson's claims regarding imagined communities and what it means to construct a nation or an identity through literary language. In this thesis, I analyze Ishiguro's works from the perspectives of how a nation can be constructed

via language, text, and imagined landscape in order to better understand how Ishiguro helps make the concept of the nation migratory and exportable via translation while also deconstructing stereotypes and national identity in a world that is becoming ever more interested in and accessible from external perspectives.

### **Chapter 1: “Imagined Communities,” Translation, and Global Literature**

In his work “Imagined Communities” from *The Origins of Nationalism* from 1983 Benedict Anderson focuses on how print culture contributed to the creation of a sense of unity amongst its readers, promoting the creation of a national consciousness. Literary and print culture, Anderson argues, gives rise to nations and creates an opportunity for a shared sense of identity. Although print culture and the text provided nations with something to rally around and find a common identity in, he does articulate that the nation in some way has boundaries: “The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other national identities. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind” (Anderson 50). Text has the ability to bring about a national identity, which Anderson was a proponent of, but the expanses of that identity are stifled by the existence of other physical communities and their geographical or ideological boundaries. The nation is negatively defined by the nations that are physically opposed to it. The presence of other nations makes it easier to define a nation, while simultaneously curtailing the extension of the nation beyond its physical boundaries.

As Anderson articulates, language is one of these major boundaries. Print-languages, for Anderson, laid the groundwork for the creation of national consciousness in three ways. First, speakers of differing languages and dialects became capable of comprehending one another via

print and paper: “In the process they gradually became aware of the hundreds of thousands, even millions of people in their particular language-field, and at the same time that only those hundreds of thousands, or millions, so belonged” (Anderson, 56). The printing of a text in various languages created a new understanding of a wide variety of common readership. Secondly, print-language created documents that could be reproduced infinitely, and rendered language “fixed” in time as a marker. Lastly, print-capitalism created languages of power and dominance, languages that were predominantly printed in and transmitted as being widely accessible (Anderson 56). At the same time, language created, and still creates, an impenetrable boundary amongst readers, and it is because of this that “there was and is no possibility of human kind’s general linguistic unification” (Anderson 56). The nation, in this context, would seem to be the extent to which a group can be created around a text.

However, with the rise of translation, globalization, and an even larger market of print-capitalism, global literature has become a common term in the world of literary criticism, and puts pressure on the limits of the imagined community.

### **Goethe “On World Literature”**

Even before this discussion of imagined communities and nationhood, Goethe began to raise questions about world interactions with the ever changing landscape in the mid-nineteenth century. In his essay “On World Literature,” Goethe is one of the first scholars to discuss the idea of a literary scape that crosses national boundaries, or what he called “Weltliteratur.” Written in the early nineteenth century, Goethe unpacks the concept of world literature from a distinctly German perspective.<sup>5</sup> He argues that world literature is literature produced from communal

---

<sup>5</sup> Goethe believed that the creation of a distinctly German national literature was necessary and that literature, much as Anderson suggests, would be incredibly effective in doing so. A distinctly German, nationalist literature in the



causes and elicits reactions from external nations that define the original creators of a particular work. International discourse is foundational for Goethe, and he specifies that “the phenomenon which I call world literature will come about mainly when the disputes within one nation are settled by the opinions and judgments of others” (Goethe 228). As he projects the development of “weltliteratur,” external perspectives and judgements and the way they influence internal functionings is key for Goethe. Simply acknowledging and engaging with the creative works of other countries is not enough (Goethe 225). Consumption of global literature does not constitute global engagement, but fostering personal connection that results in a desire to produce on a communal level is at the core of Goethe’s idea of world literature.

Goethe’s definition raises questions regarding the reader, as his conceptions are heavily based on creation. With this model, the reader is not necessarily a part of a global literary scape because they can not produce with a community. Although the reader in Goethe’s example may not engage in creative production, they do have a vital role in terms of global discourse. They can react and comment, which Goethe does argue is part of the equation in that “from the way they [the people] speak about us [in a particular nation], whether favorably or unfavorably, we learn to judge ourselves; it can certainly do no harm if for once someone makes us think about ourselves” (Goethe 226). The reader has the ability to force reflection, and letting others define one’s nation serves as a moment of evaluation. The audience and their reaction to a text makes the literature a mirror through which to observe the nation. This reflection based on particular texts, however, only portrays a particular image of the nations from which it stems, creating

---

concept of a World Literature would also allow for the dissemination of his thoughts to all of Europe and beyond to the colonies etc (“A Brief History of World Literature”).

skewed identities, perspectives, and stereotypes that the readership at large is making claims about.

### **Casanova and *The World Republic of Letters***

Stepping forward to 1999, jumping nearly 200 years of literary production and international interaction, Pascale Casanova<sup>6</sup> argues in her work *The World Republic of Letters* that global literature stems from a place of competition and is a violent space through which nations attempt to claim intellectual and cultural superiority. In terms of community, literature becomes a common battle ground through which nations can enter into conversation with one another, not to create a common product, but to create the ultimate literary product.

The sixteenth century is pinpointed as the crux of the creation of the international literary space, “the very moment when literature began to figure as a source of contention in Europe, and it has not ceased to enlarge and extend itself since” (Casanova 11). The idea of a global literary landscape, for Casanova, stems from the development of exclusively European nations (Casanova 11), birthing an extremely eurocentric foundation for literary supremacy and general world view, mirroring the kind of conception of world literature that Goethe had.

Supremacy here is grounded in a nation distinguishing itself by its cultural value in terms of literary capital, especially in terms of its literary work attaining the status of a “classic” (Casanova 15). These “classics,” having spread beyond a nation’s boundaries, dictate a nation’s cultural prowess which establishes a sense of literary credibility and can dictate what is

---

<sup>6</sup> Pascale Casanova was a French literary critic who made major leaps in the general discourse surrounding world literature. Her text *The World Republic of Letters*, originally written in French as *La République mondiale des lettres*, opened up conversation and discourse regarding cultural capital and how nationalism can be and is used by particular nations with a strong identity to dominate the international literary space. To discuss the French placement in world literature without Casanova would leave this analysis bereft of depth (“Major French Literary Critic Pascale Casanova Dies at 59”).

considered literature (Casanova 12). This race for the creation of classics and the push and pull in who has the ability to define literature is part of Casanova's world literature battlefield.

With this establishment of literary and cultural hierarchy also comes about the establishment of languages of prestige and literary and linguistic hegemony. Casanova articulates that "certain languages, by virtue of the prestige of the texts written in them, are reputed to be more literary than others, to embody literature" (Casanova 17). Not only do some texts come to have more merit, but they become associated with literature in it of themselves. Regardless of the text, even if it is well written, its merit will be largely predetermined based upon the cultural value of the language in which it is written. Therefore, world literature's definition is constricted to particular texts, as opposed to the entirety of the globe. French, for instance, is one such language that for much of its history was at the top of the meritocratic literary hierarchy, though in recent years English has come to overcome it.

### **French As a Language of Literature and Intellect**

France, Paris in particular, has a long history as a capital of world literature, and this image has been propagated into modern literary discourse and conceptions. Casanova explains that Paris, based on the literature it produced and the Pleiades<sup>7</sup> efforts in the sixteenth century to create a unified linguistic front became a location where politics were transformed into literature (Casanova 26), a location seemingly beyond boundaries, and was home to all who championed the arts and literature, otherwise known as the "universal republic of letters" (Casanova 29).

Paris became a home for the artist, those that exist outside traditional ideas in search of pure art and truth, with the goals of literature at heart. For Goethe, this would be the foundation for his

---

<sup>7</sup> La Pleiades is a group of 16th century poets who decided to create a united front and unite France with a common language. Under Joachim du Bellay, they published a collection of poems that played with language, pulling from ancient Latin and Greek, to establish a French literary and linguistic tradition ("La Pléiade").

world literature, a world in which the communal desire to discuss reigns supreme and results in the production of a co-created literature. This influx of literary production and dissemination created mythic Paris, an all-powerful and supreme location of intellectual merit. Creating a self-fulfilling, circular relationship, a mass influx of people, artists, and refugees who wanted to be a part of this fantastical intellectual landscape moved to Paris and in some way contributed to the intellectual exchange, therefore propagating Paris as a cultural center (Casanova 30). An imagined cultural epicenter was born: a nation of revolution, freedom, and literature. An imagined community manifested itself into a real community, however rather than extend beyond boundaries in terms of dissemination, it simply attracted a compelled audience who had the means to relocate to it.

The reverence some had for Paris as an intellectual capital was so great that some authors began to write in French (Casanova 32). Casanova writes that “because language is at once an affair of state and the material out of which literature is made, literary resources are inevitably concentrated, at least initially, within the boundaries of the nation itself (Thus it is that language and literature jointly provide political foundations for a nation and, in the process, ennoble each other)” (Casanova 34). Based on this logic, the text manifests itself into a nation, greatly coinciding with Anderson’s perspectives on the text’s ability to develop a nation. Language creates literature, and establishes a circle of readership and a locale of access and concentration of that text. This often begins as a nation, and that literature creates political foundations in that it creates shared ideas and discourse relating to governance and policies, giving it power. With the rapid influx in writers producing in French within a defined area, a “nation of intellect” was created.

However, the idea of defining the world with a literary center is in itself extremely reductive. It eliminates and erases the intercultural mix that should make up world literature. Yes, countless people with varying backgrounds went to Paris to be a part of the world's intellect, but only to write in the style and language that pertained to the nation of intellect to gain prestige and a seat at the table. The supremacy of Paris turned people to write in French in an attempt to reach acclaim and in turn often abandoned cultural stories and histories that could very well have strengthened their own national literature. Their writings then become inaccessible to their own nations if they could not read in French, ultimately abandoning their nation for a new, culturally rich Paris. All the same, French became a language that transcended politics and national influences all in the name of intellectual creation. Antoine de Rivarol<sup>8</sup> even went so far as to call French the “human language” based on its incredible growth in power at this time (Casanova 72). But how can a language be of humanity if it is one sided, erasing the multiplicity of its origins.

Today, although French is still a dominant power, English has risen to join, or even potentially supersede French as a global connector. Although their supremacies stem from a history of colonization and forced assimilation, English and French are widely used among countless countries and serve as a middle ground for cultural exchange. People often abandon their native languages, arguably most effective in expressing their ideas, for the English or French languages purely because this is how they can achieve a distinguished position in world

---

<sup>8</sup> Antoine de Rivarol was a French politician and journalist from the later half of the eighteenth century, just around the time of the French revolution, (to which he was greatly opposed) (Mydlarski). His *Discours sur l'universalité de la langue française* unpacks questions relating to the French language as being used in quest for great intellect, how it came to be so, and whether it should continue to be implicated in this way (“L'universalité de la langue française de Antoine de Rivarol”).

literature. Although the languages of French and English do carry significant weight, translation plays a key role in illuminating the connections between texts, and how intertextuality illuminates aspects of the text de depart and the text d'arrivee. Text written to be easily translated, or born translated, occupy a unique point in between languages. With translation on top of this, and the idea of translatese as a literary language, there is a new kind of intercultural literary communication that was previously unimaginable.

### **Considering Colonialism in the English and French European Empires**

Jonathan Arac unpacks Edward Said's work<sup>9</sup> in the context of world literature. He tracks Said's engagement with and discusses the concept of world literature, mentioning Goethe and Auerbach, and what it means to look at a world literature. What is interesting about some of Said's commentary is that he mentions a reading of texts that do not center around a European perspective. These texts are associated with a "new geographical consciousness of a decentered or multiply-centered world" that can transcend culture and move and shift in perspective, something more amorphous as opposed to concrete (Said qtd. in Arac 79). Or he goes even farther to suggest a world view, a perspective, that necessitates not just a European lens, but inherently mandates a lens that "equally include India, Egypt, or Syria and Europe and America as well" (Said 2000: 471)" (Said qtd. in Arac 79). A kind of literature that is not just decent, but makes all perspectives central to the understanding of this text.

Although this work does not decentralize the perspective of how we should read Ishiguro, as it uses another imperial language that is a central part of the narrative of world literature in the terms of western literature, the French language is being reclaimed across the globe. With a

---

<sup>9</sup> Edward Said was a Palestinian American who published *Orientalism*, exploring how the western world created stereotypes regarding the Middle East and Islamic portions of the world. He argues that the western world "othered" the Middle East ("Edward Said").

multitude of francophone countries, the French translated editions of these works immediately have a wider audience it can reach, and this analysis may help articulate the ways in which this literature might appear to these populations. It helps catalog the shifts towards a more decentralized literature, or what that might look like in theory, as it is not yet in practice. As at present, “the world of world literature requires a vividly concrete awareness of geography and acknowledgement both of large-scale relationships of political power also of human-scale circumstances of individual lives” (Arac 79). World literature is only at present accessible, as Arac says, using Said as a lens, when you have the understanding of varying political structures, national histories, and how they interact with one another. Said, Arac argues, says that “the problem with the Orientalist tradition he is criticizing is that, despite its immense erudition, it was not worldly because it was too confined and confining” (Arac 80). France and Britain were able to imagine these orientalist nations, reduce them, and then commodify them for the world (Arac 80). Ishiguro in some way subverts these pretensions in drawing attention to it, whether that was his intention or not, as a Japanese-British author who himself is orientalized with his own writing. Said even mentions that the novel and the opera are the main ways in which these constructions of the orient are created and that shape how external nations, particularly France and England, view these countries. France and England both have this cognisance and exerted their powers to commodify the world for their visions. They deconstruct the conceived national identities of these oriental nations to construct imagined communities that the public later use as their base of understanding external nations, as Goethe suggests. This paper examines how these nations construct mythic constructions of the occidental world (primarily England) and orientalist representations of Japan in an effort to understand how Ishiguro exports fantastical

representations to subvert the audiences expectations and comprehensions regarding references and allusions to the imaged communities he addresses.

### **Global Literature Today and the Born Translated Novel**

Considering the ideas of Goethe, Casanova, and Said, and transitioning them into a 21st century context, global literature consists of a type of cultural exchange where texts are in some way disseminated across the globe and often involve some form of interaction with other nations.

Despite the nature of translations to connect and create a potentially simultaneous experience, it is widely accepted that translations can never fully achieve the same effect as the texts from which they stem. In his essay published in 1923 “The Task of the Translator,” Walter Benjamin<sup>10</sup> makes it clear that translations can never fully remain loyal to their parent text. For Benjamin, in order for a text to be translated it must lend itself to translation, calling for it to be translated. There must exist in the writing some quality that renders it easily convertible into another language while still maintaining its essences as a text or it was intentionally written for an audience that needs a translation. Translatability must be one of a text’s essential qualities in order to be translated (Benjamin 254). In a more philosophical sense, Benjamin suggests that translatability would be a necessary quality of particular works, because “a specific significance inherent in the original manifests itself in its translatability (Benjamin 254). When a translation is required in a text, it is because the translation serves to illuminate an element of the original. Without the translation, a necessary and defining piece of the work is lost in the original; this is what quantifies necessity for Benjamin. In translating a piece, a translation and the original text

---

<sup>10</sup> Walter Benjamin was a prominent philosopher, essayist, and critic in the early twentieth century. He was considered instrumental in understanding the conceptualization of modernity in Europe and was greatly influential in reconstructing how scholars engage with European literature (“Walter Benjamin—Philosopher, Cultural Critic, and Essayist”).



exist within a sort of symbiotic relationship. The translation, although it can never fully be compared to the original text, in some ways augments the qualities of its original, makes it more potent and meaningful, renewing its ideas (Benjamin, 257).

