

Soseki Natsume on the Ghost in *Macbeth*

教科・領域教育専攻

言語系コース

M04183D

小林 純子

Soseki Natsume on the Ghost in *Macbeth*

---

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate Course at  
Hyogo University of Teacher Education

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of School Education

---

by

Junko Kobayashi

(Student Number: M04183D)

December 2005

## Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and express my appreciation to those who have helped me in completing this thesis.

First and foremost, I express sincere thanks to my seminar supervisor, Professor Hiroshi Oshima, for his valuable suggestions, advice and sincere guidance at every stage in the preparation of this thesis. Without his help, I could not have completed this thesis at all.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to the other staff members of the Department of Language Studies at Hyogo University of Teacher Education for their professional and insightful suggestions. I also wish to thank my colleagues in the Graduate Course for the valuable discussions and generous advice.

My special thanks are extended to Ms. Jennifer Wilson for her critical comments and helpful advice in reading this thesis.

Last but not least, I would like to express my thanks to my family and friends for their affectionate and heartfelt support during these past two years. Without their support and constant affections, I could not have continued my study.

Junko KOBAYASHI

Kato, Hyogo

December, 2005

## Abstract

Soseki Natsume (1867-1916) published “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” (“On the Ghost in *Macbeth*”) on 10th January 1904 (the 37th year of the Meiji era), which was included in the *Teikoku Bungaku*. He finished writing this article in December 1903 (the 36th year of the Meiji era). Its content is based upon part of his lecture on *Macbeth* for the students at the faculty of literature in Tokyo Imperial University from September 1903 to February 1904. Although it is worthy of attention as Natsume’s first and last article on English literature after his return to Japan from the United Kingdom, few critics have paid attention to this article so far.

This paper aims to examine and analyse “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” in comparison with his early writings about English literature, and with the reception-history of Shakespeare in Japan.

In Chapter 1, we consider the relationship between this article and his early five writings about English literature. We find out that these five writings are merely introductory essays or reviews, and none of them are academic critiques. “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” is worth paying attention to as his first academic critique.

In Chapter 2, “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” is analysed with reference to the problems of the Ghost in *Macbeth*. Natsume refers to *Macbeth: A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (1873) for various views of the Ghost. His argument centres on the following three questions: (a) one ghost or two, (b) Banquo’s Ghost or Duncan’s, and (c) a hallucination or an apparition. Natsume’s article has some faults: he misreads Knight’s remark; he concerns

with neither the placement of the Ghost nor other apparitions in *Macbeth* like the dagger and the three witches. Although “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” has these faults, this is the most important and highest-quality among his articles on English literature.

In Chapter 3, we examine “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” in the context of the reception-history of Shakespeare in Japan before 1904. Compared with *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth* was introduced relatively later in Japan. It was first introduced through the translation of Lamb’s *Tales from Shakespeare* in the second decade of the Meiji era. Only in the third and fourth decades of the Meiji era, only a few adaptations and partial translations from *Macbeth* in the original came out. Neither the adaptations nor the partial translations were staged. It was not until 1905 (the 38th year of the Meiji era) that *Macbeth* was performed in Japan. This first performance was rather later than those of other Shakespearean dramas such as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, *King Lear*, and *Othello*. Thus, the reception-history of *Macbeth* was very limited, before Natsume published “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”.

In “*Makubesu hyotyū*” and “*Makubesu*”, Tsubouchi attempted in part to express his own opinions with reference to other critics’ views. Sho tried character criticism to analyse *Macbeth* in “*Higeki makubesu ni tsuite*”. In “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”, Natsume developed these two preceding approaches most fully and presented a full-fledged academic critique.

It is interesting to note that Bradley’s argument in his *Shakespearean Tragedy* is much the same as Natsume’s. Furthermore, the Ghost in *Macbeth* is no longer problematic, since Bradley’s argument is widely

accepted today. Natsume's article, however, was issued before Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*. It follows that Natsume could not refer to Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*; he independently completed his study on the Ghost in *Macbeth*, which ranks as high as Bradley's classic study.

Much more attention should be paid to Natsume's "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" from the following three points: (1) it is the most important and highest-quality among his articles on English literature, (2) it is the earliest academic critique on *Macbeth* in Japan, and (3) it ranks as high as Bradley's classic study on the Ghost in *Macbeth* in his *Shakespearean Tragedy*.

## Contents

Acknowledgements .....	i
Abstract .....	ii
Contents .....	v
Introduction .....	1
 Chapter 1	
Soseki Natsume's Writings about English Literature	
1.1. The First Group .....	3
1.2. The Second Group .....	4
 Chapter 2	
Analysis of "Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite"	
2.1. The Problems of the Ghost in <i>Macbeth</i> .....	6
2.2. Natsume's Argument about the Ghost in <i>Macbeth</i> .....	8
2.2.1. One Ghost or Two .....	9
2.2.2. Banquo's Ghost or Duncan's .....	10
2.2.3. A Hallucination or an Apparition .....	14

## Chapter 3

“*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” and the Reception-History of Shakespeare  
in Japan before 1904

3.1. The First Period .....	18
3.2. The Second Period .....	20
3.3. The Reception-History of <i>Macbeth</i> .....	21
3.4. A Critical Comparison among Tsubouchi, Sho, and Natsume.....	25
Conclusion .....	29
Notes .....	31
Works Cited .....	32
Appendix .....	37



## Introduction

Soseki Natsume (1867-1916) published “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” (“On the Ghost in *Macbeth*”) on 10th January 1904 (the 37th year of the Meiji era), which was included in the *Teikoku Bungaku*. He finished writing this article in December 1903 (the 36th year of the Meiji era). Its content is based upon the part of his lecture on *Macbeth* for the students at the faculty of literature in Tokyo Imperial University from September 1903 to February 1904. Although it is worthy of attention as Natsume’s first and last article on English literature after his return to Japan from the United Kingdom, few critics have paid attention to this article so far.

This paper aims to examine and analyse “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” in comparison with his early writings about English literature, and with the reception-history of Shakespeare in Japan.

In Chapter 1, we will consider the relationship between this article and his previous five writings about English literature. These five writings are (1) “Bundan ni okeru byodoshugi no daihyosha ‘Uoruto Hoittoman’ Walt Whitman no shi ni tsuite” (“On Walt Whitman’s poems”), (2) “Eikoku no tenchisansen ni taisuru kannen” (“The Concept of Nature in the United Kingdom”), (3) “*Torisutoramu shandē*” (“On *Tristram Shandy*”), (4) “Eikoku no bunjin to shimbun zasshi” (“Literary Men, Magazines and Newspapers in the United Kingdom”), and (5) “Shosetsu *Eiruwin* no hihyo” (“A Commentary on *Aylwin*”). In Chapter 2, “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” will be analysed with reference to the problems of the Ghost in *Macbeth* which were discussed in the United Kingdom. In Chapter 3, we will examine

“*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” in the context of the reception-history of Shakespearean works in general and *Macbeth* in particular, in Japan before 1904.

