agilely to poststructuralism than Asian Studies has. Whether one agrees with Cox’s position on these fundamental issues, it is to his credit that he rejects the tendency by some poststructuralists (including some Foucauldians) and some socialist and feminist modernist academics to erase agency in uncritical fealty to structure.

Another of Cox’s significant contributions is made through opening the question of how the body signifies both for the object of study and for the writing and researching subject. Here he draws on the work of Judith Okely and Ruth Behar in anthropology’s concern with the ways that claims to objective study are invariably compromised by the presence of the observer (as ethnographer), but does not engage with the important work coming out of feminism, queer studies, and other responses to Foucault’s later work on how power relations inscribe the body.

These are critical topics for a white male anthropologist to take seriously, particularly one trained in Britain who is researching and publishing under the grand auspices of the Royal Asiatic Society (who copublished this volume in conjunction with RoutledgeCourzon). Particularly those in the field of cultural anthropology who take up the social location of a white male in a former imperial power always run the risk of claiming to decolonize while once again installing normative white, masculine, first-world categories and even experience at the center of ethnographic writing. Yet again, this is a problem not with Cox’s work alone but one that reaches to the entire enterprise of ethnography and helps explain the continuing scramble in anthropology and other fields to rethink the ethics and politics of fieldwork and indeed the conventions of writing itself.

The ethnographic chapters (3–8) consist largely of Cox’s use of an eclectic mix of anthropological and aesthetic literature sprinkled with anecdotes from the field. To Cox’s credit the autobiographical-centered explorations of embodied aesthetic forms are modulated with a wariness of the narcissism that is a pitfall in some self-reflexive writing rethinking objectivity and the exoticized Other of ethnography. However, Cox’s failure to more actively flex his own agency in destabilizing boundaries of subject/object or same/Other (as seen in the work of Okely, James Clifford, and Vin-canne Adams) and his inability to work with Japanese-language materials condemns his writing to persistent returns to long-established views of Takie Lebra, Kenneth Kraft, and Yasuo Yuasa.

The ambivalences and confusions of this volume are not slight, but clear vision is never easy on high-stakes battlefields. The volume makes important contributions to dislodging entrenched claims to authenticity and nationalist cultural essences and to reconsiderations of the body even as it reinscribes the authority of the white, masculinized ethnographer. Cox’s volume suggests that the struggle for decolonizing knowledge is changing the anthropology of Japan and the field of Buddhist studies in profound ways despite the best efforts of Orientalism’s dedicated supporters.

Joe Parker
Pitzer College

Writing Home: Representations of the Native Place in Modern Japanese Literature.
By Steven Dodd. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005. x, 293 pp. $40.00 (cloth).

The quest for a furusato, or native place, is a modern Japanese obsession, given the large number of uprooted urbanites longing for a real or imaginary place called
home, be it a home in the Edo past accessible only through fiction and memory, or a home in the country conjured through literary allusion. Steven Dodd’s study examines in great depth the works of four modern writers—Doppo, Tōson, Satō Haruo, and Shiga Naoya—in their respective ways of finding or creating a native place in a literature characterized by the loss of a home, to use Kobayashi Hideo’s term. The strength of this study lies in the painstaking and thought-provoking analysis of this powerful mythmaking process in these works. The weakness lies in its less than persuasive attempt to force this imaginative process to fit in a larger ideological context of establishing a national identity.

Placed in the theoretical context of spatial hermeneutics and space-centered analysis, this study resonates with the current interests in urban and cultural studies. Dodd’s forte is clearly in literary textual analysis, which is evident in his perceptive close reading of each author. He argues that while Doppo creates an imaginary and modern space through literary references to Western literature, his awareness of “the intrusion of western ways of seeing” (p. 253) contributes to the fragmented nature of his native landscape. The two chapters on Tōson delineate his conscious effort in reappropriating the countryside as a literary construct and argue for its sense of authenticity. Dodd argues that Satō’s “aestheticizing gaze” (p. 172) creates a furusato in a fantastic territory that stands outside history and geography and lies within the realm of fantasy. In the chapters on Shiga, Dodd argues that Shiga successfully creates a calm and harmonious furusato “replete with tradition and desire” (p. 244) but criticizes its lack of political import and historical grounding.