He also raises the idea of a mythic true or pure language that is achieved by the intersection of languages via translation. Benjamin describes true language as “that in which the independent sentences, works of literature, and critical judgments will never communicate - for they remain dependent on translation; but in it the languages themselves supplemented and reconciled in their way of meaning, draw together” (Benjamin 259). The languages intersect in a “tensionless” environment when translation occurs (Benjamin 259). They interact, augment one another, illuminate different angles and perspectives of a particular text, while altogether highlighting different ideas while attempting to reflect the content of an original text. Benjamin’s “pure language,” an extremely mythic conception, connects the original and translated texts with a common thread, and for Benjamin this is the goal of the translator, to find the common thread and illuminate the language that is in a text using other languages. The interstice is where the most pure or true language and essence of a text can be found.

Jacques Derrida, a prolific French philosopher famous for his work on deconstructionism, born in Algeria but conducting much of his work in France, illuminates much when it comes to theories of translation as well. He published several works primarily in the 1960s and 1970s relating to deconstructionism. French scholar Pascale-Anne Brault, one of Derrida’s translators, recapitulates his conceptions of language and translation in her work “Plus d’une langue: Jacques Derrida and the Language of the Other.” In the text, she breaks down several of his ideas regarding translation and its relationship to “the other,” the external parties. She explains how

Derrida considered translation in all aspects, from the mind to words and from one language to another (Brault 2). She breaks down his famous quote «Il faut traduire et il faut ne pas traduire/we must translate and we must not translate» and describes this phrase as putting translators in “a ‘double bind’--we must translate and yet, in translating we must not translate. We must not translate and yet we must” (Brault 3). The translation in itself is confounded with a necessity to translate, as Benjamin puts it, but also a necessity to maintain something of the language of departure, to leave things in a sense untranslated in the way that they were conveyed. Translate with the intention of the text of departure to linger over the translation. Brault explains this in depth with the image of a veil, in that “translation is not the moment when the veil is lifting on an essential meaning that lies behind the veil but the moment when, so to speak, two veils touch, or, better, when one veil comes to take on the impression and texture, the body even, of another, the moment when the fabric of one language receives the impression of the other within it, receiving, then, the impression of another language, not the moment when a disincarnated meaning from one language simply get reincarnated in another” (Brault 4). Brault here provides a deeper, visual representation of what it means to translate in the sense that both Derrida and Benjamin seem to emphasize as the purpose of translation. Not to bridge a gap, but to become the gap and let the separations and differences illuminate what the other language fails to accomplish, making them both all the more powerful and true, and at the same time separate. This veil that Brault posits serves as that form of distance and separation, alienating the other from understanding but also preventing us from understanding ourselves (Brault 5). What happens, however, when the writer explicitly decides to create a language that occupies the veil,

or even when writers choose to engage with language in a way that occupies the language in itself.<sup>11</sup>

As globalization and transnational capitalism intensified, some writers have become increasingly conscious of their global audience and want their texts to land with their varying readership. Rebecca Walkowitz introduces the concept of the “born translated” text into the conversation regarding global literature in her work *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature* published in 2015. She defines born translated literature as follows: “...born translated literature approaches translation as medium and origin rather than as afterthought. Translation is not secondary or incidental to these works. It is a condition of their production” (Walkowitz 4). Translation is an essential quality of these works and is heavily considered part of their identity as a text while they are being created. This type of literature introduces a language and a style of writing that allows for easy access and dissemination across cultural and linguistic boundaries. Born translated literature, Walkowitz suggests, engages with Anderson’s idea of “imagined communities,” citing that imagined communities are created through literature by establishing a sense of simultaneity amongst its readers (Walkowitz 27), which can be achieved with the simultaneous and intentional creation of literature beyond the confines of one language. It establishes a common experience across boundaries that is otherwise difficult to achieve without literature and begins to break the line between the national and the international.

---

<sup>11</sup> Brault explains Derrida’s interaction with the French language as an Algerian man: “.but in coming to terms, so to speak, with a French language that was not his by working with it, inflecting it otherwise, giving it life, inhabiting it in a unique way, translating it...” (Brault 6). Derrida came to make the French language his own, a language that was representative of the colonial history of Algeria and the French imperial presence there. He made the language more global, imbuing it with his perspective, his ideas, and his person, his history. He preserved the French but also augmented it to be more than how it was before he used it.

Walkowitz's born translated literature is one step closer to Benjamin's ideal of pure language or Derrida's veil. Born translated novels are written with a multilingual and multicultural consciousness. Often before they are published, or simultaneously, the work is written into various languages or written in such a way that it can easily be translated. This translatability, as Benjamin highlights, begs a text to be translated. The text was born to be translated, and therefore enters the literary discourse as such. Even a text that is published in English, for instance, can be a born translated novel. The focus is the intention for the audience, which manipulates how an author constructs their works. According to Walkowitz:

To write in English for global audiences, therefore, is to write for a heterogeneous group of readers; those who are proficient in several languages, those who may be less-than-proficient in English, and those who may be proficient in one version of English but not proficient in another. This diversity creates an enormous range of English-language geographies, writers, and audiences. It also means that readers of English-language texts are likely to have very different experiences: the work will be foreign, strange, or difficult to some; it will be familiar to others. Anglophone novelists are thus managing comparative beginnings from the start and must find ways to register internal multilingualism (within English) even as their works travel out into additional national languages (beyond English) (20).

Writing in English opens up a variety of avenues through which readers can engage with a text. It helps ensure a larger audience with varying perspectives, and scholars like Paul Giles and Jing Tsu even comment on the idea of global English or Globish respectively, as a heterogenous

language that is transnational and can encapsulate multiple cultures. “Linguistic play in between different registers,” suggests Giles, “cumulatively suggests how the intersection of global English with other language frameworks forms part of a long transnational tradition of hybridized cultural formations” (Giles 393). English serves as a touch point, a center containing cultural identities and multicultural perspectives that, when translated, reaches the widest audience possible after it is disseminated. However, despite English being a major language around the world that has the ability to contain in some way other nations and identities, the use of English still stifles who can interact with these texts and how, just as French did in Casanova’s *The World Republic of Letters* especially in the context of novels that take place in non-English speaking countries. “Born translated novels in English,” Walkowitz argues, “often focus on geography in which English is not the principal tongue. These works purposefully break with the unique assignment of languages, geographies, and states in which one place is imagined to correspond to one language and one people, who are the users of that language” (22). Although this intermixing of languages and geography makes new geographies more easily accessible to new readers, the text and the language then become subject to experiencing a culture or an idea through a manipulated lens. The language may compress the culture in a way that helps make it more palatable, digestible, or understandable for the reader. The language may attempt to globally encapsulate a nation, but in doing so it must consolidate that nation’s identity into a narrative that it can force upon their audience. The reader’s identity may vary greatly from the one they are forced to take on by a text, causing tension between the assumptions made and the reader. And with a large variety of distinct readers, the idea of nationhood in writing must be further compressed in an attempt to make the writing widely understood in a similar fashion.

### **Kazuo Ishiguro in the Context of Global Literature**

Benjamin's conception of true or pure language and Derrida's veil, in addition to Walkowitz's commentary, complicates Anderson's conceptions regarding language and its ability to curtail or promote the extension of imagined communities, especially in conjunction with the establishment of global literature in literary criticism. In the chapter "The Series, the List, and the Clone" in her work *Born Translated*, Walkowitz analyzes Ishiguro's writing and places him in the context of global literature. Walkowitz categorizes Ishiguro as a global writer, writing "from the perspective of multilingual reading" (Walkowitz 94). She goes on to add that Ishiguro, "in early interviews [emphasized] worrying that addressing many groups diminishes literary fiction and in later interviews embracing the challenge of having audiences in Denver, Oslo, and Kuala Lumpur" (Walkowitz 94). As an author, his intention shifted from the time he constructed his first novel, *A Pale View of Hills*, to his later novels. Ishiguro's multilingual and multicultural audience altered his perspective on writing, giving him new conceptions of how to consider his readers and take his own experiences as a reader informed by global literature into consideration.

Walkowitz also mentions, along with Romit Dasgupta in "Kazuo Ishiguro" and "Imagining Japan," that Ishiguro himself is a product of global and translated literature. Ishiguro produces work in his "non-native language," English, making his writings foreign to his origins. For Dasgupta, this makes Ishiguro a "language migrant," although Ishiguro may not necessarily consider Japanese to be his native language. Additionally, Ishiguro's conceptions of Japan stem from the combination of his vague memories of when he was five and still lived in Japan, and are the translated versions of what Western culture considered to be popular Japanese literature (Dasgupta 14). Ishiguro has even admitted to creating or imagining a Japan that best fits his

intentions for a story. His goal is not to recreate the nations in which his novels take place, like Japan and England, but to create “something ‘truly like it,’” but not identical or fully encapsulating (Bennet 14) as Andrew Bennet observes in their essay “Ishiguro and the Question of England.” Ishiguro constructs nations, he imagines communities based on his globally informed conceptions of nations in order to achieve something “like them” that a larger audience can more easily comprehend.

In his Nobel Prize speech, Ishiguro makes interesting references to his method for constructing the nations of Japan and England in his texts. In reference to Japan, he proclaims his writing about the nation came from “an urgent act of preservation,” (“My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs” 3). In his lecture, he admits “..as I was growing up....I was busily constructing in my mind a richly detailed place called ‘Japan’ – a place to which I in some way belonged, and from which I drew a certain sense of identity and my confidence. The fact that I’d never physically returned to Japan during that time only served to make my own vision of the country more vivid and personal” (“My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs” 5). He goes on to elaborate, saying that the Japan he created, “‘my’ Japan,” is not some place that he can ever go, and is a place that will continue to fade from existence.

He more directly addresses his research process in a 1986 interview. When asked about his novel *An Artist of the Floating World*, also set in a post World War II Japan, and how he conducted research for the creation of Japan in the novel, Ishiguro says “..I make everything up and then I do some research afterwards and make sure I haven't got something outrageously wrong. And if I have got a few things wrong I adjust that. But yes, I mean ... research, for me, is

a kind of checking up process (*Young Kazuo Ishiguro Interview (1986) 00:16:57-00:17:09*).” Ishiguro, discusses how his Japan is a fictional one, and that is where his expertise comes from, a personal fictionalization of an unresearched Japan that may or may not really resemble the Japan of the 1950s. And the resemblance is not of importance for him, it is whether or not “the book has a sense of authority about the world in which the fiction takes place” that matter for Ishiguro’s objectives when it comes to creating these novels (*Young Kazuo Ishiguro Interview (1986) 00:17:45-00:18:07*).

Although his construction of England is not necessarily an attempt to preserve a childhood, as is the case with Japan, he does expressly convey his conscious effort to consider a non-English readership, or a readership less familiar with England. He does use his own version of England, a “mythical one, whose outlines, [Ishiguro] believed, were already present in the imaginations of many people around the world, including those who had never visited the country” (“My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs” 8). He deliberately plays with what he conceives others believe about the nation of England, and whether he admits it or not may use his initial perspectives as an outsider, to inform his creation of England for his works, as well as the conceptions his characters have of the nations they inhabit. In an interview with the Academy of Achievement, he mentions having seen the world “through the eyes of my parents” who did not anticipate on settling in England, a kind of perpetual outsiders (*Sir Kazuo Ishiguro, Academy Class of 2017, Full Interview 00:25:15*), likely making it easier for Ishiguro to place himself in a position to imagine what a non-English citizen might conceive of England to be. He was more readily able to construct myths about



England as someone who grew up consuming myths others created about it as a form of understanding.

Global literature, like globalization, has the potential and the intentions to create a sense of unity, when in actuality large scale inclusion involves the condensing of identities, ideals, and cultures to account for a larger audience. To make the implications larger, the text has to become more specific and hyper exclusive to be inclusive. Nuances are lost, at the expense of keeping the cultural content in the text understandable to a larger audience, and mythical representations of identity are used.

With this in mind, Ishiguro's construction of language and the nation in *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day* greatly impact how his audience can react to and wrestle with his presentation of imagined communities and nationhood. Analyzing how Ishiguro deconstructs the nation, constructed via text, language, and individually informed fantasies, gives the reader content to reconstruct their understanding of said nation. Coupled with the complicit state in which Ishiguro's narrators place his reader, his audience can then reject and reevaluate the problematic constructions he proposes.

## **Chapter 2: *A Pale View of Hills*, Translatese, and Using the Text to Construct a Nation**

*A Pale View of Hills* follows the story of a Japanese woman Etsuko who reminisces about her life in Nagasaki when she was pregnant with her eldest daughter, Kiki, from her first marriage with her Japanese husband Jiro. The reminiscence is spurred by Kiki's suicide and the passing of Etsuko's late English husband. Etsuko, narrating the past from the present, lives in rural England alone and is occasionally visited by her second daughter Niki (daughter to the

Englishman). Throughout the novel, the readers get glimpses of Etsuko's past in post-war Nagasaki, engaging with questions of domesticity, motherhood, guilt, grief, and national identity.

There are several instances in which text is referenced as being a means through which the characters understand national identity, Japanese national identity in particular. The text itself, *A Pale View of Hills*, informs its readers in some way about the Japanese national identity. To make the nation conceptually accessible to his readers, Ishiguro uses Japanese words and "translatese" to create an experience of reading a novel that is not originally English. He also pulls from mythical oriental constructions of Japan with allusions to the autobiographical story *Madame Chrysantheme* by Pierre Loti, later turned into a world renowned opera *Madama Butterfly* by Giacomo Puccini. Ishiguro created a novel in which the reader constructs an understanding of Japan alongside his characters who struggle to reconnect with a Japan that is greatly altered after the war.

### **Translatese in *A Pale View of Hills***

Stefanie Fricke, in "Reworking Myths: Stereotypes and Genre Conventions in Kazuo Ishiguro's Work" highlights the unique quality of the English used by Etsuko. According to Fricke, "The narrator's English seems slightly off, a 'translationese' (Mason, 'Interview' 13) in which Japanese terms like 'sensei,' 'tatami' and the suffix '-san' create further authenticity, making the setting at once exotic and familiar from other representations of Japan" (Fricke 25). The quality of the language and vocabulary augments this sense of 'translationese' that Fricke mentions. Like Fricke, Walkowitz also notes the translation-like quality of the language. Walkowitz names the style of writing "translatese." She pinpoints the circular nature of conversation with constant repetition and echoes as qualities of Ishiguro's writing that forces the

reader to notice this translatability and reflect upon the language and the topic of conversation (Walkowitz 100). This also makes the dialogue easier to follow for those who are not experts in the language they have access to the particular text in.

In a fairly banal conversation between Etsuko, the narrator, and her father-in-law, whom she consistently refers to as Ogata-San, on an outing to Fukuoka, the reader is exposed to several techniques that Fricke mentions, including the suffix “-san” used as a sign of respect or honor. The conversation is centered around Etsuko’s discovering that Ogata-San wants to send a postcard to a female companion of his. Etsuko presses her father-in-law, saying:

“Father’s looking very guilty,” I said. “I wonder who it can be he’s writing to.”

Ogata-San glanced up with a look of astonishment. Then he burst into loud laughter. “Guilty? Am I really?”

“Yes, very guilty. I wonder what Father gets up to when there’s no one to keep an eye on him.” Ogata-San continued to laugh loudly. He was laughing so much I could feel the bench shake. He recovered a little and said: “Very well, Etsuko. You’ve caught me. You’ve caught me writing to my *girl-friend* – he used the English word” (138).