## Chapter 1

### Soseki Natsume's Writings about English Literature

Natsume published six writings about English literature in total, of which "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" is the last. "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" was published in 1904, while the others were all in the 1890's. These earlier five writings can be classified into two groups. The first group comprises the earliest two articles during Natsume's Tokyo Imperial University student days: "Bundan ni okeru byodoshugi no daihyosha 'Uoruto Hoittoman' Walt Whitman no shi ni tsuite" and "Eikokuno tenchisansen ni taisuru kannen". Both of them are concerned with poetry. The second group consists of three articles published when he was a teacher at the Fifth High School in Kumamoto: "*Torisutoramu shandē*", "Eikoku no bunjin to shimbun zasshi", and "Shosetu *Eiruwin* no hiho". They are related to novels and journalism.

Let us make a brief survey of these early articles, and sum up the distinctive characteristics.

#### 1.1. The First Group

"Bundan ni okeru byodoshugi no daihyosha 'Uoruto Hoittoman' Walt Whitman no shi ni tsuite" appeared in the *Tetsugaku Zasshi* in October 1892. This writing numbers 18 pages and is known as the earliest article on the American poet Walt Whitman (1819-1892) in Japan. At the beginning part of this article, Natsume takes up the question of "how the

sense of equality was expressed in the poems of ‘Walt Whitman’ (6). Then, he shows four points of view —time, space, the way of judging human nature, and attitude toward nature itself —with brief comparison of other poets such as Robert Burns (1759-96), Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822), Alfred Tennyson (1809-92) and others. This article is no more than an introductory essay on Whitman and his poems.

“Eikoku no tenchisansen ni taisuru kannen” came out in the *Tetsugaku Zasshi* in March 1893. This article covers 40 pages and is based upon his lecture for the faculty of English literature at Tokyo Imperial University. In this article, Natsume first gives the definitions of “nature” and “Shizenshugi”. Then, he explains concretely poets and their works, such as William Cowper (1731-1800), Robert Burns (1759-96), and William Wordsworth (1770-1850). As Yoshio Nakano points out, “The merit of this article lies in the convincing way of argument, which includes apt citations from various poets and other critics’ comments, but this article describes only the basics of the history of English literature” (218).

## 1.2. The Second Group

“*Torisutoramu shandē*”, an article 16 pages long, was included in the *Koko Bungaku* in March 1897. This is known as one of the earliest articles about the works of Laurence Sterne (1713-68) in Japan. To begin with, Natsume explains the plot of *Tristram Shandy*. Then, he refers to the contents of this novel from the following points of view: interesting parts, surprising parts, moving parts, Sterne’s language and others. It includes citations from some philosophers and other novelists, but we cannot see

Natsume's own critical views in it. This article is regarded as a mere explanatory review of *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* (1759-67).

“Eikoku no bunjin to shimbun zasshi” was published in the *Hototogisu* in April 1899. The article covers 12 pages and explains the history of newspapers and magazines in the United Kingdom.

“Shosetsu *Eiruwini* no hihyo” was included in the *Hototogisu* in August 1899. This is 19 pages long and is one of the earliest articles about *Aylwin* (1898) written by Watts-Dunton (1832-1914). After a brief sketch of the plot, Natsume explains this novel from the following four points of view: characters, scene, structure and length of this novel. In conclusion, Natsume estimates that *Aylwin* is nearly a poem. His statement is presented without any reference to other critics' opinions. Just like “*Torisutoramu shandē*” and “Bundan ni okeru byodoshugi no daihyosha ‘Uoruto Hoittoman’ Walt Whitman no shi ni tsuite”, this article is no more than a explanatory review or an introductory essay.

To sum up, we can say that Natsume's early writings about English literature are merely introductory essays or reviews, and none of them are academic critiques. It is not until “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” is published that we find an academic critique by Natsume. This article came out in January 1904. It was the first and last writing about English literature that Natsume contributed after he returned from the United Kingdom. In the next chapter, we will analyse academic aspects of “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”.

## Chapter 2

### Analysis of “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”

#### 2.1. The Problems of the Ghost in *Macbeth*

In “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”, Natsume notes the scene where the Ghost appears twice in III, iv of *Macbeth*. The Ghost in *Macbeth* was a matter of argument until the era of Soseki Natsume. The controversy was partly due to different versions of *Macbeth*.

The first version of *Macbeth*, called the First Folio, was published in 1623. This version was maybe based on a prompt-book of Shakespeare’s company, the King’s Men. It was edited by John Heminge (1556-1630) and Henry Condell (?-1627), members of the King’s Men. In this version, the Ghost first appears before Macbeth drinks to appetite and health (III, iv, 47)<sup>1</sup>. Its stage direction goes: “Enter the Ghost of Banquo, and sits in Macbeths [sic] place”. It is the same with the Second Folio (1632), Third Folio (1664) and Fourth Folio (1685).

The appearance of the first Ghost has differences among some editions from the early eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. For example, in Edward Capell’s edition (1761), the first Ghost appears after Macbeth drinks to appetite and health, and Lenox says, “May’t please your highness sit” (III, iv, 51). In Howard Staunton’s edition (1860), it appears after Macbeth alludes to Banquo’s absence (III, iv, 55). We will discuss these differences in detail later.

In this connection, we should note the history of the performances.

For example, the performance at the Globe on 20th April 1611 was recorded by Simon Forman (1552-1611). In his note, he describes as follows:

The next night, being at supper with his noblemen, whom he had bid to a feast, to the which [sic] also Banquo should have come, he began to speak of noble Banquo, and to wish that he were there. And as he thus did, standing up to drink a carouse to him, the ghost of Banquo came and sat down in his chair behind him.  
(Hunter 31)

The Ghost's appearance is apparently different between the First Folio and Forman's note. The *Macbeth* which Forman enjoyed was performed before the publication of the First Folio. Kenji Oba observes, "It seems that this note of Forman's can be one of the evidences to show that the interpretation of the text was also dependent on editors in those days" (226-27).

In addition, it was controversial whether the Ghost should be visible or invisible to the audience. Mostly "the rationalizing mind of the eighteenth century was bound to be attracted by the possibility that the Ghost was a figment of Macbeth's imagination" (Hunter 34). However, the audience earnestly requested the visible Ghost on the stage, so John Philip Kemble (1757-1823) made the visible Ghost appear in the production in September 1809 (Fukuda 221). From 1820 to 1851, William Charles Macready (1793-1873), actor and manager of his company, gave a superb performance as Macbeth. His performance in his later years is known as quite true to the First Folio; therefore, it must have included the visible Ghost. Thus, the Ghost was visible in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, but it was invisible in the eighteenth century.

