



Przemysław SZTAFIEJ¹

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3658-4338>

Forming a solidarity discourse through transtextual practice: Case study of Yamada Bimyō's works on the Philippines

ABSTRACT

Networking should be considered an important aspect of the history of pan-Asian thought. The Philippine Revolution (1896–98) and the Philippine-American War (1899–1902) provide an example of events that helped form unexpected links. Mariano Ponce's stay in Japan to lobby for support of the revolution influenced Yamada Bimyō to publish a series of works in 1902–1903. This article provides an analysis of Yamada's techniques for creating a discourse of Japanese-Filipino solidarity in *Momoiroginu* and *Aginarudo: Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*. While Yamada is frequently mentioned in studies of the Japanese reception of the Philippine Revolution, there is no in-depth analysis of these texts. To fill this gap, I employ Gérard Genette's concept of transtextuality to first, show how Yamada referenced/rewrote his sources while simultaneously inserting original ideas and second, to address the fact that one of Yamada's texts was transtextually re-contextualized during the Pacific War.

KEYWORDS: Yamada Bimyō, Japanese literature, transtextuality, the Philippines, Philippine Revolution, Emilio Aguinaldo

Introduction

Network creation or in modern casual speech “networking” often plays an important role in the formation and dissemination of discourses around racial or ethnic solidarity. Political events, such as wars, revolutions,

¹ Przemysław Sztafiej, PhD, is an assistant professor at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń. His main research interests are Japanese literature and cinema in the context of the Japanese view of the Other, particularly members of groups outside the so-called West. Contact: przszst@umk.pl.

assassination attempts, political or social activities that led to arrests and/or the seeking of asylum abroad, can cause certain people, who otherwise would never have had the opportunity, to mingle. These unexpected encounters then lead to the creation of contact zones between various cultures, as these social nets are often transnational and transcultural. The members, that is, actors, of these networks make important personal connections, exchange views and information, or start movements and organizations.

Modern Japan, with its modernization after the Meiji Restoration, has also provided ample ground for the creation of transnational contacts of this kind². CuUnjieng Aboitiz (2020: 28) explains the context of this process as well as its unofficial (namely, that it was not sanctioned by the government) nature as follows:

Pan-Asianism as a network and practice took place largely in Asian cities—particularly Yokohama, Kobe, Tokyo, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Indeed, these place names appear almost as a refrain in the Spanish religious and colonial officials' notes, always incanted with threat. These hubs of regional anti-colonial subversion arose due to Japan's singular position as an Asian model to be followed, but also due to the particular international relations of the region at the time. The context of multiple colonial powers administering separate but neighboring Asian colonial territories set the limits and field for Pan-Asian activism, which danced around instances of imperial rivalry and cooperation. For a Filipino under Spanish colonial repression, colonial British Hong Kong was an unintended site of resistance. Both the colonies of other powers and Europe itself became havens for transnational activism directed at other powers. At the same time, Japan's own ambitions in the international world order made Japan susceptible to French pressure to extradite Vietnamese revolutionaries such as Phan Bội Châu. In the end, Tokyo disavowed any official aid to Asianist revolutionaries, even while certain of its government officials, political parties, and branches of government extended their own unofficial assistance.

One pivotal chain of events conducive to the formation of transnational networks of this nature was the Philippine Revolution (1896–98) against the

² Since at least the 1880s, some politically engaged figures (anticolonial revolutionaries, political refugees et cetera) from diverse Asian countries and regions stayed in Japan for some periods of time, for example Kim Ok-gyun from Korea, Sun Yat-sen from China, Phan Bội Châu from Vietnam, Rash Behari Bose from India. See: CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 68–73; Hau and Shiraishi 2009: 330–337.

Spanish colonial regime and the subsequent Filipino-American War (1898–1902)³. Both struggles galvanized public opinion on the global scale, including Japan and other Asian countries in the vicinity. After the outbreak of the revolution in the Philippines the revolutionary government took interest in trying to establish international connections to gain support for its cause. Japan with its recent modernization and military success in the Sino-Japanese War was also considered as a potential ally by the Filipino revolutionaries. Therefore in 1898 two emissaries, Mariano Ponce and Faustino Lichauco proceeded to Japan, where the former stayed for a long period of time⁴. While the revolutionaries failed to obtain any official backing from the Japanese government, Ponce managed to create a private network of contacts, through which an unsuccessful attempt to send arms to the Philippines was made⁵. However, he was also involved in efforts to promote the Filipino cause through meetings, speeches and finally through the written word, for in 1901 a book in Japanese, titled *Nan'yō-no Fūun: Firipin Dokuritsu Mondai-no Shinsō* ('the situation in the South Seas: The truth about the problem of Philippine independence'), was published. The textual production of discourses of solidarity can often be facilitated through the aforementioned transnational networks of contacts. Hau and Shiraishi (2009) provide an in-depth analysis of one such example preceding the Philippine Revolution:

In this article, we turn our attention to two major but critically overlooked features of that historical phenomenon known as "Asianism". One is its network quality, and the other is the strong element of fantasy that informs and animates Asianist thinking and

³ This war started as an extension of the Spanish-American War with the appearance of the American forces first to destroy the Spanish fleet in Manila. Subsequently the Americans started a land campaign, first allying themselves with the Filipino revolutionaries. After peace negotiations with the Spaniards in Paris, the Americans decided to stay in the Philippines and start the so-called "benevolent assimilation" or civilizational tutelage of the islands. This in turn caused the Filipinos to continue their military struggle, this time against the Americans. While the war was officially proclaimed as over in 1902 by then U.S. President Theodore Roosevelt, some forms of regional resistance persisted for around a decade after. For more see: Agoncillo 1990: 199–231, 247–260, 294–297; Constantino 1975: 198–280.