In this passage, the reader is expressly made aware of the fact that the conversation is not happening in the language it is being read in. Ishiguro presents the reader with a conversation that in reality is happening in Japanese, but is translated into English for the audience. However, before this point, it is fairly easy for the reader to forget the language of conversation is different from the language in which the narrator is communicating with them. Ishiguro does so by articulating Ogata-San’s use of the word “girl-friend” in English. Throughout the entirety of the

novel, this is the only instance in which Etsuko clarifies the use of an English word, as opposed to the Japanese in which many of the conversations actually take place, reminding the reader that the dialogue is taking place in Japanese and not English. Etsuko, as a character, contains a unique contention between the language in which the reader understands her and the different languages in which the story takes place. Like Ishiguro, Etsuko is a “language migrant,” deviating from her native language, Japanese, to translate the story for who she assumes to be English speaking readers. She is actively serving as a translator, acting as the bridge or the veil between these two languages and her audience, and the translated quality of the work augments this sense of culturally experiencing an alternate language. Etsuko, in narrating this passage, places herself uniquely in relation to the text, the conversation, and the audience.

Beyond the nature of the language, the word choice also has a unique effect on the reader and their experience. During the conversation, Etsuko’s referencing Ogata-San as ‘Father’ and referring to him in the third person immediately draws the reader’s attention to the relationship between the two characters. In her own memories and private recounting of events, she refers to him in the formal sense maintaining that unique distance and reverence for her elders and father figure in her life. This creates a sense of distance between father-in-law and daughter-in-law, while highlighting the respect that Etsuko has for Ogata-San, whom she has a long standing relationship with. However, it also creates a feeling of foreignness for the reader. The third person constantly takes the reader away from the scene, making them aware of the style of reference. Referring to him as “Father” also makes the language feel childish or childlike. The narrator’s use of short sentences with basic grammatical structures and repetitive language,

saying “guilty” back and forth with Ogata-San, make the conversation feel elementary and circular. His responses mirror her language patterns as well, repeating “You’ve caught me” twice.

Ishiguro’s use of Japanese formal titles, repetitive and simple language, and the expression of the use of English words, reminds the reader that this narrative occurs in a language other than the one in which they are reading it. The repetition halts the flow of the conversation throughout many parts of the novel, forcing characters into cyclic patterns of conversation. For Walkowitz, it is this cyclic nature of the conversations, which often repeats itself throughout Ishiguro’s novels, that is meant to be reflective of a “world circulation” (Walkowitz 100). It forces a separation between the reader and the text.

Walkowitz also highlights that in the novels where Japanese characters are the narrators, “the characters appear to be speaking Japanese.” However, she also suggests that the characters, rather than speaking simplistically, “often speak in a vague or convoluted diction that can seem like translatese” (Walkowitz, 95). The dialogue, in this instance, does appear to be surface level, and it does not go very far beyond general statements. The language feels “off,” almost as if it had been written in Japanese and translated into English, and the reader has to wrestle with that distanced feeling. Writing in this way makes the text significantly easier to disseminate to a global audience while maintaining the cultural references that Ishiguro hopes to evoke in his writing. Ishiguro’s use of translatese makes it easier for him to become a part of a global literature, in that they all peel a push away from being fully included in the language of conversation in the text.

In terms of cultural reference, Ishiguro also displaces the reader when he uses traditional Western titles as opposed to Japanese titles of reverence throughout the novel. For instance, a

local noodle shop owner, Mrs. Fujiwara is consistently referred to with the title “Mrs” as opposed to “San.” The distinction becomes extremely apparent when Ishiguro places both styles of titles together in the text.

After Ogata-San and Etsuko speak with one of Ogata-San’s former students about his writing, Etsuko decides to take Ogata-San to Mrs. Fujiwara’s noodle shop. They begin to discuss the education of her son and his former teachers:

“Now let me see,” said Mrs. Fujiwara. “There was a teacher in those days, she was very kind to Suichi. Now what was her name? Suzuki, I think it was, Miss Suzuki. Have you any idea what became of her, Ogata-San?”

“Miss Suzuki? Ah, yes, I recall her quite well. But I’m afraid I’ve no idea where she could be now.” (150).

Ishiguro directly opposes the titles of Mrs. Fujiwara and Miss Suzuki in this scene to the title of Ogata-San. Placing the titles next to one another pushes the reader into a state of tension between the text, the intended language of conversation, and their own perception of the conversation as deviating from what they understand to be Japanese cultural standards.<sup>12</sup>

In the case of Ishiguro, his writings, and he himself, are a byproduct of globalization and therefore the condensing of cultures and cultural identities. His characters wrestle with the confinements of their identities to a nation that so desperately wants to exist beyond its own

---

<sup>12</sup> In some ways, Ishiguro may also be using these varying titles to comment on gender, in that women of power and influence often receive the Western titles, more directly linked to a culture in which they would be able to pursue these opportunities, than in a more traditional Japan, a pre-war Japan that Ogata-san champions and Ishiguro also alludes to in *An Artist of the Floating World*. Ono, the narrator, and his grandson often get caught in cycles in which they discuss the fragility of the women in their lives and play into the masculinity of their roles as son and father. Ono seems to want to preserve the notion of female fragility and masculine strength in a world where his daughters increasingly take care of Ono, or seem to be more “correct” in their judgments regarding the world.

boundaries, but can not. Ishiguro creates nations and scenarios, fabricating and imagining identities and cultures, to put them in contention with the readers that engage with his work.

#### Condensed Extremes and Morally Gray Characters

Ishiguro plays off of stereotypes and mythical conceptions as a way of preventing his reader from getting lost in the morally gray world of his narrators (in the case of *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day*). He creates characters, like Ogata-San, Sachiko, Mariko, and Mrs. Fujiwara to occupy extremes of the social contexts that they inhabit. In doing so, Ishiguro is forcing his readers hand and level of understanding, guiding them to construct a particular view as they go through the story with the narrators. The characters color the morally gray perspective of the narrators. The narrator's world and understanding remains perpetually gray. However, the reader has consumed the experiences of the other characters at the extremes, which balance one another out, to generally inform their understanding of the novel. While Etsuko struggles to understand, Ishiguro gives the reader space to act and react to the world he has constructed, only after being expressly confined.

Ishiguro wants the reader to feel a sense of tension and disconnect here, and using a first person narrator helps achieve this effect. The reader is placed in a limited, constricted universe, the mind of their narrator, where they hear alternate perspectives. For the narrator, these alternate perspectives fail to break through and alter their understanding of the world they inhabit. The perpetually pull and push of these voices that fight against the unitary narrative perspective are intended to have a greater impact on the reader. If Ishiguro were to shift the perspective of his narrator, or used free and direct style to present the thought processes of the different characters, or even Etsuko, he would be creating characters that can connect more authentically with the

reader. If the characters were all tapped into to create the discourse, the audience could identify with someone other than Etsuko, defeating her purpose as a narrator for the novel. The reader's metamorphosis in understanding will, ideally, far exceed that of the narrator, pushing the reader away from them so they can no longer identify with this morally gray and obtuse narrator. The audience can then reflect on the often problematic nature of the narrator, but also the extreme characters who attempt to pull the narrator into their similarly flawed understandings of the nation and the world.

Karni also posits Ishiguro's characters in these novels into a kind of gray area, as they physically wrestle with the concept of light in the texts, with an emphasis on morality and identity, the narrators find themselves lost in a sea of cultural gray area, that Ishiguro may also find himself in (Karni 335). These characters have a more concrete access to national identity and have the greatest access in helping the reader conceptualize the national identities they engage with. Ishiguro seems to illuminate where we can find the closest access to national identity, in between the gray of the national myths we function in.

### **Construction of Understandings and Stereotypes**

In order to have these narrators function in the way Ishiguro wants them to, their conceptions of the nation must also be seemingly flat and based on national myths or fantasies. Lowenthal makes the point that "Landscape-as-heritage lends itself to nostalgic myth-making..." (217). Both *A Pale View of Hill* and *The Remains of the Day*, and several of his other novels<sup>13</sup>, play with national identity and its manifestations within the landscape. Although Lowenthal particularly makes reference to the English landscape and its past, the pasts of all the nations

---

<sup>13</sup> The novels include *An Artist of the Floating World* and *The Buried Giant*, both referenced in this work. Both novels deal with questions of memory and complicity in war and violence and how nations are represented.



Ishiguro plays with in some way “permeates this landscape in not the primordial wild, but a nearer history infused with memorable human processes, desires, decisions, and tastes” (Lowenthal 216). In *The Remains of the Day*, Stevens drives through the rolling hills of England, the same rolling hills and landscape Ishiguro explores in *The Buried Giant*. The mountains and hills, filled with tar, blood, and bones spilled from inquisition and conquest, interbrother battle, that becomes mythicized with a dragon who makes those living on the land forget about its own atrocities, guarded by a traditional English hero, Gawain, who wishes the world to forget his own shortcomings. In an effort to erase the past upon which the nation is built, Ishiguro’s characters exist in a world based on myths. This novel is an excellent example of Lowenthal’s proposition that “landscape-as-heritage lends itself to nostalgic myth-making” (217). Members of a nation can be nostalgic for a past that never existed but was rather fantasized and manifested itself in the landscape. Stevens does exactly that, rather ignorant himself to the atrocities of the English past which he also played a part in. He propagates the myths of English grandeur to which he himself falls victim, under the spell of Ishiguro’s nationalist-amnesia smoke breathing dragon. And not only does Stevens himself fall prey to the amnesia, or rose colored glasses of his national identity, he colors the way in which his readers experience the myth. Lowenthal comments that this nostalgic myth-making that stems from the landscape-as heritage often “prevail[s] most among outsiders ‘smitten by blind Anglophilia’” (217). Although it would be generous to conjecture that all of Ishiguro’s readers fall prey to blind Anglophilia, Stevens absolutely does. And his blind love of England as a nation and its mythic innocence is what he imposes on his readers. Stevens paints this fantastical England, making his mindset more accessible to outsiders while also playing on pre-existing conceptions and stereotypes of a

mythical England to an external reader. Ishiguro makes the discourse more “enterable” by an external reader, while also allowing Stevens to impose ideas of Englishness that erase the colonialist history of English erasure embedded in this idea of supremacy.

This suffusion of the landscape with nationalism is not exclusive to Ishiguro’s novels set in England. The landscape in *A Pale View of Hills* is also reflective of the post-World War II past in Japan, in which the American world power utterly destroyed the Japanese countryside, or suburb, and turned it into a waste land of sorts. For deeply traditional nationalist characters like Ogata-San, the embodiment of what is good in this nation was contained in a landscape that he knew and had control over. This directly contrasts with the quote-on-quote new Japanese nation being physically built and redefined on top of the landscape and beyond the landscape which he sees, as does the reader, in the form of literature.

The narrator Etsuko paints a picture of a pre-World War II Nagasaki ravaged by war and a deceptively optimistic vision of a future in Japan that neglects its past as opposed to being nostalgic for it. Etsuko describes how she and Jiro, her husband at the time, moved just “east of the city,” and she was “once told that before the war a small village had grown up on the riverbank” (11). This image, paralleling what looks like the foundations of civilization, a small village by the riverbanks, is ravaged and destroyed by the bombing, which left nothing but “charred ruins” (11). The land is eventually developed on, and several apartment buildings are constructed by what seem to be government workers, but the rebuilding programme is halted, with only four buildings being constructed, creating what Etsuko calls the “waste ground” between her apartment complex and the river (11). In the waste ground, “One wooden cottage had survived both the devastation of the war and the government bulldozers...standing alone at

the end of that expanse of waste ground, practically on the edge of the river” reminiscent of the kind of cottages seen in the “countryside” (12). Etsuko too makes references to a countryside, but unlike Stevens, who can openly explore his countryside of England, Etsuko’s Japanese countryside is being actively replaced by the desire for post-war progress or abandoned as unsalvageable. She is also indefinitely separated from the countryside, as it is constantly paired with images of danger and death. Venturing into this past Japan, raw and un-industrialized, is seemingly dangerous and hazardous, potentially for what it would reveal.

The landscape upon which Etsuko exists contains three representations of Japanese history within Etsuko’s lifetime: pre-war, the war, and post-war reconstruction. Etsuko eventually insists on her need to move on with her conception of Japan and her personal future, with the new industrialization of Japan prompting her commentary.

The erasure of her national past parallels the erasure of her personal identity associated with that past. Throughout the novel, Etsuko makes references to specific details of events that she does not quite remember, such as when she met her friend Sachiko.<sup>14</sup> By the end of the novel, the reader is forced to question the entirety of the plot, realizing that Etsuko in some way erased a part of her own past, just as she proclaimed should be done: never looking back and always looking forward. While on a trip with Sachiko and Mariko, Etsuko looks at the view of Japan standing on top of a mountain and describes the harbor, “looking like a dense piece of machinery left in the water” and the expanse of buildings and houses framing the harbor along the hill. She comments on how it would be practically impossible to tell that any kind of tragedy had occurred

---

<sup>14</sup> Sachiko is a mother to a young girl named Mariko. Sachiko is roughly the same age as Etsuko and lives in a small cottage on the other side of the waste ground just by the river. She is ostracized by many of the other women in their local area, in particular for the way she rears her daughter and her connection to an American man, Frank, who she plans to go to America with.

here beforehand and how the bomb ravaged the area (110). With this particular view, she proclaims her newfound desire to be an optimist, as without optimism and forward thinking, all of what she looks at “would still be rubble” (111). Etsuko falls into denialism, aware of what was done to the traditional Japanese landscape but opting to deny its destruction and glorify the way Japan has rebounded into the future. She creates a myth of a newly born Japan, letting the landscape hide its past in exchange for a blinded look forward.

Etsuko is hit with a kind of nationalist amnesia, denying the hard truth for a fantasy that she constructed, forcing the readers too to have this altered conception of what Japan was like before the war and after the war. For readers with little context, as aforementioned, Etsuko informs the readers of what to think when it comes to understanding Japan. She uses traditional Japanese words, describes the landscape, and creates an illusory authentic Japan for the readers to foreground their imagination of the nation. In having Etsuko construct Japan, Ishiguro forces the reader to be caught in her single minded fantasy; and not until the end of the novel is there a sense of tension between the story the reader is told and a part of, and the grave reality of post-war Japan and its impact on Etsuko as a woman.

### **Ishiguro, Loti et *Madame Chrysantheme* ou *Madama Butterfly*<sup>15</sup>**

Ishiguro augments this stereotypical and mythical representation of Japan, using other texts based on orientalism and exotification, to subvert the reader’s understandings of Japan, especially a Western informed readership. *A Pale View of Hills* uses intertextuality to augment the imagined quality of Ishiguro’s Japan. According to Emily Horton’s article “Diaspora, Trauma, Spectrality and World Literary Writing in *A Pale View of Hills*,” Ishiguro took

---

<sup>15</sup> See brief English summary in Appendix A

inspiration from a text that has gone through countless writers and cultural transitions to help construct an understanding of Japan through a pre-filtered lens in this novel: Pierre Loti's *Madame Chrysantheme* and the opera recreation by Giacomo Puccini, *Madama Butterfly*. Although Horton's analysis explicitly focuses on the opera *Madama Butterfly*, her commentary illuminates the role that the story plays in terms of subverting idealizations of the Western world and realizing the way in which the West orientalized Japan. With this context, it is necessary to illuminate how the nation and people of Japan were constructed in the original autobiographical work by Pierre Loti *Madame Chrysantheme* during his initial journey to Japan in the 1800s. In using Loti and Puccini's narrative, Ishiguro constructs Japan for his readership with these oriental mystifications so his readers can break them down.