Furthermore, in the nineteenth century, another problem was discussed: who are the first and the second Ghost. This question partly arises from the ambiguity in the stage-direction. In the First Folio, the stage-direction to the second Ghost reads, "Enter Ghost" (III, iv, 111). The name of the "Ghost" is not put in this stage-direction. Besides, the First Folio was known as an unreliable edition because it supposedly included some interpolations; therefore, the stage-directions are sometimes treated as unimportant.

## 2.2. Natsume's Argument about the Ghost in *Macbeth*

Natsume referred to *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* for various views of the Ghost. He admirably sorted them out; his argument is not only logical but also persuasive. Now let us examine his argument in detail.

To begin with, Natsume analyses the character of Macbeth in six qualities: Macbeth is (1) cunning, (2) poetic, (3) reckless, (4) fortitudinous, (5) imaginative and (6) considerate (109-10). Natsume points out that Macbeth's character is the central cause of his tragic life. These analyses of Macbeth's character and his tragedy seem to be a crude summary of opinions from various critics. They do not, therefore, include anything new or any original ideas, but they are to the point.

Then, Natsume goes on to considerations of the Ghost. His argument centers on the following three questions: (1) one ghost or two, (2) Banquo's Ghost or Duncan's, and (3) a hallucination or an apparition. As we have discussed in the preceding section, the Ghost in *Macbeth* already had



fundamentally three points of argument: ( i ) the placement of its appearance, ( ii ) its visibility, and ( iii ) its identity. Natsume's (1) and (2) are correspondent to (iii), and (3) is to (ii). Natsume does not make any mention of ( i ). We will refer to this fault later. First, we examine Natsume's considerations of (1), (2), and (3).

### 2.2.1. One Ghost or Two

As far as the number of the Ghost is concerned, Charles Knight (1791-1873) and E. H. Seymour argue that there are two Ghosts. Knight insists that "to make the ghost of Banquo return a second time at the moment when Macbeth wishes for the presence of Banquo is not in the highest style of art" (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 212); Seymour asserts that no new terror or augmented perturbation is to be produced by the reappearance of the same object in the same scene (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 211).

Against those arguments, Natsume maintains that if the reappearance adds to our interest, it is worthy to be considered since it is the most artistic. Moreover, he urges as follows:

If the mind, expression, delivery and behaviour of Macbeth have no difference between his encounter with the first Ghost and the second Ghost, and if there is no difference between the first Ghost and the second Ghost, the reappearance is a genuine repetition. Human minds, however, can be in flux and changeable as if they were running water or daily lives; the poetic Macbeth is the more changeable because he has lost a

balance of mind and is about to face a crisis. (112)

In consideration of the psychology of Macbeth, Natsume contends that the reappearance is not a genuine repetition to Macbeth. He concludes that the first and second Ghosts are one and the same ghost.

### 2.2.2. Banquo's Ghost or Duncan's

As to the Ghost's identity, E. H. Seymour and Joseph Hunter (1783-1861) maintain that the first Ghost is Duncan's and the second Ghost is Banquo's. With regard to the first Ghost, Seymour observes: "[...] if but one dread monitor could gain access to this imperial malefactor, which was the more likely to harrow the remorseful bosom of Macbeth —'the gracious Duncan' or Banquo, his mere 'partner'?" (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 211) Natsume argues that "we sometimes keep in mind insignificant things rather than important ones [...] the bosom of Macbeth, in this case, focuses on the unimportant Banquo rather than the great Duncan" (114).

In addition, Seymour and Hunter pay attention to the words "If charnel-houses and our graves [...]" (III, iv, 89-91) and argue that "they will not suit Banquo, who had no grave or charnel-house assigned to him but must refer to Duncan [...]" (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 211). Natsume points out that "we can use poetically charnel-houses or graves to describe the death" (115).

Concerning the words 'If I stand here, I saw him' (III, iv, 93), Seymour insists that "If Banquo were the object here alluded to, it must be unintelligible to the Lady, who had not yet heard of Banquo's murder" (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 211). Natsume notes Macbeth's mental

confusion and urges as follows:

The word 'him', which is unintelligible to the others, speaks of Macbeth's confusion about reality. And the utterance of this word also has an influence on the people who participate in the banquet, and makes them feel creepy. These effects are deliberately made by Shakespeare. (116)

Charles Knight alleges that the first Ghost is Banquo's and the second Ghost is Duncan's. As for Banquo's ghost, he remarks that "There is a coincidence of passage [...]. It is found in the 'twenty trenched gashes on his head,' mentioned by the Murderer, and the 'twenty mortal murders on their crowns,' alluded to by Macbeth" (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 212).

Natsume observes that this argument is merely concerned with words and phrases.

With reference to Duncan's ghost, Knight maintains as follows:

The terror of Macbeth is now more intense than on the first appearance; it becomes desperate and defying. In the presence of the ghost of Banquo, when he is asked 'Are you a man?' he replies, 'Ay, and a bold one that dare look on that [/] Which might appal the devil.' Upon the second apparition, it [his reply] is 'Avaunt and quit my sight'—'Take any shape but *that*'—'Hence, horrible shadow!' Are not these words applied to some object of *greater* terror than the former? (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 212)

Against this opinion, Natsume expresses his own analysis of the psychology of Macbeth:

Macbeth feels terror rather than fury when he encounters the first Ghost. And he feels fury rather than terror when the Ghost reappears. He is regaining his balance when he encounters the same ghost again. The Ghost vanishes only to give him for an instant peace of his mind, and reappears just after he has got a momentary peace. This is more ironic than just staring at Macbeth without disappearing. [...] It is not the Ghost but Macbeth that changes in this scene. (119)

Alexander Dyce (1798-1869) and Richard Grant White (1821-85) affirm that the first and the second Ghost are Banquo's. Dyce notices the stage-directions:

[...] it is certain that the stage-directions which are found in the early editions of plays were designed *solely for the instruction of the actors*, not for the benefit of the readers; and consequently, if Shakespeare had intended the Ghost of Duncan to appear as well as the Ghost of Banquo, he would no doubt have carefully distinguished them in the stage-directions [...]. (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 212)

White points out "Macbeth's mental preoccupations":

[...] this first ghost is *Banquo's* is beyond a doubt; and that the second is also his, seems almost equally clear from like considerations of Macbeth's mental preoccupation with the recent murder, and the appearance of the Ghost again upon a renewed bravadoing attempt to forestall suspicion by the complimentary mention of Banquo's name. (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 214)

Natsume agrees with these two critics; he adds a supplementary comment, based upon on the relationship between the psychology of Macbeth and of the audience:

If the first Ghost is treated as Duncan's, interests in this scene must be lost. In these lines [where Macbeth stands up, and laments the absence of Banquo at the banquet in front of his men (III, iv, 51-55)], we can see Macbeth's belief that he can deceive his men. It is also certain that he believes that Banquo is not to come to the banquet. At this moment, he sees Banquo's Ghost enter and sit in his place. This makes him feel terror more intensely. We audience can empathize with Macbeth. The first Ghost has Macbeth at its mercy. (121-22)

As to the second Ghost, Natsume pays attention to Macbeth's psychological change from "pride" to "fury", and concludes that the second Ghost is Banquo's:

At this moment [after the first Ghost vanishes, Macbeth expresses again the feeling of sadness about Banquo's absence (III, iv, 112-15)], Macbeth keeps remembering Banquo. Macbeth, however, wants to deceive his men into believing that he laments the absence of Banquo. Macbeth is inflated with pride. The reappearance of the Banquo's Ghost discourages him, and makes him feel fury. I can not help treating the second Ghost as Banquo's. (122)

### 2.2.3. A Hallucination or an Apparition

Charles Cowden Clarke (1787-1877), John Philip Kemble (1757-1823), and Charles Knight (1791-1873) assert that the Ghost is a hallucination. One of the reasons for a hallucination is that since the participants in the banquet couldn't see the Ghost except Macbeth, the Ghost should be banished from the stage. Natsume refutes this reason, because the point of this drama is to invite the audience's empathy for Macbeth:

[...] the centre of this drama is Macbeth. The audience does not take the same attitude toward Macbeth as his men. We audience are more closely related to the mind of Macbeth than those of his men, so we are privileged to read his feelings into his mind more closely. (123)

Henry Norman Hudson (1814-86) draws our attention to the problem of "a subjective ghost" in Shakespeare's time:

I have long been fixed in the thought that the reappearance of the dead Banquo ought, by all means, to be discontinued on the stage. In Shakespeare's time the generality of the people could not possibly conceive of a subjective ghost. (Shakespeare, *A New Variorum* 215)

Natsume interprets "the reappearance of the dead Banquo" as the appearance of the second Ghost. Apparently this is a misreading, because "a subjective ghost" is naturally related to, not only the second Ghost, but also the first Ghost. However, this is a trifling mistake, which never weakens Natsume's argument. Natsume indicates the difference between literature and science so as to rebut Hudson's argument:

Literature is not Science. If apparitions aren't admissible in literature because they're not admissible in science, this just confuses science with literature. [...] Therefore, if we do not treat the Ghost in *Macbeth* as an apparition, we should say that it is not because apparitions are not admissible in science, but because apparitions kill our interest. And if we try to agree that the Ghost is a hallucination, we should say that it is not because hallucinations are admissible in science, but because hallucinations heighten our interest. However, if we banish the visible Ghost from *Macbeth*, the drama loses its luster. (123-24)

Thus, Natsume is careful in his argument, although it includes some slight mistakes. Various opinions from other critics are sorted into three groups; he criticizes or comments on each of the groups, and gives his own opinions. We can estimate that this article is the most academic and highest-quality among the six writings about English literature. Especially it is worth while to note the two viewpoints which define this article: the focus on the character and psychology of Macbeth, and on the relation between the hero and the audience. We will discuss these viewpoints in the next chapter.

In addition to the above-mentioned trifling mistakes, there are three more faults in this article. One is a trivial one. Natsume makes a careless mistake. He states that Knight claims that the Ghost is a hallucination, but in fact Knight remarks that he would assert it but for the stage-direction. This slight fault is unimportant and has no influence on Natsume's argument.

Another fault is related to the visibility of the Ghost. As Yushi Odajima points out, “this article would have been more interesting if Natsume had related the Ghost of Banquo with other apparitions in the drama like the dagger and the three witches” (429).

The other fault is concerned with the placement of the Ghost. As I have mentioned before, Natsume referred to *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* for various views of the Ghost. The footnotes of *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* indicate that some critics paid attention to the difference of the placement of the Ghost among several versions of *Macbeth*. Yet Natsume does not mention or consider these differences in his article. Let us check on the differences.

As I said at the outset of this chapter, in the First Folio, Edward Capell’s edition and Howard Staunton’s edition, the first Ghost appears in line 47, after line 51, and after line 55 respectively. In Thomas Keightley’s edition (1865) and Henry Norman Hudson’s (1871), it rises after Ross mentions that Banquo’s absence should be blamed (III, iv, 58).

As far as the second Ghost is concerned, it appears before Macbeth alludes to Banquo’s absence (III, iv, 111) in *Macbeth: A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* as well as all the Folio editions.

In the Variorum editions of 1773, 1778, 1785, 1803, 1813 and 1821, it enters just before Macbeth alluded to Banquo’s absence (III, iv, 112). In Richard White’s edition (1861), it rises just after Macbeth alluded to Banquo’s absence (III, iv, 115). In the Alexander Pope’s editions (1709 and 1714), it appears after the lords drink to their loyalty to Macbeth (III, iv, 116).



Do these differences not affect Macbeth's psychology? In my opinion, Natsume's article would have been more thorough and convincing, if he had taken these differences into consideration.

## Chapter 3

### “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” and the Reception-History of Shakespeare in Japan before 1904

In this chapter, we consider “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*” in relation to the reception-history of Shakespeare in Japan before 1904 (the 37th year of the Meiji era when that article of Natsume’s was published).

It is in *Eibunkan* that the name of William Shakespeare was first introduced to Japan (Kawatake 49). *Eibunkan* was published in 1840. It was a translation from the Dutch version of *English Grammar* written by Lindley Murray (1745-1826). The translator was Rokuzo Shibukawa, who was a Temmonkata (an Astronomical Officer) of the Tokugawa Shogunate. In this book, the name of Shakespeare appeared as ‘Shakesupiru’. After that, Shakespeare’s name was referred to as ‘Sekisupia’ in *Egeresukiryaku* (*A Brief History of the United Kingdom*) in 1853 and as ‘Shekusupia’ in *Eikokushi* (*History of the United Kingdom*) in 1861 (Kawato 247). These are merely slight references to Shakespeare. It is not until the Meiji era that Shakespeare was really introduced.

The reception-history of Shakespeare’s works in the Meiji era before 1904 can be divided into two periods.

#### 3.1. The First Period

The first period is from the beginning of the Meiji era to the third decade. The distinctive feature of the first period is that Shakespeare’s

plays were mostly adaptations from the originals and translations from Lamb's *Tales of Shakespeare* (1807), written by Charles Lamb (1775-1834) and Mary Ann Lamb (1764-1847). These included adaptations such as "Hamurettö" ("Hamlet") in 1875 (the 8th year of the Meiji era), and "Hamurettö Yamato Nishikie" ("Hamlet with Coloured Woodblock Prints") in 1886, and translations such as "Muneniku no kiso" ("The Prosecution for a Pound of Flesh") in 1877, and "Sannin musume" ("Three Girls") in 1890. These adaptations and translations were made by Japanese journalists and innovators such as Takichi Shinada, Robun Kanagaki, and Mokichi Fujita. They were published in newspapers and books, and performed in the form of Japanese traditional plays such as kabuki and joruri.