Following this line of investigation, the search for furusato from Doppo to Shiga reflects the bold experimentations in modern Japanese fiction, from the ingenious blending of native and Western literary traditions in Doppo, to the exploration of a modernist prose and perspective in Satō, and the invention and cultivation of a rhetoric of authenticity in Tōson and Shiga. That Shiga’s work is called the “furusato of literature” throws light on this process of “reaching home” in the development of modern Japanese fiction, not necessarily that Shiga is the greatest, but that Shiga’s A Dark Night’s Passing marks a kind of metaphorical arrival that began with the Meiji writers leaving the familiar territory of tradition in search of a new literary form and expression that they can call home. Dodd’s fine and meticulous textual analysis illuminates this fascinating development in modern Japanese fiction. Very few contemporary works of literary criticism undertake textual analysis of the important works of major authors at the level of Dodd’s commitment and sophistication. Students and scholars alike will benefit from the perceptive readings of these major authors.

The flaw of this work lies in its awkward attempt in linking the search of the furusato to a larger ideological and national agenda. It is difficult to see how Doppo’s spatial discovery is connected to “the national search for a subjective identity” (p. 70), nor is it convincing that Tōson’s literary construct serves “to outline a distinctly Japanese homeland available to a broader society in flux” (p. 136). The imaginary home in Satō’s and Shiga’s has more to do with the prevailing Taishō mood of searching for Utopia and less to do with the authors’ deficient political and historical consciousness.

Finally, among the selection of writers in this study, Doppo, Tōson, and Satō came to Tokyo from the provinces while Shiga was born outside Tokyo, so none of the writers is a native Tokyoite. Though it is impossible for a single study to be comprehensive, it will be interesting if this work stimulates further studies in the idea of home in Tokyo-born urbanites, such as Sōseki, Kafū, or Akutagawa on the one hand, and Tokyo-born writers who leave Tokyo in the quest of a new home, such
as Arishima Takeo and Tanizaki Jun’ichirō on the other hand. Ideally, this work will also pave the way for further studies on spatial hermeneutics, such as the investigation of urban space as a possible *furusato* in modern and postmodern Japanese literature, and the meaning and definition of the native place in the predominantly urban and modern mode of existence in Japanese fiction.

**Angela Yiu**
Sophia University


“Translating international law into Japanese and using its terms in practice” provided Meiji leaders with “a new method of intercourse with” the West and enabled them “to reorder the vocabulary of power within Asia” (p. 1) in terms of international legitimization; so Alexis Dudden sums up the gist of her book. The key words suggested here are indicative of how Japan’s colonization of Korea was fit into the larger context of its modern transformation into an imperial empire: international law, translation and practice, vocabulary of power, and Asia.

By focusing on discursive dimensions coupled with the tidal waves of change in international geopolitics from the mid-nineteenth century, Dudden traces the construction and dispersion of international legal terms imported from the West and applied to the processes of Japan’s colonization of Korea. The title of this book is a bit misleading in that it deals not with the question of the colonization process itself, but rather with imperialist discourses brimming with claims to legitimacy for the drive of imperialism that swept the West and Japan. For this, Dudden demonstrates her sophisticated analytical skills in illustrating how Japan was able to make its annexation of Korea “legal” in the eyes of the West.

This is an inspiring work that adds a new angle to the discussion of Korean-Japanese relations at the turn of the nineteenth century—an angle that helps debunk the international system that operated under the guise of an inevitable course of history. Indeed, the term *international* that excludes the dominated is always deceptive and misleading, and its beguiling nature is further exposed when it is conflated with such terms as *legitimate*, *legal*, or *normative*. In this line, Dudden is convinced that “the failure to incorporate Japan’s empire into general theories of imperialism remains a fatal blow of such studies and of international studies in general” (p. 4). Given the innate fallacy of “international” theories, however, there will always be a danger of plunging into a tautological logic of those theories when one tries to trace the legitimacy of Japan’s colonial endeavors within the parameters of international law.

In this connection, either missing or treated lightly in this book are the voices of the dominated—the Koreans themselves. In the chapters dealing with issues on “illegal Korea” (The Hague Incident) and “voices of dissent” (righteous armies resistance), Dudden discusses how Koreans resisted Japan’s 1905 protectorate takeover and tries to deconstruct the “historical nature of international terms” that sustained “a sense of the transcendent value” in “Japan’s expansionist policies” toward Korea (p. 25). But readers would come away with the impression that, on the domestic front, Koreans did not do much about overcoming Japan’s “transcendental value” of international power politics because they were detoured by the West, which endorsed the “enlightened exploitation” of Japan’s imperial expansionism.