Dans son article, "L'Évolution des consciences grâce à la langue, vue au prisme du voyage, de la colonisation, et de l'émigration," Eri Ohashi souligne le rôle que la langue avait dans la création des concepts qui définissent l'orient, en particulier le Japon. Elle utilise la perspective d'Edward Saïd pour parler de la langue comme une façon de coloniser lorsque Saïd remarque "que la langue française est le premier élément destiné à être exporté dans le monde entier" (qtd. in Ohashi 71). En utilisant la langue, on impose une façon de penser et aussi une hiérarchie linguistique, comme Casanova explique, et la langue est la première forme d'imposition qu'on peut exporter vite et assez facilement. Sans le lien des connexions créées par la langue, il y a peu de possibilités pour deux cultures d'interagir. Mais, il faut noter que la langue imposée, que les colonisés doivent apprendre pour parler avec le colonisateur, limite comment les colonisés peuvent parler avec les colonisateurs. Il leur manque des capacités linguistiques, souvent, pour vraiment

communiquer leur pensée et leur pouvoir avec les colonisateurs. Les colonisateurs utilisent ce manque d'aptitude à parler pour infantiliser les colonisés, ce qui renforce une hiérarchie où leur culture est représentée comme plus puissante et où ils ont le pouvoir d'imposer et "éduquer" la population colonisée.

Un autre aspect important de l'utilisation de la langue du colonisateur est que plus un pays est colonisé, plus on utilise cette langue dans d'autres parties du monde ce qui développe d'autres réseaux de connexions pour le colonisateur. La présence de cette langue croît d'elle-même par les échanges créés entre différents pays colonisés par le même occupant. La colonisation unifie donc paradoxalement des nations colonisées par cette langue commune même si ces nations ou cultures n'étaient pas liées au préalable, tout cela bien sûr au profit du colonisateur. Pour la France, la langue a été un outil crucial pour développer sa puissance. Ohashi explique notamment que la France a utilisé la langue française comme un outil de colonisation qui a même fait disparaître les langues d'origine et qui a unifié les cultures colonisées, ce qui "prouve[nt] que la langue est un élément essentiel de la construction des Etats" (Ohashi 70). Ohashi rend visible le lien entre la langue, la colonisation, et la construction des Etats, ou des nations. L'auteur analyse la perspective de l'écriture issue de voyages pour montrer au lecteur comment la langue est impliquée dans le changement de la "conscience" grâce à, ou à cause des perspectives du voyageur, du colonisateur et de l'émigré" (Ohashi 69). Mais pour le sujet de cette analyse, on s'intéresse le plus à la perspective du colonisateur, ici au cas de Pierre Loti, pour comprendre comment Ishiguro utilise les constructions du Japon de Loti dans *A Pale View of Hills*.

Quand Loti parle de son récit *Madame Chrysanthème*, il insiste sur son authenticité. Il présente ses personnages, leurs expériences et tous les événements du récit comme fidèles à la réalité (Loti qtd. in Ohashi). Il dit il même dans un article dans le journal du *Figaro* “Tous mes personnages sont réels, ou ont été mes amis. Je les copie, physiquement et moralement, le plus fidèlement que je peux...(Gille 1887)” (qtd. In Ohashi 71). L’obstination de Loti sur la crédibilité de son œuvre, en particulier car il est perçu maintenant comme un écrivain exotique, est polémique, car il a complètement inversé la perception du Japon. A cause de Loti, le Japon est un culture que l’occident peut contrôler, comme un poupé (Ohashi 73). La langue qu’il utilise et l’autorité avec laquelle il parle donne une connotation positive à la japonophobie. Il rend les traces de japonophobie, orientalisme, et exotisme moralement acceptables. Lorsque Loti dit qu’il ne fait que copier la réalité et qu’il compare les Japonaises au songes et à des oiseaux muets (Ohashi 73), ou bien encore la nation du Japon a un monde ancien dénué de nouveauté (Ohashi 72) sauf dans le contexte de l’art, il déshumanise le peuple japonais et sa culture et donne l’impression qu’il est acceptable ou utile de l’observer et de l’esthétiser, et de penser que l’art est la seule manière de capter cette culture pourtant plus complexe et multidimensionnelle (Ohashi 73). Loti a adopté une perspective réductive qui passe par la conviction de la supériorité de la langue française. Ohashi note que “Loti ne reconnaît jamais que le japonais puisse avoir les mêmes fonctions que le français, qui peut exprimer profondément toutes les idées” (Ohashi 72). Loti est ignorant de plein gré et il décide d’ignorer la possibilité de découvrir le Japon à travers la langue Japonaise. Il trouve, à cause de sa perspective eurocentrique et franco-centrique, que la langue française peut exprimer profondément ce qu’il pense, ce qui transforme le Japon en un monde barbare et antique. Cela s’accorde bien avec comment il décrit le Japon et en particulier

les Japonaises et comment il les “apprécie” (ou plutôt les fétichise), comme des femme silencieuses, endormies, décoratives qui ne disent rien (Ohashi 73).

Kyoko Koma fait une analyse de l’image que Loti construit des femmes dans *Madame Chrysanthème* et note les mots français et les appropriations de mot japonais qu’il utilise pour les décrire. Koma insinue que l’image que Loti fait est un prototype du stéréotype généralisé sur la femme japonaise aujourd’hui” (Koma 21). Loti utilise des mots qu’il combine, par exemple, comme petite créature, petite fille, petit chien/chat, mievre, mignard, singe et poupée pour décrire la femme japonaise pendant tout le récit. Sur la base de ces mots, Koma montre comment Loti construit une image docile et ornementale des femme japonaises, sans sentiments, sans mots, sans vraie caractéristique pour les distinguer et leur donner une vraie personnalité. Loti a aussi utilisé ce que Koma nomme le xénisme “mousmé,” qui veut dire “une/très jeune fille” (Koma 26). Koma explique qu’un “xénisme ou pérégrinisme, [...] mots qu’on ne peut acclimater dans notre lexique [sont des] indices de couleur locale ou d’effet de réel »” (Veronique Magali qtd. In Koma 24). On utilise le xénisme pour préserver quelque chose de la langue d’origine qu’on perd si on essaie de le traduire dans la langue d’arrivée. Pour Koma, le xénisme japonais donne à Loti l’opportunité de réduire la culture Japonaise, l’esthétisme, et donne à son œuvre un air exotique (Koma 25). Loti fait quelque chose de semblable avec les noms des femmes dans l’œuvre. Il “francise” les noms japonais, il les déshabille de leur culture japonaise et efface l’identité qu’un nom contient, et il présente les femmes comme il l’entend, avec une identité prise et imposée par les Français. Par exemple, il présente le nom Toki san comme madame L’Heure ou O Sei san comme Madame Très-Propre (Koma 24). Il plaisante sur des mots japonais et essaie de les comprendre avec la langue française, pas avec la langue japonaise. Encore comme le



suggère Said, la langue française impose sur cette culture qu'il n'essaye pas de rendre accessible, et Koma le souligne en montrant comment Loti représente les femmes japonaises en gardant une distance subjective, parce qu'il n'a pas la langue, ou le désir, de les comprendre d'une manière intime et compliquée. Il est plus facile de les mettre en scène d'une manière subjective, de leur prendre leur mots et de les convertir à des idées françaises.

L'image que Loti construit de l'orient repose sur le silence et la soumission de la culture japonaise, en particulier des femmes, car il supprime leur capacité de parler et de contredire ce qu'il écrit comme un réalité imaginaire du Japon. Quand il les peint comme des personnages sans intelligence et sans voix, il donne l'impression au reste du monde que cette culture est mûre pour l'esthétisation. Le Japon de Loti s'inscrit au monde d'art flottant, l'art qui est là pour être silencieux et adapté, volé, et immortalisé par les pouvoirs puissants et occidentaux. Quand une culture n'a pas un lien pour communiquer avec les colonisateurs, il sera à la merci des colonisateurs, et Loti propage cette notion d'un monde qui peut être dominé par l'Occident.

On peut bien voir que les suppositions de Loti sur les facultés de la langue japonaise sont réductives. Naoko Tsuruki explique comment Loti a contribué à la formation du stéréotype de la Geisha. Il continue de consolider la culture japonaise, en particulier celle des femmes, avec la création du stéréotype de la "Geisha." La manipulation de ce terme par Loti réduit plusieurs aspects de la culture japonaise.

Premièrement, Tsuruki explique que le terme Geisha en japonais est beaucoup plus compliqué. Le terme veut dire "personne d'art et de technique" et est en fait neutre dans le cadre du genre (Tsuruki 216). Le travail ou l'art d'être une "personne d'art et de technique" a commencé avec les "hokan," les hommes qui devaient créer de la conversation et spectacle, une

atmosphère de gaieté chez leur seigneurs (Tsuruki 216). Le gouvernement a finalement légalisé la prostitution pour que les gens puissent vivre avec le plaisir, mais en général le terme de geisha désigne quelqu'un de bien, homme ou femme, qui maîtrise l'art de la conversation et qui connaît les arts et sait créer une soirée captivante (Tsuruki 217). Mais, la langue française, liée par les contrats du genre attribués à chaque nom, a décidé de créer une féminisation du terme Geisha, en partie par les écritures des voyageurs comme Loti qui ne parle que de femmes geisha.

Tsuruki souligne que les écrivains du genre de la littérature de voyages comme Loti laissent flotter une sorte d'air mystérieux, quelque chose de sexuel, d'exotique, de silencieux et docile ce qui fait que l'occident peut s'imaginer ce qu'il veut des Geisha (Tsuruki 224). Il crée un stéréotype qui peut facilement être augmenté à cause de son ambiguïté linguistique. Il utilise le mot "geisha/guechas" une fois, mais il ne définit jamais le terme, il décrit seulement des femmes et crée l'image de "L'Autre-femme" avec "les perceptions sensorielles-la vue avec la couleur de sa peau et l'odorat avec son parfum-et de suggérer un certain erotisme suscite par l'exotisme" (Tsuruki 226). Loti, selon Tsuruki, donne des expériences corporelles qu'il a ressenties à cause des femmes japonaises. Il dépersonnalise les femmes et donne l'opportunité pour l'écart entre les geisha féminine au Japon et le stéréotype imaginaire de la geisha. Ohashi prononce clairement cette divergence en disant "Les romans sont ainsi une sorte de miroir qui réfracte les images diverses de la langue dans le regard des locuteurs" (Ohashi 80). Car Loti essaie de comprendre les nouvelles expériences culturelles inconnues, comme Tsuruki explique (227), le lecteur qui n'a pas l'expérience elle-même ce que Loti décrit n'a pas d'autre choix que d'identifier avec le flacon dans laquelle l'écrivain représente, ou réfracté, son expérience du monde. Tsuruki explique que "Mais cela nous confirme l'impossibilité fondamentale de la totale objectivité en ce qui concerne

la transmission, ainsi que la longévité d'une image stéréotypée, difficile à déconstruire une fois interprétée et stabilisée dans l'imaginaire collectif d'une société réceptrice" (Tsuruki 228). D'une autre perspective, Loti a établi un stéréotype qui s'est bien propagé en facilitant l'expérience et "le ressenti" de l'orient pour le lecteur. Cette œuvre est devenue le seul angle par lequel les Français, ou les gens qui parlaient le français, pouvaient voir, imaginer et "comprendre" l'orient. Avec ses représentations japonophobiques, exotiques et esthétiques, Loti crée un peuple sans langue et sans accès direct à la langue française. Par conséquent, les Japonais n'avaient pas l'opportunité de construire une contre-représentation de leur culture plus précise et nuancée. Dans ce contexte, la langue française ne pouvait ni entrer ni s'intéresser à la langue japonaise et prenait pour argent comptant la perspective de l'homme colonisateur sur la culture et la nation japonaise.

L'impression et l'image que Loti construit des Japonaises n'impacte pas que la culture japonaise. Mathilde Kang<sup>16</sup> retrace un triangle de traduction mettant en relation Paris-Tokyo-Shanghai et qui était intégral à la dissémination de la littérature française vers la culture non-francophone à l'orient. Kang se focalise généralement sur la Chine, mais note aussi comment la langue française s'est répandue et fait partie de la scène littéraire du côté du Japon et de la Chine. En Chine, il y avait un désir de lire des œuvres occidentales, d'en savoir plus, en particulier sur la possibilité d'une révolution et de réformes, un type de réorganisation de la société (Kang 51). Ce désir d'acquisition d'œuvres occidentales, s'accélère et montre que "le climat littéraire de l'époque est que l'Asie connaît sa première génération d'auteurs bilingues (en l'occurrence le français/l'anglais). Ces derniers, du fait qu'ils sont occidentalisés et adeptes des

---

<sup>16</sup> Mathilde Kang est une professeur des langues moderne a Hampden-Sydney College. Elle a écrit l'article "La migration des œuvres françaises en Asie" qui souligne comment les textes français ont été traduits et disséminés dans le monde oriental. Elle analyse le trajet de trois textes français et comment ils sont arrivés en Asie.

littératures européennes, créent un horizon d'attente propice" (Kang 51). Le français et l'anglais, ainsi que les cultures, l'histoire et les écoles de pensées que ses langues représentent ont circulé en Chine mais pas sans l'intervention intermédiaire du Japon. Le triangle Paris-Tokyo-Shanghai a non seulement donné à la Chine et au Japon accès à l'occident, mais aussi aux lecteurs qui peuvent traduire les langues chinoise et japonaise la possibilité de disséminer des textes dans d'autres parties du monde.

*Madame Chrysanthème* est arrivée à Tokyo en 1895 et à Shanghai en 1929, grâce à sa traduction en anglais avant de partir en Chine et au Japon (Kang 53). L'œuvre a donné aux cultures orientales l'opportunité de voir comment Loti, dont l'optique était celle d'un colonisateur, a représenté le Japon. Stéréotypés et mythifiés, une partie de l'Asie a pu voir comment l'occident déformé l'identité et les vies de ceux qui y étaient représentés, tout cela au profit de l'intrigue. Loti impose la supériorité de la France en donnant au Japon l'opportunité de voir comment il l'a dépeint pour le reste du monde. Réduit au silence et représenté de manière inauthentique, le Japon a consommé lui-même ses propres stéréotypes pour informer sa propre société.

Le travail de Loti, bien connu partout dans le monde et fondamental dans les conceptions du Japon par le monde occidental, a été transformé et adapté pour une audience encore plus grande et en croissance constante. L'écrivain américain John Luther Long a écrit un petit historique inspiré par l'œuvre de Loti ("Discover Madam Butterfly") et David Belasco a adapté le travail de Long pour le théâtre, une pièce que Puccini a vue. Puccini a effectivement créé un opéra qui est connu maintenant dans le monde entier. Ce narratif sort d'un contexte global, et Ishiguro, comme nous le verrons un peu plus loin,

continue cette chaîne de globalisation. Comme Horton a noté, le personnage de Sachiko a bien l'air d'être inspiré par l'adaptation du *Madame Chrysanthème* par Puccini: *Madame Butterfly*.

Quelques informations et un bref résumé de l'intrigue permettent de comprendre la relation entre cet opéra, que Puccini a créé en 1898 et certains personnages d'Ishiguro. L'histoire de Puccini se passe à Nagasaki et suit la jeune geisha japonaise Cio-Cio San, aussi connue comme Madame Butterfly. Le lieutenant de vaisseau Pinkerton est stationné à Nagasaki et paie pour un mariage arrangé à Cio-Cio San. Madame Butterfly tombe amoureuse de Pinkerton et se marie avec lui. Il est important de noter qu'elle se convertit au Christianisme ce qui la mènera à être reniée par ses proches. Après leur mariage, Pinkerton quitte Butterfly et retourne aux Etats-Unis pour trouver une femme américaine. Seule et loin de sa communauté, Cio-Cio San, et le fils qu'elle a de Pinkerton, attend son retour, pleine d'espoir et de naïveté enfantine. Convaincue que Pinkerton reviendra, elle renonce aux traditions japonaises et se considère comme américaine.