Furthermore, some of Shakespeare's works and his life were received in the form of practical precepts or guiding mottos in life. For example, in 1871 (the 4th year of the Meiji era) Masanao Nakamura translated *Self-Help* (*Saigoku risshi hen*) by Samuel Smiles (1812-1904), which included some preceptive passages of Shakespeare's life as follows:

"Shekusupia wa [...] shinchin naru shosei nishite benkyo shite waza o naseru hito [...] sono arawasu tokorono sho [...] eijinno hinkou o tsukuri nasu [...]. (Shakespeare was [...] gathering his wonderful stores of knowledge from a wide field of experience and observation. In any event, he must have been a close student and a hard worker; and to this day his writings continue to exercise a powerful influence on the formation of English character.)" (Kawato 54)

In 1882 (the 15th year of the Meiji era), *Shintaishisho* (*Collection of*

*Poetry in the New Style*) was edited by Masakazu Toyama (1848-1900), Tetsujiro Inoue (1855-1944), and Ryokichi Yatabe (1851-1899). It was well known for its contribution to the development of Japanese contemporary verse through its translation of perceptive passages from the monologues in *Hamlet*.

Yoshio Yoshitake mentions the background of such receptions from the viewpoints of the government policy and the spirit of the people in those days. The Japanese government made use of such receptions to control the people and to realize its national policy such as *fukoku kyohei* (wealthy nation and strong army) and *shokusan kogyo* (encouragement of new industry). To the Japanese people, such precepts became their mental pabulum politically and morally to succeed in the modern, civilised and enlightened society of that time (4-7). We may point out another factor behind this. From the 10th year of the Meiji era to the early third decade, political novels such as the works of Edward George Earle Bulwer-Lytton (1803-73) and of Benjamin Disraeli (1804-81) were booming, which influenced on *Shinnihon undo* (Yoshitake 4-7). The popularity of political novels seems to play a part in the reception of Shakespeare's works as practical precepts. Mainly *Hamlet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Julius Caesar* were received as precepts from the earliest period of the Meiji era. The reception as precepts continued till the fourth decade of the Meiji era.

### 3.2. The Second Period

The second period is after the 30th year of the Meiji era. In this period, main-stream of the reception shifted from the adaptations to the

translations, such as “*Osero*” (“*Othello*”) in 1899 (the 32nd year of the Meiji era) and *Ze machanto obu benisu* (*The Merchant of Venice*) in 1903. These translations are not complete ones, but merely include some parts or lines of Shakespearean dramas<sup>2</sup>. The translators were mainly scholars such as Shoyo Tsubouchi and Koya Tozawa. The translated dramas as well as the adapted ones were staged. Also, the translations were published in scholarly journals, such as the *Waseda Bungaku*, the *Teikoku Bungaku*, the *Kokugakuin Zasshi*, and the *Taiyo*.

### 3.3. The Reception-History of *Macbeth*

In this section, we discuss the reception-history of *Macbeth* in detail.

In July, 1885 (the 18th year of the Meiji era), Mokichi Fujita wrote *Eiko no yume* (*A Dreamlike life of Vicissitudes*). This is the first introduction of *Macbeth*, which was translated from Lamb’s *Tales of Shakespeare*. In that book, Fujita remarks: “This is one of the most famous Shakespearean dramas. Its original title was *Makubesu*. It is translated as *Eiko no yume*” (272). The names of the characters are written in kanji. Archaic expressions are used; for example, such as “Makubesu shogun no guraimuko to naru o shukusen” (I, iii). This translation simply gives an outline of *Macbeth*.

In November 1885 (the 18th year of the Meiji era), “*Makubesu*” (“*Macbeth*”) appeared in the *Bungaku Zasshi*. Izumi Yanagida observes that “this is an extract from Lamb’s *Tales of Shakespeare*” (159).

In the same year, it is said that “*Makubesu*” (“*Macbeth*”) was published in the *Gakusei Gakujutsu Zasshi*, although neither the original nor copies

have been found so far (Yanagida 159). We can identify neither the writer nor the month when this article was published, but the *Gakusei Gakujutsu Zasshi* was first published in November 1885. Therefore, at least this article was published later than the publication of *Eiko no yume*.

In 1886 (the 19th year of the Meiji era), Takichi Shinada issued *Sekisupia monogatari* (*Shakespeare's Stories*), which consisted of *Hamlet*, *King Lear*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Macbeth*. According to Yanagida, “a reference to Shakespearean works and Charles Lamb’s works is found in the preface” (175); therefore, this is probably a translation from Lamb’s *Tales of Shakespeare*.

In 1891 (the 24th year of the Meiji era), Shoyo Tsubouchi printed “*Makubesu hyotyū*” (“Notes and Commentary on *Macbeth*”) in the *Waseda Bungaku*. This article contains a partial translation of *Macbeth*. As I mentioned in the preceding section, the main-stream in the first period of the reception-history was the adaptations. This is one of the earliest translations of Shakespeare’s originals in Japan. Tsubouchi states: “I tried to translate *Macbeth* for my research. It is translated in a ‘colloquo-literary’ style. It is a two-language version and a literal translation” (Tsubouchi, *Shekusupiya zenshu* 1). Archaic expressions are used such as “Nanimono zo, chi ni somari taru arenaru onoko wa (What bloody man is that)?” ( I , ii ), but Tsubouchi’s “*Makubesu hyotyū*” is brand-new in the following two respects: (1) it is a two-language version with a literal translation; (2) he adds explanations sometimes including his own interpretations. Unfortunately, “*Makubesu hyotyū*” was not completed, because the *Waseda Bungaku* was forced to cease its publication.

“*Makubesu hyotyū*” contains a translation of only a part of *Macbeth* from the beginning to Act 1, Scene 2.

Interestingly Tsubouchi tried to translate *Macbeth* again in “*Makubesu*” (“*Macbeth*”). This translation appeared in the *Kokubungaku Zasshi* from 1897 to 1898 (from the 30th year of the Meiji era to the 31st). Archaic expressions are still used, as in “*Makubesu hyotyū*”. Tsubouchi could not complete the translation of *Macbeth* this time, either. This translation covers the first four scenes, with a revised translation of the first two scenes in “*Makubesu hyotyū*”.

In addition to Tsubouchi’s translations, two adaptations were published: *Maboroshi (Illusion)* (1892) by Shokoshi Miyazaki and *Toshima no arashi (A Tempest in Toshima)* (1895) by Ochi Fukuchi.