⁴ On their sojourn in Japan see: CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 113–115, 117–127; Hatano 1988: 79–80, 84–91; Ikehata 2001: 223–224.

⁵ While the Japanese government was not interested in providing any official support some private initiatives were conceived: arms were sent on board of a ship called *Nunobiki-maru*, however it sank before reaching the Philippines. Chinese revolutionaries like Sun Yat-sen, who was in exile in Japan at the time, were also involved in the Filipino struggle by providing some material support as well as assistance in networking with their Japanese acquaintances. See: CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 117–127; Hatano 1988: 84–91; Matthiessen 2016: 26–29.

⁶ From now on referred to as *Nan'yō-no Fūun*.

practice. We will discuss these two features by focusing on a chance encounter in the late 1880s between José Rizal⁷ ([...]) and Suehiro Tetchō ([...]). This encounter offers one snapshot of an early link in the network. We seek to account for how and why that link gave rise, at least on the part of Suehiro, to fantasies about Asianist solidarity but, interestingly, not on the part of Rizal (Hau and Shiraishi 2009: 330).

The figure of Ponce has seemingly exerted similar influence on one Japanese person of letters – Yamada Bimyō – who subsequently published a series of politically inclined works meant to stimulate sympathy for and solidarity with the Filipinos. Irrespective of influence of Ponce or his book, Yamada often employed quite covert references to a vast array of texts or contexts in his writings on the Philippines. Therefore these works lend themselves to a possibility of an intertextual analysis, something that has not yet been sufficiently explored in previous studies of Yamada’s Filipino-themed publications⁸. In this paper I intend to bridge this gap in scholarship by employing the concept of transtextuality⁹ to analyze the methods of shaping the solidarity discourse in two of Yamada Bimyō’s works: *Momoiroginu: Seiji Shōsetsu*¹⁰ (‘peach-colored silk’, 1902) and *Aginarudo: Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*¹¹ (‘Aguinaldo: The tale of the Philippine independence war’, 1902).

1. Relevance of transtextuality in context of studies of *Momoiroginu* and *Aginarudo*

Gérard Genette (1997: 1) defined transtextuality as: “all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts” and mentioned five types of transtextual relationships: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality and architextuality. In the

⁷ José Rizal was a Filipino ophthalmologist and a writer, whose fictional and non-fictional works drew the ire of the Spanish colonial regime in the Philippines. In 1892 he was exiled to Dapitan on Mindanao and later executed shortly after the start of the Revolution on 30 December 1896. *Noli Me Tángere* along with its sequel *El Filibusterismo* were the novels that particularly aggravated the Spaniards. See: Tucker 2009: 546–547.

⁸ In previous studies, *Momoiroginu* only has its plot summarized or is only mentioned by title. On previous studies of *Aginarudo* please refer to section 4 of this paper.

⁹ The relation of transtextuality and intertextuality is explored by Allen (2022: 92–111), who remarks on Genette’s transtextuality as something “which we might style ‘intertextuality from the viewpoint of structural poetics’” (Allen 2022: 95).

¹⁰ From now on referred to as *Momoiroginu*.

¹¹ From now on referred to as *Aginarudo*.

context of the works analyzed in this paper intertextual¹² and hypertextual¹³ linkages appear the most prevalent¹⁴. Delving into the complex web of categories of hypertextual relations weaved by Genette in his *Palimpsests: A Literature in the Second Degree* could obscure insights into Yamada's writing, therefore I limit myself to a simplified analysis based on his explanation of hypertext as: "any text derived from a previous text either through simple transformation, which I shall simply call from now on *transformation*, or through indirect transformation, which I shall label *imitation*" (Genette 1997: 7).

While it is facile to make an assertion that some form of relation to other texts is natural, I argue that particularly in the case of *Aginarudo* the sheer degree of dependence on other sources (like Wildman's *Aguinaldo: A Narrative of Filipino Ambitions*¹⁵ published in 1901, heretofore not mentioned in previous research) merits a reevaluation of the originality of Yamada's Filipino works, as well as a reassessment of the ideological and intellectual relation of his Asianist discourse and Western ideas of civilizational hierarchies and progress.