Pour en revenir à l'œuvre de Ishiguro, l'histoire de Sachiko et de son amoureux Frank est tout à fait parallèle à celle de Cio-Cio San et Pinkerton. Sachiko a des plans de retourner aux Etats Unis avec Frank et Mariko (la fille de Sachiko) pour une meilleure vie. Au fil du récit, le lecteur apprend que Frank a abandonné Sachiko et Mariko à Nagasaki. Frank les a laissés et il a pris tout l'argent avec lui. Etsuko est bien choquée par les actions de Frank, mais Sachiko ne semble pas être alarmée par ce qui s'est passé. En riant, elle dit à Etsuko << Vous avez l'air stupéfaite, Etsuko, dit-elle. Non, il n'avait rien laissé. Il est parti hier matin, c'est tout ce qu'ils savent. Pour vous dire la vérité, je m'y

attendais un peu>> (110). Quand Etsuko propose la possibilité que Frank a quitté Nagasaki, Sachiko réplique << Oh, Etsuko, il n'est pas loin. D'ailleurs, s'il avait vraiment voulu me quitter, il m'aurait laissé une lettre, non? Vous voyez, il n'est pas allé loin. Il sait que j'arriverai à le retrouver>> (Ishiguro 110). Calme et sûre, mais aussi naïve, et sans doute aveuglée par son amour pour lui ou pour un meilleur avenir, Sachiko ne voit rien de troublant dans le comportement problématique de Frank, vis à vis d'elle et de sa fille, Mariko.

Le personnage de l'opéra, Mme Butterfly est aussi naïve, quand elle est sûre que Frank retournera, même après la lettre qui vient de Pinkerton et que lui lit Sharpless et qui dit qu'il ne retournera pas pour elle. Son espoir est si fort et si grand, qu'elle dit qu'elle va re-nommer son fils, qui s'appelle Douleur, Joie (Puccini). Puccini a construit cette femme sur le modèle de Loti, enfantine, petite, naïve, et complètement liée au désir et à la volonté d'un homme occidental, celui-ci américain. Pinkerton tire partie du style de vie japonais, en dépeignant une jeune fille qui sera reconnue comme Geisha, correspondant au mythe de la femme qui est là pour procurer du plaisir, accommodante et docile mais aussi sans valeur, dont on peut se passer.

On note que Ishiguro fait plusieurs changements à cette histoire d'amour et de chagrin, transformant les fantaisies orientales en quelque chose de plus nuancé. Il faut admettre que Sachiko est beaucoup plus indépendante et moins enfantine que Butterfly dans l'opéra, ce qui rend sa naïveté encore plus surprenante. Mais son déni vient peut-être du désespoir qu'elle ressent en l'absence de Frank, et de l'espoir qu'elle nourrit qu'il reviendra pour l'escorter aux Etats Unis, comme Pinkerton promettait à Butterfly.

Mais la plus grande similarité entre Sachiko et Madame Butterfly vient de la façon avec laquelle elles adoptent toutes les deux une identité américaine. Dans l'opéra, après que Madame Butterfly est rejetée par la société, Prince Yamadori essaie de l'épouser, disant que Madame Butterfly, par la loi japonaise, était automatiquement divorcée quand Pinkerton l'abandonne. En réponse, Madame Butterfly dit qu'elle vit sous la loi américaine, et qu'elle est américaine. Aussi, pendant l'opéra, elle répond aux gens qui s'adressent à elle en l'appelant Madame Butterfly, qu'elle est Madame Pinkerton. Elle essaie donc de s'immerger dans une identité Américaine.

Comme Pinkerton, Frank est un lien avec le monde extérieur. Même s'il n'arrive pas en bateau, il arrive dans son camion de la marque américaine Ford, pour "sauver" Sachiko de sa vie à Nagasaki. Elle dit qu'avec Frank, "nous parlons toujours anglais. Dès que j'aurais passé quelque temps aux Etats-Unis, je devrais le parler comme une Américaine" (68). Sachiko révèle ici qu'elle veut ressembler à une Américaine, et s'immerger complètement dans le monde Américain. En parlant à Frank en anglais, elle commence à construire une vie dans laquelle elle perd une partie de sa culture d'origine et sa langue. Aussi, l'utilisation constante de l'anglais avec Frank a des implications intéressantes pour sa fille Mariko. Mariko est la raison pour laquelle Sachiko veut déménager aux Etats-Unis. Quand Etsuko la questionne, et dit que ce déménagement peut être mauvais pour Mariko, Sachiko le défend, en disant qu'elle a "réfléchi à toute cette question avec le plus grand soin, et [qu'elle en a] parlé avec Frank" (69). Le lecteur ne connaît pas le père de Mariko, et Sachiko donne à entendre que Frank, un homme qui est une clef pour une meilleure vie, une ouverture sur un autre monde, et qui a abandonné

Nagasaki perdu après la deuxième guerre mondiale, est un sauveur pour Mariko et elle-même. Cette situation familiale particulière représente un microcosme de ce que discute Ogata-San dit à propos de la perte du Vieux Japon aux mains des Américains.

En tout cas, Ishiguro subvertit l'histoire de Loti et de Puccini en faisant de l'héroïne une femme indépendante. Cependant, Ishiguro souligne aussi la fascination qu'exerce la culture occidentale sur elle et comment elle essaie d'imposer et profiter de sa propre désirs pour une meilleure vie au Japon. Pinkerton et Frank, tous les deux comme Loti également, ont séduit des Japonaises car ils les ont perçues comme faciles à manipuler à cause des fantaisies que Loti circulait déjà avant eux dans le monde occidental. Butterfly perd sa vie et son fils aux mains des Américains. Sachiko perd sa fortune et y laisse sa dignité, sa langue et sa culture japonaises pour avoir une chance de vivre dans une nation qu'elle pense va la sauver du Japon détruite par les actions du monde d'occident. En prenant en compte l'allusion intentionnelle ou pas à ces événements qui altéreront la nation japonaise, Ishiguro rejoint un discours international et global, ce qui transforme les constructions occidentales de l'Orient, pour ré-impregner la tragédie romantique et l'héroïne dans l'histoire plus multidimensionnelle et profonde.

### **Chapter 3: *The Remains of the Day*, Englishness, and the Landscape**

Ishiguro's Nobel Prize winning novel, *The Remains of the Day* published in 1989, follows a seemingly similar character and plot to that of *A Pale View of Hills* in that it focuses on memory, guilt, regret, complicity and national identity post-war. The narrator, Stevens, is a butler in Darlington Hall from the early 1930s to late 1950s. Stevens reminisces about his time as a butler during the Suez Canal crisis, a major turning point post World War II, in that America



continued to dominate as a world power, outshining England. The power shift on a global level is reflected in the change in ownership of Darlington Hall, from its former English owner Lord Darlington to its new American owner Mr. Farraday. Stevens reminisces the lost past of working under Lord Darlington in this great house during the lead up to the Second World War. The catalyst of the reminiscence is a roadtrip through the countryside that Stevens takes when he receives a letter from his former co-worker Miss Kenton.

Ishiguro's narrators often find themselves rediscovering and redefining their connection to their own nations. Stevens', however, finds himself in a unique position when it comes to relating to England. As a narrator, Stevens comes across as a foreigner in his own country. He consumes and understands England through a tourist or external perspective, and hovers amongst the nostalgic mythical England as opposed to existing within and beneath them. He never goes beyond what the fantasized version of England consists of because within it, he does not have to wrestle with questions of national identity and what his place is in reference to it. His lack of knowledge preserves him from feeling a lack of identity and guilt, which is ultimately what he discovers at the end of the novel after exploring England and reconnecting with himself, and his personal past. Stevens' relationship to the nation, or his illusions regarding England, are also forced upon the reader, and the use of express stereotypes and myths makes the England that Stevens understand more exportable to Ishiguro's audience of readers, but also allows him to illuminate the problematic nature of this kind of nation imagining and exportation.

### **Stevens and Illusions of British Grandeur**

The way Steven presents the greatness of a nation is a vehicle for him to reduce that greatness to an individual level. His nationalistic perspective of England, although severely

reductive and confined, allows him to create a syllogism for the English butler or the Englishman. If England is great, English men must be great by proxy. He puts it best himself when he says “It is with such men as it is with the English landscape seen at its best as I did this morning: when one encounters them, one simply *knows* one is in the presence of greatness” (44). After droning on and on about the superiority and greatness of the English landscape, which Ishiguro creates a particular image of, Stevens can claim the superiority of those who live off that pastoral land. Although Stevens is not necessarily an inherently arrogant character, it is in moments like this where his arrogance of the English nation comes through.

Despite his arrogant tone, Stevens still attempts to pull in his implied readers, a community of butlers, and this is where Ishiguro again puts the reader in a position to begin to question Stevens and his thought process. Stevens, on elaborating upon his discussion of dignity with a fellow butler Mr. Graham, says “It is surely a professional responsibility for all of us to think deeply about these things so that each of us may better strive towards attaining ‘dignity’ for ourselves” (44). Coming from someone who has yet to think for himself and define dignity on his own terms, this comment is absurd.

Upon first reading the novel, it is significantly easier for the reader to fall into this trap of trust with Stevens and take his words seriously. In assuming that we are butlers, he attempts to pull on our moral obligation as butlers who have no sense of personal duty, but rather a duty dedicated to an elitist society that serves the better portion, the dignified portion, of England. The narration pulls you into his thought process and frames you to be lulled into a sense of English elitism. It is not until later that the implied reader begins to push themselves away from Stevens' flawed thought process.

### **Darlington Hall as a Eurocentric Microcosm for Global Discourse**

Throughout the novel, Darlington Hall is presented as a place of international discourse and center of elite and the utmost correct society. Lord Darlington holds his conferences regarding global affairs within his very walls, housing American, French, German, and even Italian guests. These conferences were meant to create feelings of peace with Germany, as Darlington sympathized with the German cause and believed the Treaty of Versailles was incredibly harsh on the German nation. Stevens internalizes this idea of Darlington Hall as a global connector or a global epicenter, as Said would describe it, noting that at the conference “Darlington Hall was filled with people of all nationalities, talking in rooms” and exchanging ideas (88). However, in Stevens' observation, he reduced the entirety of the world into the “western world,” completely neglecting any other nation involved in the war. As he does with the identities of his readers, he condenses who falls into the category of the world, or the world that matters. He effectively alienates a large portion of the globe, and therefore his readership, making them invisible in this portion of the novel. The decentralized perspective that Said champions as necessary for an international discourse, a perspective that is equally representative of all nations, languages, and cultural experiences, is impossible for Stevens. The central perspective for Stevens is and will always be his fellow, dignified English butlers or European powers. The diplomats and individuals present, and his imagined audience, for Stevens are those who he has come to learn are the major players, the advanced world that can engage in civilized discussion with great, dignified England at the helm leading the charge. England is at the center of this world, and this narrative is what dominates how Stevens views the globe. He has English

colored glasses, if you will, that force all active parties to conform in some way to the Darlington Hall that is a eurocentric microcosm of the outside world.

Disregarding a large proportion of his readership, by discrediting the non-Western European readers, Stevens again creates a point of contention between himself and his readers, pushing the external narratee to feel insignificant or enraged by his remarks. However, this does not mean Ishiguro does not use techniques to have the readers fall into the habit of overgeneralized and grandiose nostalgic myth-making.

Darlington Hall is a producer of the stereotypes in this novel, a factory that pumps out generalizations after harboring them in its walls. Mr. Lewis, the American diplomat who visits Darlington Hall during a conference, is a prime example of how Ishiguro lures his reader into making generalizations like Stevens. Mr. Lewis, while discussing the French influential diplomat M. Dupont., a French influential diplomat, describes the French perspective of Germans in comparison with the English:

But the way the French see it, the Germans destroyed civilization here in Europe and no punishment is too bad for them. Of course, that looks an impractical kind of position to us in the United States, but what's always puzzled me is how you English don't seem to share the view of the French. After all, like you say, Britain lost a lot in the war too" (86).

Ishiguro has Mr. Lewis use sweeping terms that encapture a nation like "the French," "the Germans," and "the English" to subconsciously make readers subscribe to this idea of an entire nation falling prey to a particular habit of thinking or being responsible for an action. He is utilizing national agglomerations in a subtle way that his readers may not notice. He makes all

Germans destroyers of civilization, he makes all French haters of Germans, and he makes all English obstinate to the French. Ishiguro intentionally erases the nuance and multiplicity that is contained within a nation and its actions, because Stevens does exactly that. In doing so, Ishiguro helps the reader become closer in identity with Stevens' implied reader, while leaving just enough of a distance for readers who do not fit in with Stevens' implied reader fully to push back against his projections. Stevens continues to consolidate readers and make them complicit in his thought process with his use of the personal pronoun "you."

### **"You," Complicity, and Consolidation**

Elif Oztabak-Avci engages with Stevens' use of the word "you" throughout the novel. He argues that Ishiguro's use of the word "you" in Stevens' narration creates a distinction between the implied reader, who for Stevens is a stereotypical English butler like himself, and the external narratee, the readers who are actually receiving the narrative. The implications of referring to the reader as "you," for Oztabak-Avci, create an understanding that the implied reader subscribes to Stevens' 'Englishness.' The reader, for Stevens, shares the viewpoints and perspectives of a stereotypical, and what for him would be an ideal and dignified, butler. In assuming that all of his audience thinks exactly like him, favoring the ideas of his employers as opposed to thinking freely, Stevens becomes a consolidator of global identities, attempting to compress all other identities into one that fits his understanding.

Oztabak-Avci, at one point, addresses a need for more discussion surrounding the use of "you" and the impact it has on Ishiguro's readers. Oztabak-Avci writes, "I think the discussion on Stevens's addressee needs to be articulated in yet another scholarly conversation about the tension in Ishiguro's novels between the 'local' and the 'global,' so that the connections between

the explicit and frequent employment of ‘you’ in *The Remains of the Day* and Ishiguro’s effort to take issue with ‘parochial’ and nationalist perspectives can be explored” (Oztabak-Avci 53).<sup>17</sup>

Ishiguro’s use of “you” creates a distinction between the local and global on several levels, but also on a cultural and political level. The “you” for Oztabak-Avci creates “tension between the national and the international” (Oztabak-Avci, 53).

This tension stems from the expectation of knowledge and perspective on the behalf of Stevens and the real knowledge and perspectives of the audience that he attempts to compress. Ishiguro consciously shrinks his readers' multicultural and international identities into the “English” mindset that Stevens exhibits. He disregards the possibility for other identities and makes it very difficult for the reader to isolate their own experiences from what Stevens is projecting upon them. Ishiguro is trying to render his readers complicit in Stevens’ ideas of nationalism and national identity. This constriction of countless national consciousnesses forces the reader to take a step back, and step away or isolate themselves from the “imagined community” of “Englishness” and butlerhood to which Stevens belongs and thinks his audience belongs. Stevens’ attempt to invite his reader into his ideas, and the assumption that they sympathize with him, coercing his reader to reflect on their own perspectives. The reader is transformed into a character for his personal gain. It even drives Stevens to reflect on his own thoughts, which Oztabak-Avci highlights in the way that Stevens shifts from “you” throughout the novel to “I” at the very end.

---

<sup>17</sup> I elect not to use ‘local’ and ‘global’ as the gap is considerably larger than that between the ‘nation’ and the ‘international.’ The local also contains larger levels of nuance, in that investigating the local helps establish a more complete and comprehensive notion of the ‘nation.’