In 1897 (the 30th year of the Meiji era), “*Higeki makubesu ni tsuite*” (“On the Tragedy of *Macbeth*”) was written by Gesshi Sho, and printed in the *Dainihon*. This article comprises the following two parts: (1) the plot from the beginning to the appearance of the Ghost with explanations of the two pictures, and (2) some considerations on the characters of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth.

In 1898 (the 31st year of the Meiji era), “*Sao wa makubesu hamuretto tyuni jiko o egakidaseru ka*” (“On How Shakespeare Draw His Personality in *Macbeth* and *Hamlet*”) was published in the *Kokumin no Tomo*. This article is a synopsis of an article by Frank Harris (1856-1931)<sup>3</sup>, a critic, writer and editor in the later nineteenth century (*Kenkyusha* 547). It deals with the similarities between the personalities of Macbeth and Hamlet, and with the relationship between Shakespeare’s personality and

these two characters.

In 1902 (the 35th year of the Meiji era), *Bungaku sosho eishibun hyoshaku* (*A Commentary on English Poems*) by Shoyo was issued. This contains a partial translation from *Macbeth* and *Hamlet* (Kawato 308).

Daisui Sugitani wrote *Sao monogatari makubesu hoka ni hen* (*Shakespearean Stories: Macbeth and Other Two Stories*), which gives brief outlines of *Macbeth*, *The Tempest*, and *Twelfth Night*. This book came out in March 1903, about a half year before the Natsume's lecture on *Macbeth* started.

To sum up, *Macbeth* was first introduced to Japan through the translation of Lamb's *Tales of Shakespeare* in the second decade of the Meiji era. In the third and fourth decades of the Meiji era, only a few adaptations and partial translations from *Macbeth* in the original came out. Neither the adaptations nor the partial translations were staged. It was not until 1905 (the 38th year of the Meiji era) that *Macbeth* was performed in Japan. This first performance was rather later than those of other Shakespearean dramas such as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, *King Lear*, and *Othello*. Thus, the reception-history of *Macbeth* was very limited, before Natsume published "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*". When it comes to articles containing something like literary criticism by Japanese, only three articles are numbered: Tsubouchi's "*Makubesu hyotyū*", "*Makubesu*", and Sho's "*Higeki makubesu ni tsuite*"<sup>4</sup>. In the next section, we will make a critical comparison among these four articles "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*", Tsubouchi's "*Makubesu hyotyū*" and "*Makubesu*", and Sho's "*Higeki makubesu ni tsuite*".



### 3.4. A Critical Comparison among Tsubouchi, Sho, and Natsume

In “*Makubesu hyotyū*” and “*Makubesu*”, Tsubouchi refers to the various editions of *Macbeth* published in the United Kingdom and to academic critiques on the drama. To begin with, he notes Holinshed’s *Chronicles* (1587) as the origin of *Macbeth*. When he explains the lines and stage-directions, he refers to three editions of *Macbeth* to show the differences among them: *The Cambridge Shakespeare* (1865), the edition by Henry Norman Hudson (1814-86) and the Folio<sup>5</sup>. As for the academic critiques, Tsubouchi reads at least the following three: Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s *Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton* (1856), Edwin Abbott’s *Shakespearian Grammar* (1870) and Edward Dowden’s *Shakespeare, His Mind and Art*.

We can find the same approach in “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”. As I mentioned in Section 2 of Chapter 2, Natsume refers to *Macbeth: A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (1873) for various views of the Ghost. In addition, Natsume apparently reads *Macbeth: The Works of Shakespeare* (1896), since it is well known that he possessed that book, in which he wrote summary notes for “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*”. For academic critiques, we can find in “*Soseki sambo zosho mokuroku*” some books on Shakespeare such as Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s *Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare and Other English Poets* (1890) and Sidney Lee’s *A Life of William Shakespeare* (1899). However, Natsume mentioned in his article only the critics included in the footnotes of *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*. Therefore, he probably did not refer to these other books on Shakespeare.

Thus Tsubouchi and Natsume express their opinions and comments

with reference to those of other critics. This approach is very fundamental and orthodox in these days, but in the third and fourth decades of the Meiji era, it was an innovative one. Recall the reception-history of *Macbeth*. As I have mentioned in the preceding section, this approach was first tried by Tsubouchi's "*Makubesu hyotyū*". However, Tsubouchi only partly tried it, for "*Makubesu hyotyū*" is not an academic critique at all; it is, as it were, a mixture of Tsubouchi's translation, explanation and interpretation. In "*Makubesu no yūrei ni tsuite*", Natsume fully adopted this approach and presented a full-fledged critique. In this sense, "*Makubesu no yūrei ni tsuite*" is the first authentic academic critique of *Macbeth* in Japan.

In "*Higeki makubesu' ni tsuite*", Sho focuses on Macbeth's nervous nature (22). Sho argues: "Macbeth could carry through murders by applying his nature to bad behavior. His mental corruption and moral contamination caused by bloody deeds ended in a mad frenzy" (22). Natsume also analyses the character of Macbeth into six qualities, as I mentioned in Chapter 2, and points out that "Macbeth's character is the central cause of his tragic life" (110). We find that both Sho and Natsume adopt what is called character criticism.

Tetsuo Kishi succinctly explains a distinguishing feature of character criticism: "circumstances do not change man's nature. It is man's nature that determines circumstances" (47). Kishi also points out that "in those days [when "*Makubesu no yūrei ni tsuite*" was published], character criticism was in its prime in the United Kingdom" (46-47). It is said that character criticism was first tried fully by Morris Morgan's book on Falstaff, published in 1777. Then, in the nineteenth century, William Hazlitt

developed character criticism in his *Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (1817). Samuel Taylor Coleridge's *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare* (1849) and *Seven Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton* also included this kind of criticism. We can say that Harris's article, which deals with the similarities between the personality of Macbeth and of Hamlet, belongs to this criticism. In 1904, Andrew Cecil Bradley (1851-1935) published *Shakespearean Tragedy*, which is regarded as a classic example of this criticism (Murakami, *Kenkyusha* 390-91).

It is worthy of note that Bradley deals with the Ghost in *Macbeth* in his *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Focusing his attention on the psychology and imagination of Macbeth, and on those of the audience as Natsume does, Bradley reaches the same conclusion as Natsume does that the Ghost is Banquo's and an apparition. Interestingly enough, Bradley does not mention the placement of the Ghost, either. As for Natsume's argument and Bradley's, it is hard to decide which one is better than the other. Natsume's argument is superior to Bradley's in the following two points: (1) he analyses the character of Macbeth and argues the psychology of Macbeth and of the audience in more detail than Bradley; (2) he expresses his opinions and comments with reference to those of other critics. As compared with Natsume's argument, Bradley is superior in that he makes his argument with reference to other apparitions in *Macbeth*, such as the dagger and to the Ghost in *Hamlet* and in *Julius Caesar*. As we pointed out in Section 2 of Chapter 2, Natsume's article does not include these viewpoints. In this respect, we can say that Bradley's argument is higher in quality than Natsume's. Anyway, it is interesting to note that Bradley's

argument in his *Shakespearean Tragedy* is much the same as Natsume's.