Oztabak-Avci briefly touches upon this scene, in which Stevens is on a pier after having spoken with Miss Kenton.<sup>18</sup> On the pier, he has a conversation with a former butler that decides to confide in him, and to whom Stevens ultimately returns the sentiment. Stevens has found his ideal reader, a butler who can finally identify with his “you.” The two discuss their experiences butlering, and Stevens divulges his feelings of regret for having not “made his own mistakes” (243) like Lord Darlington. He shares how “I trusted. I trusted in his lordship’s wisdom” which is the reason he “cannot even claim” having had a choice in the way that he lived his life (243). He acknowledges his own complicity in the life that he led. He then attempts to pull the implied reader in with him, but far beyond the expectations of them being a butler. He pulls on the reader as an individual, addressing them as follows:

The hard reality is, surely, that for the likes of you and I, there is little choice other than to leave our fate, ultimately, in the hands of those great gentlemen at the hub of this world who employ our services. What is the point in worrying oneself too much about what one could or could not have done to control the course one’s life took? Surely it is enough that the likes of you and I at least try to make our small contribution count for something true and worthy (244).

Stevens directly involves the reader and consolidates his experience with them. Rather than simply saying “you,” as he does throughout the novel, he combines himself, his identity, his perceptions and thoughts with his implied English butler reader and makes them a part of his lack of agency. He attempts to bring them into his powerlessness, saying that neither he nor the

---

<sup>18</sup> Miss Kenton was a maid in Darlington Hall and worked under Stevens. She eventually stopped working at Darlington Hall during World War II as a result of the anti semitic firing of several staff members that she did not agree with, on top of her engagement to another man. Miss Kenton was a potential opportunity for love in Stevens’ life and also attempted to draw his attention to problematic actions that Stevens often ignores by choice. It is a letter from Miss Kenton that prompts Steven to go on his journey through the countryside.

reader has a choice in the course of their life. For him, the only choice is to leave the gentlemen in power up to making the decisions. Stevens even tries to redeem his complicity and complacency by saying he tried to make a difference, and that he sacrificed so much to “try” and make a contribution, which in his point of view absolves him of all his mistakes. The implied reader is then put in contention with the external narratee that Oztabak-Avci mentions. The implied reader is the complicit butler who also succumbed to the initiatives and goals of “great gentlemen” at their own expense. The external narratee, however, could be so far removed from this expectation, in terms of their individual and national consciousness. Stevens’ attempt to turn the reader into a character who sympathizes with him forces the reader to question their own position and reevaluate their own agency in, and outside, of the text.

Each reader who engages with this text, and that Stevens attempts to make synonymous with himself, will also have a unique conception of who they believe the implied reader is and who they are as the external narratee. What this means is that the reader will have their own contentious relationship between who they think Stevens thinks they are, and who they are. The reader’s actual conceptions of butlers, Englishness, and complicity may very well conflict with what Stevens intends for them to believe. Ishiguro puts the reader in a place where they must wrestle with their involvement and or separate themselves from Stevens and evaluate their own implications within a political and social environment. It is this aspect of the reading experiences that makes this text and Ishiguro’s writing globally applicable. His readers, in some way shape or form, will have a contentious connection with the England that Stevens thinks they imagine and are a part of the actual identity that they have.

Stevens as Foreigner



Early on in the novel, Stevens informs the readers of his impending trip around England and how he ultimately prepares himself for this trip. He found himself rereading volumes of Mrs. Jane Symons' *The Wonder of England* (11), a "series running to seven volumes, each one concentrating on one region of the British Isles" that was written in the thirties. It is necessary to note that Symon's work is purely a construction, fabricated by Ishiguro in this novel for Stevens' incredibly flawed, encyclopedic knowledge of England. Mrs. Symons also does not exist, however she is rendered as incredibly concrete and necessary for Stevens in this novel. If it were not for Mrs. Symons, Stevens would have no conceptions of England to inform himself with. This forged woman is conflated with being a crafter of the English landscape, preserving and propagating the pastoral landscape that Stevens becomes so tied to. For him, she is a very real source of inspiration and dignifies his imagined nation, almost building it from scratch for him.

Not only is Symons fictitious, but her writings are also outdated. From the time that Symons's travel journals were published and the time of Stevens' reflections and countryside road trip, 26 years and a World War has passed. In reference to the war, he expresses that not much must have changed in the time between it being written and "present day," because "after all, I do not imagine German bombs have altered our countryside so significantly" (11). Stevens, isolated in Darlington Hall during both World War I and World War II, has absolutely no understanding of the implications of the war on physical landscapes and spaces. Countless monuments and towns were destroyed and had to be rebuilt, and with it a "new" English identity.

Although part of the reconstruction involved preservation, it also physically meant that England was moving in a new direction and leaving old elements of its architecture behind. In terms of pastoral England, the landscape even after World War I was marked by trench warfare.

Stevens, however, leaving an extremely ignorant life and existence has a skewed vision of what warfare looks like and how it impacts those who are implicated. The pictures, entirely lacking the markings of World War on the British Isles, consist of photographs and “a variety of artists’ sketches of that region” (11). On top of a portrait of England stuck in time, Stevens is basing his ideas on art, translations of the regions into idealized forms.

Darlington Hall and Lord Darlington also greatly influenced what Stevens considered of value. As aforementioned, with Darlington Hall as a microcosm for England and center of “international discourse,” Stevens is lead to believe even more that England was at the forefront of worldly conversation and progress. The many guests that visited were the only representations of an outside world that Stevens could even attempt to understand and grasp, and many of these guests were anglophilic. The nature in which they appear and are introduced allows Ishiguro to once again condense national identities and stereotypes to stand in for entire nations. These fantastical constructions are what Stevens, himself based on a national stereotype, informs his reality. Mrs Symons was “a frequent visitor to this house before the war” and it “was in those days, then, prompted by my natural admiration for the lady, that I had first taken to perusing her volumes in the library whenever I had an odd moment” (11). Stevens has no concept of natural admiration. He has no personal opinions, and the only reason he admired Mrs. Symons was because he felt anyone who came to Darlington hall was esteemed and should be treated as such. His high regard for her extended 26 years into the present, propagating the pre-war idealized pastoral England that Stevens still identifies with. He exists only within the microcosm of a picture perfect England that can be easily reduced into a travel log, as opposed to the increasingly complex England of which he is a part of and was also a part of creating.

Even after Stevens' first day of traveling in Salisbury, he subscribes to this picture perfect “English countryside” and expounds on the idea of England as supremely great. To make this claim, Stevens calls on what he has “seen in encyclopedias and the *National Geographic Magazine* [the] breathtaking photographs of sights from various corners of the globe” (28). His national ignorance extends into the international, framing him in an entirely fabricated or represented global context. He even admits that he has never seen any other part of the globe, and after just visiting one English landscape has the audacity to say “with some confidence: the English landscape at its finest- such as I saw this morning - possesses a quality that the landscapes of other nations, however more superficially dramatic, inevitably fail to possess. Stevens favors the quote-on-quote seeming simplicity of England’s pastoral landscapes to the dramatic and almost flamboyant wonders of the world that he has never even beheld with his own eyes. The quality that he subscribes to the only English landscape he has really seen is ‘greatness’ (28). And it is for this reason that it is *Great Britain*, in his opinion.

This experience that Stevens has is that of a newborn tourist. He lacks a frame of reference through which to compare his understanding of the landscape. All that he has to work with is perfect portrayals in magazines of global landscapes and England, and his first visit to Salisbury. Stevens absorbs the make-believe renditions of England only to conflate them with greatness and incomparability. He erases all that is deeply wound in England’s history, especially the history associated with its land that Ishiguro explores in *The Buried Giant*,<sup>19</sup> and preserves

---

<sup>19</sup> In “Ishiguro’s *The Buried Giant*,” Richard Rankin Russell approaches Ishiguro’s novels *The Buried Giant* and *The Remains of the Day* from the perspective of fantasy novels, the former subverting the styles of the genre and the latter in some way functioning as a fantasy in its construction of a mythic national past. What is of particular interest and relevance in Russell’s argument is his analysis of the pastoral landscape and the way in which Ishiguro lulls his reader into forgetting the true origins of national history layered underneath modern England. Russell highlights that the main characters in *The Buried Giant* on their journey to remember their personal, and inherently national, history “discover gestures toward the layering of the English landscape that was well underway by this point as successive

the ideal of an innocent pastoral landscape in his British “greatness.” For him, the greatness lies in “the very lack of obvious drama or spectacle that sets the beauty of our land apart” (28). This is where Ishiguro draws out the stereotypes and ignorance regarding the pastoral presentation of England. This complex landscape, containing histories of erasure, conquest, death, and war, all is eradicated in these beautiful representations. The beauty is deceptively simple, and characters like Stevens fall for that simplicity. In a time where a nation is questioning its own identity, it only feels natural to return to the land, the roots of a nation as it was being established. There is a desire to return to the times when this landscape was all there was to England, and that is the world Stevens lives in. The pastoral England of Darlington Hall, of World War I and World War II, of the British Empire is what is contained in that greatness. This aestheticization oversimplifies and erases the deep scores and marks that England’s past have left on its landscape and its community. Stevens exists outside of that complicated past, or at latest attempts to forget about it or discount it. He is emblematic of those who choose to exist in a world without

---

invaders—Romans, pagan Saxons, and now Christian Britons—built onto or on top of their predecessors’ buildings and homes” (Russell 308). The reader, alongside the characters, “start to realize here that we have read our stereotypical projections about supposedly pastoral, peaceful England onto the landscape itself” (Russell 309). The landscape is covering something far more sinister, although a point of nostalgia for many. It is a hateful history of death, murder, and conquest with the desire to establish a real England, one that can never truly be created. The layering of the present is a form of denial of the truly bloody and awful nature of the English past.

Shame is crucial for Russell, in that it serves for him as the key to confessing complicity and ultimately come to understand the shame that is associated with it in the construction of a national past, and its necessity in a forward progress. Russell even suggests that Ishiguro’s embrace of the fantasy genre is “linked to his desire to write more convincingly about the development of nationalism more broadly through tribal hatred and conflict—not just of English nationalism” (Russell 316). In turning to the fantasy and the altered, augmented in some way separate from reality, Ishiguro comes closer to discussing nationalism and what it means to construct a nation.

At the conclusion of his text, he makes an interesting comment about the way in which Ishiguro represents “a national crisis throughout history whose iterations are still emerging—not just the imagined and real story of a people who would become known as the English” (Russell 319). He makes explicit reference here to the way in which national history is constructed via literature, and that Ishiguro is helping demystify a history that is in itself incredibly complicated, mystified, convoluted and intangible, not because it is English history, but because it is an attempt to turn a nation into a finite item.

post-war guilt and a post-war search for nationalism in a nation that no longer exists. Not only is Stevens identifying with a touristic, idealized England, but he is identifying with an out-dated representation.

This idea of national purity and generational greatness, or the ability to reduce a nation into aspects of its composition, is not isolated to England alone, and this is what makes Stevens' experience and statements extend beyond English readers. Other elements of the novel stand in for depictions of other nations through which the readers can base their imagined nations upon, as Stevens does.

### **British Nationalism and the Orient**

Ishiguro implicates the non-Western world into the English household through the lens of orientalism and imperialization. The moments in which the readers have the opportunity to see a non-European world are instances when oriental figures disrupt the composure and beautifully controlled picture of great Englishness.

David Lowenthal outlines the way in which the untouched English landscape acts as a manifestation of the England heritage or the desire for a pure English heritage to be preserved in the landscape. Lowenthal explains this connection as follows: “Two special traits link landscape with national ethos and imprint its heritage role. One is insularity; the other artifice” (Lowenthal 214). When Lowenthal mentions insularity, he makes reference to a cultural ignorance, a feeling of apathy when it comes to considering or learning about external cultures, or generally any ideas or identities outside of oneself. When this insularity comes into play, it often results in a stagnant and curtailed worldview, one that fails to conceptualize a nation's identity in tandem with those outside of itself, and therefore creating a false self-reflective understanding. This false identity,

feeding into an inflated sense of heritage, leads nicely into Lowenthal's second tie of the landscape to national ethos. When it comes to artifice, Lowenthal explains that "...the English landscape is not natural but crafted, suffused with human as well as divine purpose" (Lowenthal 215). It is not something that grew of its own accord, but was deliberately constructed, built upon layers of history that pile upon one another, and compress and eliminate undesired portions of identity, so that fabricated ones can sit on top as artificial expressions of an unreal English identity. Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant* plays with questions of national history and what the landscape, pastoral and beautiful as it may seem, truly contains. Although *The Remains of the Day* makes less explicit allusions to the ominous layers of the English past upon which English society at the time of Stevens' reflection is built, Stevens' interactions with the landscape, and his failure to experience the landscape outside of Darlington Hall greatly impacts the conceptions of the nation that he has.

Stevens falls into Lowenthal's categories of insularity and artifice, almost a manifestation of the landscape himself. Stevens fails to recognize nations outside of his own, other than what he can discover in Encyclopedias. He is generally apathetic, and wishes to have no knowledge unless it in some way informs his capacities as a butler. And even when it comes to understanding "butlering" and his own nation, his ideas are founded upon imaginary creations of Englishness, in the form of fake travel journals and made-up stories about ideal butlers. Stevens lacks any initiative to discover any nation, let alone his own, and arguably falls into a category worse than Lowenthal's insularity, because he is even apathetic when it comes to understanding his own national identity. Stevens falls victim to the lens through which Lord Darlington guided

his conceptions of England, and he overly compensates by zooming in on his own mythic English nationalism.

Despite Stevens' apathy for the reality of his own country (as opposed to his imaginary England) he is indubitably apathetic to other nations and the proposition of their erasure to his Englishness, or at least conceived Englishness. His security is consistently jostled throughout the novel, existing in the time of the Suez Canal crisis, in which America is displacing Britain as a world power. However, it is not only the Americans who interact with Stevens and his state of equilibrium in Darlington Hall and his idealized butler fantasy, however. The "oriental" world, seemingly distant and irrelevant to Stevens' reality, looms in the novel.

At one point in the novel, a scene that upon first reading feels misplaced and arbitrary, the clear English landscape in the household that upholds the English identity is put off balance by the presence of a misplaced "Chinaman." To foreground the scene, it is important to understand that Stevens could fall into a category of England that Lowenthal outlines in his work, explaining that "white Britons typically assume that Britain was highly homogeneous until mass Asian and Caribbean immigration 'altered the fabric of the society' and destroyed 'much of the tradition and strength and homogeneity of the nation'" (Lowenthal 208). Stevens, having been sheltered and informed by other white Britons and white imperial powers, like the French and the Americans, Stevens has no way of understanding what populations actually exist in Britain. Without exiting Darlington Hall, and even on his whitewashed journey through the countryside, Stevens has no one to challenge his conceptions of England as being a predominantly white nation, except for the "Chinaman." The "Chinaman" dissolves the homogeneity of the household that was

Darlington Hall, the microcosm of Englishness and the Western world, the most ideal, the most "correct" and possessing English heritage.

This serves as the only piece of decor that is focused on in the novel, one that is in itself a stereotype of an Oriental figure, commodified as a decoration that can be played with and arranged at the English houseowner's will. It is the control over this piece of orientalist art, being misplaced, that results in a slew of rage. The orientalist figure forces Stevens to wrestle with the instability and lack of reality in his conceptions of his father as the epitome of the English butler, a dying breed that can no longer fit in a nation that is struggling to re-identify itself. Refusing to look at the "Chinaman," refusing to acknowledge the existence of an exterior culture in his own house, Stevens is refusing to see the English power coming to an end that can not fully control the orient.

In reference to the Chinaman, Miss Kenton consistently asks that Stevens "kindly look at the Chinaman" and comments that he is failing to "see" what she is insistent upon showing him when he avoids looking at "the Chinaman" to begin with (59). Rather than acknowledge the Chinamen in question, Stevens contemplates evading the situation entirely by escaping through the french windows in his office, only to realize that his plan would fail because someone would have to lock the windows from the inside (58). When Miss Kenton does finally confront Stevens, she insists on him needing to take a stance on the "correctness" of the location of the Chinaman and proclaims that "The fact is, Mr Stevens, all the Chinamen in this house have been dirty for some time! And now, they are in incorrect positions!" (59). Not only does Stevens refuse to look at these oriental figures, but these items have been neglected for "some time." Although the neglect and the dust build up is attributed to Stevens' father by Miss Kenton, as head butler the



neglect of these figures is on the part of Stevens. He ignores these decorations, the sole representations of a world outside of Britain in this house, as insignificant. Better to evade than to make notice of the large quantity of them in Darlington hall. The Chinamen, in this scene, taint and disrupt the pure household and show the shortcomings of the English in accepting the new heterogenous influx of “foreign” ideals and identities, in this case the oriental in particular.

Stevens also transports his reader to the Orient in basing his conception of a dignified butler as someone who can control and eradicate orientalist figures that threaten the English. While explaining his conceptions of dignity as a necessity of being a butler, Stevens shares with the reader a story his father shared with him when he was a child. For him, this story is foundational in understanding what it is to be a dignified butler, especially from the perspective of his father and his father’s generation. The story is short, and focuses on a butler who traveled with his employer to India (36). He served his function in upholding the English standard of the household. The story hinges on the butler finding a tiger under the dining room table and dealing with the situation with such discretion and composure, in that he killed the tiger with three gunshots without greatly disturbing his proprietor (36). Another seemingly arbitrary reference, this short scene in which the oriental figure of the tiger, “languishing” and stagnant, not causing harm, is murdered out of fear of its potentially disrupting the idealistic tranquil English household that the butler is running. Stevens applauds this mythic butler for killing the passive, oriental figure without cause. He also plays into this myth, saying that his father never specifically gave the butler a name, but insisted on the fact that this did indeed occur. Stevens even brings up the question of truth, ultimately letting that question fall in exchange for an ideal example of a dignified butler, a mythic, constructed depiction of the way the English colonized

and destroyed the orient before it even had a chance to act in their presence. Stevens himself bases his conceptions of the great national butler as someone who wards off the orientalist tiger in the English household; preventing the orient from penetrating the western household, the stronghold of the western powers.

### **Translating British Greatness and Maintaining it in French**

La traduction des *Vestiges du jour* doit faire attention à l'écart entre le lecteur sous-entendu et la langue d'arrivée qu'Oztabak-Avci a soulignée. Puisque le personnage de Stevens suppose que son lecteur est anglais, il utilise des anglicismes que son audience supposée, à son insu, connaît bien. Implicite, ils savent tous les mots et les idéologies anglaises qui s'accordent avec ce que Stevens pense. Malheureusement, on risque de perdre les anglicismes ou la supposition d'un lecteur anglais à cause de la traduction. La langue d'arrivée, dans ce cas la langue française, doit compter pour la perte de cet effet sur le lecteur.

Dans sa traduction française, Sophie Mayoux garde les anglicismes, ou supplémente sa traduction en français avec des mots anglais, d'une part pour essayer de garder ou préserver l'esprit anglais de Stevens et son commentaire et d'autre part donner au lecteur la même opportunité d'imaginer la nation anglaise.

Par exemple, Mayoux traduit ce paragraphe sur la dignité d'un majordome:

It is sometimes said that butlers only truly exist in England. Other countries, whatever title is actually used, have only manservants. I tend to believe this is true. Continentals are unable to be butlers because they are as a breed incapable of the emotional restraint which only the English race are capable of. Continentals - and by and large the Celts, as you will no doubt agree - are as a rule

unable to control themselves in moments of strong emotion, and are thus unable to maintain a professional demeanor other than in the least challenging of situations. If I may return to my earlier metaphor - you will excuse my putting it so coarsely - they are like a man who will, at the slightest provocation, tear off his suit and his shirt and run about screaming. In a word, 'dignity' is beyond such persons. We English have an important advantage over foreigners in this respect and it is for this reason that when you think of a great butler, he is bound, almost by definition, to be an Englishman (43).

Dans la traduction, elle fait bien attention aux références des anglicismes ou à l'identité anglaise:

<< On dit parfois que les majordomes, les *butlers*, n'existent qu'en Angleterre. Dans les autres pays, quel que soit le titre utilisé, il n'y a que des domestiques. Je suis prêt à le croire. Les habitants de l'Europe continentale ne peuvent pas être des *butlers* parce qu'ils appartiennent à une race incapable de cette maîtrise de soi qui est le propre des Anglais. Les continentaux, comme dans l'ensemble, les Celtes, je pense que vous en conviendrez, ne parviennent pas, en règle générale, à se contrôler dans les moments d'émotion forte, et ne peuvent donc conserver un maintien professionnel que dans les situations les moins difficiles. Si je peux revenir à ma métaphore précédente – vous m'excuserez de parler aussi crûment –, ils ressemblent à un homme qui à la moindre provocation, arracherait sa veste et sa chemise et courrait dans tous les sens en hurlant. En un mot, la << dignité >> n'est pas à la portée de ce genre de gens. Nous autres

Anglais bénéficient dans ce domaine d'un avantage considérable sur les étrangers, et c'est pour cette raison que lorsque vous pensez à un grand majordome, il est presque certain, par définition, qu'il doit s'agir d'un Anglais (66).

Au début du passage, Mayoux ajoute immédiatement la clarification du *“butler”* après que Stevens commence à décrire “les majordomes.” Il y a plusieurs autres fois où Mayoux traduit “butler” par “majordomes,” mais l'utilisation du butler ici est expressément pour garder l'esprit de l'anglais.

Quand on fait une petite enquête sur le terme “majordome,” on voit que le mot vient d'un échange international. Le Centre Nationale des Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales explique dans sa définition de majordome que le mot est “emprunté, par l'intermédiaire de l'italien *maggiordomo*, du latin médiéval *major domus*” qui veut dire “maître de maison” (“Définition de majordome”). Le mot ne vient donc pas directement du lexique français mais est une traduction de l'italien et décrit le majordome comme quelqu'un qui a du pouvoir dans la maison. La définition exacte que fournit le CNRTL est: “Chef du service intérieur de la maison d'un souverain” ou “maître d'hôtel de grande maison” (“Définition de majordome”). La première définition fait des références historiques à l'Espagne ou à l'Italie, mais curieusement pas à l'Angleterre. La deuxième définition fait référence aux œuvres de Balzac et de Proust. Des synonymes mentionnés incluent “domestique, homme de confiance, serviteur, collaborateur et universel (“Proximité de majordome”)”. *Domestique* et *serviteur* s'accordent bien avec la présentation qu'on voit du majordome dans les textes, mais *collaborateur* et *universel* suggèrent d'autres idées. *Collaborateur* implique une complicité que l'on peut voir dans le contexte de

*Remains of the Day* où Stevens est collaborateur dans le sens où il ne fait pas d'objection aux actions de Lord Darlington. Le mot "universel" suggère que le fonctionnement du butler, peut être est universel, ou les butlers sont universels. Mais Stevens essaie de montrer au lecteur que le butler dans son stéréotype et connotation n'est pas universel, mais nécessairement anglais, et Ishiguro essaie de nier le stéréotype et montre que la connotation du mot, en réalité, a grandi au-delà de l'Angleterre.

Alizée Delpierre développe cette idée d'universalité concernant les butlers. Elle fait la distinction, dans une petite note de bas de page, sur la traduction française du terme butler comme majordome, et révèle que le terme majordome s'applique seulement aux hommes, et que les femmes sont appelées "gouvernantes." Selon elle, le majordome fait référence au genre de la personne qui a ce rôle, ce qui correspond au terme de butler, et qui est neutre dans le cadre du genre (Delpierre 93). Delpierre examine les établissements qui forment les Butlers, les Butlers Académies, et ce qu'ils offrent pour créer des butlers qui peuvent fonctionner dans le monde entier mais en même temps qui suivent des traditions anciennes, européennes, et aristocratiques (Delpierre 94). Ces académies se basent sur l'idée que le "vrai" butler vient d'Europe ou de l'Occident aristocratique, et elles veulent que leurs étudiants, qui pour la plupart ne viennent pas du monde occidental, souscrivent à cet idéal recherché du butler. En particulier, "l'authentique butler est anglais, néerlandais, ou belge— les nationalités qui partagent la majorité des fondateurs des Académies" (Delpierre 96). Pour parvenir à cet objectif, il faut que les butlers abandonnent leur propre culture pour avoir une fluidité culturelle et mieux s'adapter aux cultures des nouveaux riches à travers le monde. Mais Delpierre trouve que cette espèce de butlers est souvent rejetée par les nouveaux riches comme comique et trop traditionnelle.

Il paraît possible que ces académies soient l'accès qui maintient le standard du butler que Stevens imagine, et que Ishiguro voudrait faire imaginer aux lecteurs. Même si Stevens peut avoir du mal à imaginer que quelqu'un qui n'est pas anglais soit un domestique, c'est exactement cette tension qui est importante. Stevens croit ferme à cette institution représentée par la figure du butler et soutenue par un mythe en voie de disparition. Le monde des nouveaux riches, et dans ce cas des Américains comme Mr. Farradays, n'a pas le même besoin pour un butler qui maintient l'image d'un anglicisme pur et puissant.

C'est là qu'on peut voir les comparaisons avec la littérature japonaise que Karni souligne dans son travail. L'image du majordome Anglais est incomparable, et Stevens lui-même fait référence à la célébrité de cette image. Ishiguro expressément utilise ce portrait, qui transcende les barrières de la langue, pour s'assurer que chaque lecteur, quel qu'il soit, puisse bien comprendre les pensées de Stevens.

Ishiguro utilise aussi certains mots qui réduisent un peuple ou une identité pour rendre l'image du majordome anglais facile à comprendre pour le lecteur. Par exemple, il utilise les phrases comme "continentals," "breed," "race," "such persons" et "foreigners" dans cet extrait. Ce genre de vocabulaire, qui sépare et qui présente un sentiment de supériorité, maintient cette idéologie dans la traduction française. Le lecteur peut bien voir que Stevens, lui-même un majordome anglais, se trouve plus qualifié pour parler au sujet de la dignité ou des majordomes. La traduction de Mayoux garde cet esprit, mais aussi ajoute des nuances pour séparer les lecteurs francophones de Stevens. Par exemple, Stevens fait référence au "continentals." Mayoux fait la traduction "les habitants de l'europe continentale," qui est plus spécifique et précise le cercle de points communs auquel Stevens fait référence. Sans la distinction entre l'Europe continentale et

l'Europe de l'Angleterre, on perd le complexe de supériorité et le désir d'exclure que Stevens arbore. Ishiguro ajoute encore plus de distance entre Stevens et les lecteurs non-anglais, et une distance énorme entre les lecteurs non-continentaux. Stevens continue de prendre la posture du colonisateur par le genre de vocabulaire qu'il utilise comme "race" ou "breed." Il fait une distinction entre les vrais Anglais les Anglais qui viennent de l'immigration, et qui peut être, selon lui, n'ont pas la capacité d'être de vrais majordome/butlers parce qu'ils n'ont pas cette identité anglaise traditionnelle, ne sont des Englishmen.

Il est évident que le concept du butler comme concept universel est important. Mais, on peut aussi dire que le butler en tant que stéréotype n'est pas la seule raison pour laquelle Ishiguro a choisi de l'utiliser dans son œuvre. Ce que le concept représente, et comment il est stéréotypé et mythifié est important. Ishiguro souligne comment on peut isoler un rôle, ou comment quelqu'un peut isoler son identité à travers le rôle qu'il joue et la classe sociale qui lui est associée. Tout au long du récit, Stevens mythifie le butler comme un héros, un vecteur direct qui relie son époque avec l'époque où l'Angleterre jouissait d'une réputation favorable à sa dignité puisqu'aucune révélation gênante sur son histoire n'avait été faite. Stevens intériorise l'idée du butler, un rôle qu'il construit ou conçoit comme rigide, pour maintenir l'ordre dans sa construction de l'Angleterre et le rôle que lui-même a imaginé jouer dans cette construction. Si Stevens ne peut pas maîtriser les autres et le reste du monde, il lui reste encore la maîtrise de soi, et cela va très bien avec la manière dont Ishiguro représente Stevens et son lien à l'orient.

A propos de l'orientalisme sous-jacent au roman, la traduction de la scène avec l'objet décoratif du Chinois ajoute beaucoup à notre compréhension de l'évolution de la dynamique du pouvoir des Européens sur l'orient que Stevens essaie de préserver avec son mirage du monde.

En lisant la même scène en français, la traduction d'une expression souligne l'aspect orientalisant de cette scène avec ce que Mayoux traduit comme le Chinois. En anglais, le terme "Chinaman" vient d'une histoire raciste et orientaliste. Mais le terme "les Chinois" en français est un sous-traduction, car il réfère à tous les Chinois mais le terme continue à être réductionniste d'un sens que Stevens réduit la représentation d'une nation entière en un seul mot.

Par exemple, quand Miss Kenton dit à Stevens que "Les Chinois, à ce que je crois, ont été astiqués par quelqu'un, après quoi ils ont été remis à une place qui n'était pas la bonne" (83) l'utilisations du référent "Les Chinois" donne l'impression qu'elle parle de toute la population de la Chine. Elle ne spécifie pas qu'elle réfère seulement à l'objet décoratif du Chinois, alors les lecteurs peuvent penser l'espace d'un instant qu'elle implique la population chinoise, qui se doit d'être remise à sa place. Avant de comprendre exactement à quoi elle fait allusion, les lecteurs flottent dans ce qu'il peuvent percevoir comme faisant référence à la population chinoise, qui est ensuite objectivée à travers cette figurine dont il est question. Le déplacement de l'objet esthétique sert à représenter à la fois la relation de pouvoir entre Miss Kenton et Mr. Stevens et l'enjeu de cette modification pour une puissance impérialiste sur la scène mondiale.

En plus, quand Miss Kenton confronte Stevens à propos de la gravité des erreurs commises par son père, elle dit "Ces erreurs, en elles-mêmes, sont peut-être anodines, Mr. Stevens, mais vous percevez certainement leur signification globale" (86). Dans le texte de départ, Ishiguro utilise l'expression "larger significance"(59) et pas "signification globale."

Comme Benjamin et Derrida suggèrent, la traduction, même si elle n'est pas la même, ajoute à la compréhension de cette scène dans ses implications d'analyse et perspective que Saïd suggère. L'implication d'orientalisme est plus puissante et visible, et la nature du langage utilisé



par Ishiguro en anglais fait que la traduction n'est pas trop compliquée à faire et donne à Mayoux l'opportunité de faire référence à cette scène et ses liens au monde et l'équilibre des grandes puissances en général. La répétition des structures de phrases, et la structure parallèle du dialogue qui suit, utilise des phrases qui se répètent, qui guident le lecteur sans peur de le perdre dans une traduction compliquée et alambiquée.

### **Conclusion**

Kazuo Ishiguro's novels, *A Pale View of Hills* and *The Remains of the Day* both subvert and play with Anderson's notions of imagined communities. An individual author's imagined conceptions of these nations as mythic fantasies and the style of writing he uses convey these constructions and make them exportable in a global literary scene.

Global literature or world literature and how it is conceived of has greatly evolved, and will continue to do so in the twenty-first century. Goethe's notions of literary discourse and collaboration as a source of national reflection in conjunction with Benjamin's "pure language" and Derrida's veil suggest a necessary interaction between nations and languages to achieve some form of human truth, which for Anderson was a contentious subject. Whether or not they give access to a human truth, the interaction in some way sheds light on modes of thought and reflections upon national constructions. And when those constructions are deconstructed, exported, and reconstructed on their way to the reader by the author and the translators of the author's works, there is an opportunity for the creation of more imagined communities amongst a larger audience.