Furthermore, the Ghost in *Macbeth* is no longer problematic, since Bradley's argument is widely accepted. Natsume's article, however, was issued before Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*. It follows that Natsume could not refer to Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*; he independently completed his study on the Ghost in *Macbeth*, which ranks as high as Bradley's classic study.

## Conclusion

Compared with *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *The Merchant of Venice*, *Macbeth* was introduced relatively later in Japan. It was first introduced through the translation of Lamb's *Tales from Shakespeare* in the second decade of the Meiji era. In the third and fourth decades of the Meiji era, only a few adaptations and partial translations from *Macbeth* in the original came out. Neither the adaptations nor the partial translations were staged. It was not until 1905 (the 38th year of the Meiji era) that *Macbeth* was performed in Japan. This first performance was rather later than those of other Shakespearean dramas such as *The Merchant of Venice*, *Julius Caesar*, *King Lear*, and *Othello*. Thus, the reception-history of *Macbeth* was very limited in Japan before 1904 when Natsume published "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*".

As for literary criticism, in "*Makubesu hyotyū*" and "*Makubesu*", Tsubouchi attempted in part to express his own opinions with reference to other critics' views. Sho tried character criticism to analyse *Macbeth* in "*Higeki makubesu ni tsuite*". In "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*", Natsume developed these two preceding approaches most fully and presented a full-fledged academic critique.

It is interesting to note that Bradley's argument in his *Shakespearean Tragedy* is much the same as Natsume's. Furthermore, the Ghost in *Macbeth* is no longer problematic, since Bradley's argument is widely accepted today. Natsume's article, however, was issued before Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Natsume independently completed his study on

the Ghost in *Macbeth*, which ranks as high as Bradley's classic study.

Much more attention should be paid to Natsume's "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" from the following three points: (1) it is the most important and highest-quality among his articles on English literature, (2) it is the earliest academic critique on *Macbeth* in Japan, and (3) it ranks with Bradley's classic study on the Ghost in *Macbeth* in his *Shakespearean Tragedy*.

We have focused on the reception-history of Shakespearean works in Japan before 1904 (the 37th year of the Meiji era when "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" was published). However, the Meiji era continued till 1912 (the 45th year of the Meiji era). From 1904 to 1912, we can find out a good few articles, translations and performances of Shakespearean works including *Macbeth*. I would like to carry on my study of "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*" from the wider perspective of the whole length of the Meiji era.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Shakespeare, *Macbeth: A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*, ed. Furness, Horace Howard, Jr. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1903) III, iv, 47. All subsequent references for quotations from *Macbeth* are to this edition.

<sup>2</sup> As far as I have checked, it seems that *Hamuretto* (*Hamlet*) in 1905 (the 38th year of the Meiji era) was the first complete translation.

<sup>3</sup> We cannot identify Harris's article.

<sup>4</sup> "Sao wa *makubesu hamuretto* tyuni jiko o egakidaseru ka" belongs to literary criticism, but it is a translation, not an article written by a Japanese. Therefore, this article is excluded here.

<sup>5</sup> We cannot identify the edition by Henry Norman Hudson nor the Folio from the remarks of Tsubouchi.

## Works Cited

Bradley, A. C. *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1929.

Fujita, Mokichi. "Eiko no yume." *Yubinhochi Shimbun* 7-10 July 1885. Eds. Kawato Michiaki, and Takanori Sakakibara. *Sheikusupiashu*. Meiji honyakubungaku zenshu shimbun zasshihen. 1. Tokyo: Ozorasha, 1996. 272-283.

[藤田茂吉「栄枯の夢」, 『郵便報知新聞』(『シェイクスピア集 I』明治翻訳文学全集《新聞雑誌編》1)(大空社)]

Fukuda, Koson. *Macbeth Sheikusupia zenshu*. 13. Tokyo: Shintyosha, 1961.

[福田恆存『マクベス』(シェイクスピア全集 第13巻)(新潮社)]

Hunter, G. K., ed. *Macbeth* New Penguin Shakespeare. Rev. 2nd ed. London: Clays, 1995.

Inagaki, Tatsuro. "Nihonkindai no shimbun・zasshi: meiji no shimbun・zasshi." *Nihon kindai bungaku daijiten kijoban*. Ed. Odagiri Susumu. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1984. 1701-1705.

[稲垣達朗「日本近代の新聞・雑誌：明治の新聞・雑誌」『日本近代文学大事典 机上版』(講談社)]

Kawatake, Toshio. "Sheikusupia." Fukuda et al. 45-85.

[河竹登志夫「シェイクスピア」『欧米作家と日本近代文学』第1巻英米篇 I (教育出版センター)]

Kawato, Michiaki. *Meiji no sheikusupia*. Meiji no sheikusupia soshuhen. 1. Tokyo: Ozorasha; Nadashuppansenta, 2004.

[川戸道昭『明治のシェイクスピア』(明治のシェイクスピア《総集編》1)]



(大空社, ナダ出版センター)]

Kawato, Michiaki, and Takanori Sakakibara, eds. *Sheikusupia zue: hu shiryō to sakuin*. Meiji no sheikusupia soshuhen. 2. Tokyo: Ozorasha; Nadashuppansenta, 2004.

[川戸道昭・榊原貴教編『シェイクスピア図会：付 資料と索引』（明治のシェイクスピア《総集編》2）（大空社, ナダ出版センター）]

Kishi, Tetsuo. "Souseki no sheikusupikan." *Kokubungaku* Nov. 1983: 46-50.

[喜志哲雄「漱石のシェイクスピア観」, 『国文学』第28巻第14号]

Murakami, Toshio. *Kenkyusha sheikusupia jiten*. 2000.

[村上淑朗『研究社 シェイクスピア辞典』]

Nakano, Yoshio. "Soseki to eibungaku." Nakajima Kenzo et al. *Hikakubungaku kenkyu*. 1. Tokyo: Yajimashobo, 1954. 216-232.

[中野好夫「漱石と英文学」『比較文学研究』第1巻（矢島書房）]

Natsume, Kinnosuke. "Bundan ni okeru byodoshugi no daihyosha 'Uoruto Hoittoman' Walt Whitman no shi ni tsuite." *Zenshu*. 13. 3-20.

[夏目金之助「文壇に於ける平等主義の代表者『ウォルト、ホイットマン』 Walt Whitman の詩について」『漱石全集』第13巻（岩波書店）]

---. "Eikoku no bunjin to shimbun zasshi." *Zenshu*. 13. 78-89.

[夏目金之助「英国の文人と新聞雑誌」前掲書]

---. "Eikoku shijin no tenchisansen ni taisuru kannen." *Zenshu*. 13. 21-60.

[夏目金之助「英国詩人の天地山川に対する観念」前掲書]

---. "Shosetsu *Eiruwinn* no hiho." *Zenshu*. 13. 90-108.

[夏目金之助「小説『エイルキン』の批評」前掲書]

---. "*Torisutoramu Shande*." *Zenshu*. 13. 61-77.

[夏目金之助「『トリストラム、シャンデー』」前掲書]

- ・ ・ ・. “*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite.*” *Soseki zenshu.* 13. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1995. 109-124.  
[夏目金之助「マクベスの幽霊に就て」前掲書]
- ・ ・ ・. “Soseki sambo zosho mokuroku.” Kinnoosuke, *Soseki zenshu.* 27.  
[「漱石山房蔵書目録」『漱石全集』第27巻（岩波書店）]
- ・ ・ ・. “Zosho eno kakikomi.” *Soseki zenshu.* 27. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 1997.  
[「蔵書への書込み」前掲書]
- “Sao wa *makubesu hamuretto* tyuni jiko o egakidaseru ka.” *Kokumin no tomo* June 1898: 140-141.  
[「沙翁は『マクベス』『ハムレット』中に自己を描き出せる乎」, 『國民之友』第22巻370号]
- Sato, Teruo, et al. eds. *Kindainihon ni okeru seiyobungaku shokai bunken shomoku · zasshihen: 1885-1898.* Tokyo: Yukyushuppan, 1970.  
[佐藤輝夫ら編『近代日本における西洋文学紹介文献書目・雑誌篇(1885-1898)』（悠久出版）]
- Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth: A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare.* ed. Furness, Horace, Jr. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1903.
- ・ ・ ・. *Macbeth. Mr. William Shakespeare’s Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, published according to the true original copies.* Internet Shakespeare Editions. Online. 12th October, 2005.
- ・ ・ ・. *Macbeth. Mr. William Shakespeare’s Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, published according to the true original copies. The Second Impression.* London: 1632. Internet Shakespeare Editions. Online. 12th October, 2005.
- ・ ・ ・. *Macbeth. Mr. William Shakespeare’s Comedies, Histories and Tragedies,*

*published according to the true original copies. The Third Impression.*  
London: 1664. Internet Shakespeare Editions. Online. 12th October,  
2005.

---. *Macbeth. Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies,*  
*published according to the true original copies. The Forth Impression.*  
London: 1685. Internet Shakespeare Editions. Online. 12th October,  
2005.

Sho, Gesshi. "‘Higeki *makebesu*’ ni tsuite." *Daihinon* 5 Aug. 1897: 19-23.

[松月子 『悲劇マクベス』に就て, 『大日本』第1巻第11号]

Oba, Kenji. *Macbeth Kenkyusha Sheikupia senshu*. 7. Tokyo: Kenkyusha,  
2004.

[大場健治 『マクベス』(研究社シェイクスピア選集第7巻)(研究社)]

Odajima, Yushi. "Soseki no sakuhin: *makubesu* no yurei ni tsuite." *Eigo*  
*Seinen* July 1. 1966: 428-429.

[小田島雄志 「マクベスの幽霊に就て」, 『英語青年』第112巻第7号]

Tsubouchi, Shoyo. "*Makubesu*." *Kokugakuin Zasshi* June 1897-Oct. 1898.

Eds. Kawato Michiaki, and Takanori Sakakibara. *Sheikusupiyashu*. 3.  
Meiji honyakubungaku zenshu shimbun zasshihen. 3. Tokyo: Ozorasha,  
1997. 142-219.

[坪内逍遙 「マクベス」, 『国学院雑誌』(『シェイクスピア集Ⅲ』明治翻訳  
文学全集《新聞雑誌編》3)(大空社)]

---. Afterward. *Makubesu Shekusupiya zenshu*. 29. Tokyo: Tyuokoronsha,  
1935. 1-9.

[坪内逍遙 『マクベス』(シェイクスピア全集 第29巻)(中央公論社)]

---. "*Makubesu hyoutyu*." *Wasedabungaku* 20 Oct. 1891. 15 Nov. 1891. 30

Nov. 1891. 15 Dec. 1891. Eds. Kawato Michiaki, and Takanori Sakakibara. *Sheikusupiashu*. 2. Meiji honyakubungaku zenshu shimbun zasshihen. 2. Tokyo: Ozorasha, 1996. 275-310.

[坪内逍遙「マクベス評注」, 『早稲田文学』(『シェイクスピア集Ⅱ』明治翻訳文学全集《新聞雑誌編》2)(大空社)]

Yanagida, Izumi. *Seiyobungaku no inyu*. Meijibungakukenkkyu. 7. Tokyo: Shunjusha, 1974.

[柳田泉『西洋文学の移入』(明治文学研究 第7巻)(春秋社)]

Yoshitake, Yoshitaka. "Eibeisakka no donyu to nihonshiso no kindaika." Eds. Fukuda Mitsuharu et al. *Hikakubungaku shirizu obeisakka to nihon kindaibungaku*. 1. Tokyo: Kyoiku shuppan senta, 1974. 1-44.

[吉武好孝「英米作家の導入と日本思想の近代化」『比較文学シリーズ 欧米作家と日本近代文学』第1巻英米篇Ⅰ(教育出版センター)]

Table Arguments on the Ghost in *Macbeth*

critics	one	two	1st	Duncan	Banquo	Banquo	hallucination	apparition
			2nd	Banquo	Duncan	Banquo		
Charles Knight (1791-1873)		○			○		○	○*3
E. H. Seymour (1805)*1		○	○					
Joseph Hunter (1845)*1		○*2	○					
Alexander Dyce (1798-1869)	○*2					○		
Richard Grant White (1821-85)	○*2					○		
Charles Cowden Clarke (1787-1877)							○	
John Philip Kemble (1757-1823)							○	
Henry Norman Hudson (1814-86)	○*2					○*2	○*4	
Soseki Natsume (1904)*1	○					○	*5	○

Appendix

\*1 These years show the published years of their articles or books, which are included in the footnotes of *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare*.

\*2 We can guess from Natsume's remarks on "*Makubesu no yurei ni tsuite*".

\*3 Natsume states that Knight claims that the Ghost is a hallucination, but in fact Knight remarks that he would assert it but for the stage-direction.

\*4 Natsume interprets "the reappearance of the dead Banquo" as the appearance of the second Ghost. Apparently this is misreading, because "a subjective ghost" is naturally related to, not only the second Ghost, but also the first Ghost.

\*5 Blanks mean that we cannot guess the opinions from Natsume's remarks.