Casanova warns of a reductive literary scape in which countless cultures and countries have adopted the French language and style in order to have a better access to success on the

intellectual hierarchy. However, the idea of France as a nation of intellect, full of great writers and authors, was a self-fulfilling, cartesian myth. France became a language of dominance in some way because of its exclusionary status as a world republic of letters, an epicenter of “international literature” that is predominantly eurocentric.

The mystification of nations on the part of imperial France and England and the languages they write in, giving them power and authority over the literary and intellectual scape, is/are exclusionary, ignoring countless other great works that exist in this world. Said’s call for a decentralized literary practice, in which the epicenter of perspective inhabits all parts of the world directly challenges the world republic of letters, that in reality does not encompass the world but a small portion of it. Said’s call is an incredibly difficult one to conceptualize, a literary practice that encompasses all perspectives with equal value, urgency, and attention. Languages like English and French, that stem from these dominant worlds in some way, serve to accomplish Said’s objective, in that they act as global connectors in all the parts of the globe that they have touched, but are simultaneously tied to colonialism and oppression. These languages would need to continue to evolve to truly occupy the kind of decentralization Said desires.

Writing in these global languages should not be the objective for authors, as this can strip their rich writing of their cultural background; writing in Walkowitz’s translattice serves as a possible model for entering Benjamin’s “pure language” and Derrida’s veil in an effort to augment the potency of their work and reach the corners of the globe that it otherwise would not be able to. The inter-linguistic simultaneity that the translated novel offers has the possibility to bring literature closer to a kind of decentralized perspective, in that more readers can construct understandings based on the literature they consume.

Ishiguro's novels illuminate how language can be used to both construct a nation and also make that construction of a nation transportable via translation. His use of translatability and repetition makes *A Pale View of Hills* feel like it is coming from the nation in which the novel takes place, making it both easier for a reader to understand the content of the novel but also construct a kind of Japan for their own understanding. Ishiguro's portrayal of Japan pulls on understandings beyond just his own, even if not overtly, in the form of allusions to *Madame Chrysantheme* later transformed into *Madama Butterfly*. This consistent transformation of Japan and its perception in the public purview, augmenting or reframing orientalist fantasies constructed by prominent powers that disseminated these constructions, works towards creating a contrapuntal reading, as Said urges to be the case in literary criticism.

*The Remains of the Day* functions in a similar fashion with its repetitive style of writing, but focuses more on Stevens and the way he imagines a nation and attempts to force his mythical ideals onto his readers. Readers get stuck in first-person narration, confined to the singular and reductive world view of the narrators who police their own understanding of the nation via their constructed conceptions of how they fit into the nation. The singular perspective is constrictive and eurocentric, seeing alternate perspectives and presences, like that of the orient, as a threat to the power and safety of English power. This desire for European supremacy is only highlighted via translation into French, where Sophie Mayoux safeguards hyper-English vocabulary and the term of the "butler," in some way at the same time protecting Stevens' fragile construction of his own labor from non-English influence.

Reading these novels alongside their French counterparts, in conjunction with some of the discourse surrounding global literature, the translated novel, and general translation, the

nuanced presentation and self-reflective nature of the imagined community seems to be augmented by translation. Existing in the in-between of nations and their boundaries, the interstice of languages, the veil between myth and reality (whether that can be exported or not), makes for a deeply complicated experience on the part of the reader. The depth of the nation and its myths and stereotypes lies not in the solid reality of what nation is that is unable to exit the nation itself, but in the subtly reductive constructions that in some way are more exportable, despite their problematic nature. Nations, because of how deeply complicated they are and irreducible to a singular definition, when imagined achieve a greater ability to exit their constructions and engage with a larger discourse, only to be reimagined in new languages and upon reception from their new audience. However, it is necessary for the author to reimagine these nations in such a way that the reader is able to acknowledge their mythical nature.

## Bibliography

- “A Brief History of World Literature.” *Solano Community College*, 2024,  
<https://libguides.solano.edu/worldlit/history>.
- Anderson, Benedict. “Imagined Communities.” *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 1983, pp. 48–59.
- Arac, Jonathan. “Edward W. Said: The Worldliness of World Literature.” *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, edited by Haen, Theo D et al., Routledge, 2023, pp. 77–84. EBSCOhost,  
[search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202432834225&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202432834225&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site).
- Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” *Walter Benjamin Selected Works Volume 1 1913-1926*, edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael Jennings, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002, pp. 253–63.
- Bennett, Andrew. “Ishiguro and the Question of England.” *The Cambridge Companion to Kazuo Ishiguro*, edited by Andrew Bennet, Cambridge University Press, 2023, pp. 13–26.
- Brault, Pascale-Anne. “Plus d’une Langue: Jacques Derrida and the Language of the Other.” *Traduire Derrida aujourd’hui*, Revue ITER, vol. 2, 2020, p. 17,

<https://revue-iter.org/pascale-anne-brault-plus-dune-langue-jacques-derrida-and-the-language-of-the-other/>.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M.B. DeBevoise, Harvard University Press, 2004.

Dasgupta, Romit. “Kazuo Ishiguro and ‘Imagining Japan.’” *Kazuo Ishiguro in a Global Context*, edited by Cynthia F. Wong and Hulya Yildiz, Ashgate, 2015, pp. 11–22.

“Définition de majordome.” *Centre Nationale du Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales*, <https://www.cnrtl.fr/definition/Majordome>.

Delpierre, Alizée. “Faire comme l’aristocratie?” *ACTES DE LA RECHERCHE EN SCIENCES SOCIALES*, vol. 230, pp. 92–107.

“Discover Madam Butterfly.” *English National Opera*, <https://www.eno.org/operas/madam-butterfly/>.

“Edward Said.” *Britannica*, 28 Oct. 2024, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Edward-Said>.

Fricke, Stefanie. “Reworking Myths: Stereotypes and Genre Conventions in Kazuo Ishiguro’s Work.” *Kazuo Ishiguro in a Global Context*, edited by Cynthia F. Wong and Hulya Yildiz, Ashgate, 2015, pp. 23–37.

Giles, Paul. “World Literature and Global English.” *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, edited by Theo D’haen et al., 2nd ed., Routledge, 2023, pp. 388–97.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. “On World Literature.” *Johann Wolfgang von Goethe Essays on Art and Literature*, edited by John Gearey, translated by Ellen von Nardroff and Ernest H. von Nardroff, vol. Goethe’s Collected Works 3, Princeton University Press, pp. 224–28.

- Horton, Emily. "Diaspora, Trauma, Spectrality and World Literary Writing in A Pale View of Hills." *Kazuo Ishiguro*, edited by Kristian Shaw and Peter Sloane, Manchester University Press, 2023, pp. 17–37.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *A Pale View of Hills*. Vintage International, 1982.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Les Vestiges Du Jour*. Translated by Sophie Mayoux, folio Gallimard, 2001.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Lumière Pâle Sur Les Collines*. Translated by Sophie Mayoux, folio Gallimard, 1984.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. "My Twentieth Century Evening – and Other Small Breakthroughs." *The Nobel Prize*, 2017.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *The Remains of the Day*. Vintage International, 1989.
- Kang, Mathilde. "La Migration Des Œuvres Françaises En Asie." *French Cultural Studies*, vol. 29, no. 1, Feb. 2018, pp. 49–58. *EBSCOhost*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957155817738676>.
- Karni, Rebecca. "Made in Translation: Language, 'Japaneseness,' 'Englishness,' and 'Global Culture' in Ishiguro." *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 318–48.
- Koma, Kyoko. "La Représentation de La Femme Japonaise Dans Madame Chrysanthème de Pierre Loti." *Literatūra: Vilniaus Universiteto Mokslo Darbai*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2010, pp. 20–28. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=2016832393&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=2016832393&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site).
- "La Pléiade." *Seing Saint Denis*, <https://patrimoine.seinesaintdenis.fr/La-Pleiade>.
- Lowenthal, David. "British National Identity and the English Landscape." *Rural History*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1991, pp. 205–30.

“L’universalité de la langue française de Antoine de Rivarol.” *La République des Lettres*, 13 Nov. 2024, <https://republiquesdeslettres.fr/rivarol-universalite-langue-francaise.php>.

“Major French Literary Critic Pascale Casanova Dies at 59.” Harvard University The Institute of World Literature, 30 Sept. 2018, <https://iwl.fas.harvard.edu/news/major-french-literary-critic-pascale-casanova-dies-59>.

Montier, Jean-Pierre. “Traces et Restes Du Japon, Ou Le Grenier de Pierre Loti.” *Contemporary French and Francophone Studies*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2014, pp. 428–37.

Mydlarski, Henri. “Antoine de Rivarol.” *La République des Lettres*, 13 Nov. 2024, <https://republiquesdeslettres.fr/rivarol.php>.

Ohashi, Eri. “L’Évolution Des Consciences Grâce à La Langue, Vue Au Prisme Du Voyage, de La Colonisation, et de l’émigration.” *Discourses on Nations and Identities*, edited by Daniel Syrový, De Gruyter, 2021, pp. 69–81. *EBSCOhost*, [search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202121812942&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202121812942&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site).

Oztabak-Avci, Elif. “‘You Never Know Who You’re Addressing’: A Study of the Inscribed ‘You’ in The Remains of the Day.” *Kazuo Ishiguro in a Global Context*, Ashgate, pp. 49–58.

“Proxémie de majordome.” *Centre Nationale Du Ressources Textuelles et Lexicales*, <https://www.cnrtl.fr/proxemie/majordome>.

Puccini, Giacomo. “‘Madama Butterfly’ by Giacomo Puccini Libretto (French-Italian).” DM Opera Site, [http://www.murashev.com/opera/libretto.php?libretto\\_id=66-63&print=1](http://www.murashev.com/opera/libretto.php?libretto_id=66-63&print=1).

Russell, Richard. “Ishiguro’s The Buried Giant.” *The Comparatist*, vol. 45, Oct. 2021.



Said, Edward. "Consolidated Vision." *Culture and Imperialism*, Vintage Books, pp. 62–66.

*Sir Kazuo Ishiguro, Academy Class of 2017, Full Interview*. Academy of Achievement, 2018,

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z\\_rVLxoxAwg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z_rVLxoxAwg).

Tsu, Jing. "World Literature and National Literature(s)." *The Routledge Companion to World*

*Literature*, edited by Theo D'haen et al., 2nd ed., Routledge, 2023, pp. 120–28.

Tsuruki, Naoko. "« Geisha », Un Mot Polysémique Sous La Plume de Voyageurs Européens:

Origine d'un Stéréotype?" *Frontières de La Définition Dans Le Récit de Voyage*, edited

by Véronique Magri and Odile Gannier, Éditions Classiques Garnier, 2023, p. 213.

EBSCOhost,

[search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202433552](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202433552)

[776&authtype=sso&custid=s8998431&site=ehost-live&scope=site](https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=mzh&AN=202433552).

Walkowitz, Rebecca. *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature*.

Columbia University Press, 2015, 321.

"Walter Benjamin—Philosopher, Cultural Critic, and Essayist." *Harvard University Press*,

[https://www.hup.harvard.edu/features/walter-benjamin-philosopher-cultural-critic-and-es](https://www.hup.harvard.edu/features/walter-benjamin-philosopher-cultural-critic-and-essayist)

[sayist](https://www.hup.harvard.edu/features/walter-benjamin-philosopher-cultural-critic-and-essayist)

"Young Kazuo Ishiguro Interview (1986)." *Manufacturing Intellect*, YouTube, 6 Oct. 2017,

[www.youtube.com/watch?v=tat-5V41hTs](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tat-5V41hTs).

**Appendix A: English Summary of Ishiguro, Loti et *Madame Chrysantheme* ou *Madama Butterfly***

The story of Ishiguro's character Sachiko in *A Pale View of Hills* alludes to Pierre Loti's *Madame Chrysantheme*, later transformed into Puccini's opera *Madama Butterfly*. Ishiguro subverts Loti's orientalized perspective to break down common western perspectives regarding Japan. Eri Ohashi highlights how language serves a form of cultural export and colonisation while also serving as a form of connection and construction when it comes to the nation, particularly making reference to Said's notions of language as a form of imposition. Loti's insistence on the authenticity of his portrayal of Japan and its people, which he orientalizes and fetishizes using a particular vocab that eradicates the Japanese, particularly women, of any nuance, intelligence or depth. Loti reduces the Japanese woman to art, and in refusing to learn Japanese appreciates them as silent, docile figures.

Loti's lack of desire to learn Japanese likewise leads him to use French in an attempt to understand Japanese culture. Ohashi makes note of how Loti "francifizes" the Japanese names of the women he encounters, appropriating them into French words, turning them into jokes, like Madame l'Heure for Toki san.<sup>20</sup> Ohashi calls these words xenisms, in which Loti turns many Japanese words into their phonetic French counterparts. Referring to women as animals, using xenisms, he completely aestheticizes Japan for Western purposes, making it easy for the western world to understand and "appreciate."

Naoko Tsuruki highlights how Loti augmented the sexualization of female Japanese women with his presentation of Geishas using this kind of vocabulary. Loti also describes his

---

<sup>20</sup> Page 42

encounters with Geishas on an incredibly physical level, allowing his audience to develop any kind of conception that suits them when they imagine the Geisha.

This representation that Loti constructed eventually returned to the eastern parts of the globe, most notably Shanghai and Tokyo, as a result of the Paris-Tokyo-Shanghai triangle of translation highlighted by Mathilde Kang. This gave Japan the opportunity to see how the western world sees them, but without being of equal influence on the literary hierarchy had little power in reconfiguring the mythical and fantastical construction of its nation.

Loti's story was eventually transformed into *Madama Butterfly*, an opera following the story of the Geisha Cio-Cio San, or Madama Butterfly and her tragic marriage to the American naval lieutenant Pinkerton. Cio-Cio San falls in love with Pinkerton and it costs her the support of her family and her community, which she gratefully releases in exchange for her new American identity. Pinkerton returns to America in search of a real wife, and Cio-Cio San patiently waits for his return with his son.

Sachiko's story with Frank, her American partner, greatly mirrors that of Butterfly. Frank, after promising to take Sachiko and Mariko to America, abandons them, and takes all their money. Sachiko's reaction is naive, much like Cio-Cio San, which is surprising considering how strong and determined Sachiko is as a character. Sachiko also embraces America as her proper culture, in hopes of a better life for her own daughter, as Cio-Cio San hopes for her son.

Ishiguro's allusions to a story so heavily steeped in orientalism and stereotypes subverts and reconstructs the perceptions of Japanese culture and Japanese women with this novel. He uses the construction to break them down and reconstruct them in a more redeeming, and deeper light.

## **Appendix B: English Summary of Translating British Greatness and Maintaining it in French**

The French translation of *The Remains of the Day* must pay attention to the difference between the implied reader and the external narratee. Stevens consistently supposes his audience is English, and the translator Sophie Mayoux leaves particular words untranslated, especially anglicisms like “butler” as opposed to using their French equivalent. Leaving the words in their language of origin allows for the associations contained in the English versions of the word to maintain their impact on the reader.

Alizee Delpierre comments on the universality of the butler as a European, particularly English figure, and also highlights how these kinds of butlers are now fading from popularity as dated, much as Stevens is no longer necessary in Mr. Farraday’s world.

In maintaining butler in English, and insisting on the superiority of the English butler, Stevens continues to use his conception of Englishness associated with his work to police himself within his required Englishness.

The Chinaman scene in French also illustrates how the French language allows for more generalized, and often orientalist, presentations, making even larger encompassing myths regarding the orient.