The classic study of Yamada Bimyō's life and works by Shioda completely omits any mention of sources or transtextual allusions in *Momoiroginu* and *Aginarudo*. Shioda (1938: 136–143, 369) focuses mainly on the biographic aspects of Yamada's interest in the Philippines and provides only a short overview of the plot of the former work and a few sentences about the latter work, summarizing its quirks. However, Shioda points to a still relevant point – that Yamada's solidarity was informed largely by a feeling of empathy borne out of his feelings of disenfranchisement and loneliness in the creative world at the time.

Aginarudo and, to a lesser extent, *Momoiroginu*, have aroused much more interest in scholarly works concerned not with Yamada per se, but with the contemporary Japanese views of the political situation of the Philippines

¹² Meaning "a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts: that is to say, eidetically and typically as the actual presence of one text within another" (Genette 1997: 1–2). This can be achieved in the more "explicit" manner of quoting (also in the form of plagiarism) or through more indirect means, such as allusion.

¹³ "Any relationship uniting a text B (which I shall call the hypertext) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the hypotext), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary" (Genette 1997: 5).

¹⁴ The remaining three types seem to be only marginally useful in analyzing Yamada's works, however paratextuality (relation of the text to its paratexts, that can be allographic – by someone other than the author – or autographic – by the author) and metatextuality (similar to commentary) can be employed in the case of texts that utilized Yamada's *Aginarudo* as the hypotext – particularly the commentary to this book provided in its reprinted version from the 1940s (Genette 1997: 3–4).

¹⁵ From now on referred to as *Aguinaldo*.

during its struggles with Spain and later the United States. Nevertheless these works mostly omit any discussion of potential sources, and even the scholars that do address this question were not able to pinpoint the degree of Yamada's dependence on other texts (see: Section 4 of this paper).

The author of this paper argues that the transtextual devices of Yamada in the analyzed works are twofold. The first is his attempt to build a feeling of solidarity through the creation of a discourse of a largely imagined cultural/racial proximity between the Filipinos and the Japanese by invoking contexts and narratives familiar to that of the Japanese¹⁶. The second is his attempt to subvert Western imperialism through a process of selection of potentially useful arguments made by Westerners themselves (see: Hess, Hoar) or the excision of anti-Filipino elements from parts taken from one of his main hypotexts – Wildman's book. However, the latter also reveals Yamada's inability (or even the impossibility) of creating a solidarity discourse divorced from the Western-centered views of civilizational hierarchies and progress, as at times Yamada's solidarity is permeated by the ideas of a Japanocentric resentment of Western prejudices towards the Japanese, despite Japan attaining civilizational progress based on Western models.

2. Yamada Bimyō and the Philippines: narrative of Filipino-Japanese solidarity in *Momoiroginu*

Yamada Bimyō, who today is primarily remembered in literary studies for his activities intended to promote the *genbun itchi* movement, became interested in the Filipino question at the beginning of the 20th century. Some scholars point to the connection of this sudden turn with an upheaval in his personal life. Yamada became increasingly isolated from members of his former literary circle in part because of his career choices, but also due to increasing scrutiny by the press of his sex life, divorce and subsequent death of his ex-wife, writer Inabune Tazawa (Nihon Kindai Bungakukan 1992: 1529–1530; Yamashita 2000: 90).

Yamada then found a close friend in Yamagata Teizaburō and through this friendship was introduced to the problem of the Filipino revolution and also had the opportunity to meet Ponce, who was in Japan at the time. Over the course of two years, from 1902 to 1903, Yamada was able to publish a series of texts on the Philippines: most likely a fictional speech by Aguinaldo titled *Gigun-no Sengen (Aginarudo-no Enzetsu)* ('declaration of the righteous army (Aguinaldo's speech)') in the 4th volume of *Genbun Itchi Bunrei*

¹⁶ Somewhat connected to Shioda's aforementioned view that Yamada's solidarity was strongly based on the emotional aspect of empathy and personal identification with the struggling Filipinos.

(‘model texts of *genbun itchi*’), a novel titled *Momoiroginu* with mixed political and romantic elements, a two volume work that could be classified as a sort of a fictionalized biography with elements of an opinion piece titled *Aginarudo*, and an abridged translation of José Rizal’s *Noli Me Tangere* titled *Chi-no Namida* (‘tears of blood’) (CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 66; Ikehata 2001: 225; Yamashita 2000: 90–91).

As clearly indicated by the architextual subtitle of *seiji shōsetsu, Momoiroginu* was meant to invoke the tradition of Japanese political novels. However, it transcends this narrow classification as it contains elements of other genres: a tragic romance and historical fiction (as three of the most important characters are non-fictional). The main hero, a young revolutionary Gregorio del Pilar (1875–1899), was an actual officer during the Philippine Revolution and the subsequent Filipino-American War. The initial part of the novel consists of an account of his first face-to-face encounter with his lover – Dolores Jose. Although she is a daughter of a Spanish official, she decides not to disclose the revolutionary plot, even though she finds incriminating evidence dropped by del Pilar. After a prolonged conversation between Dolores and del Pilar, interspersed with frequent outbursts of emotion and confessions, the heroes part ways – del Pilar unknowingly clutching his lover’s titular handkerchief. The second half of the novel introduces the character of Emilio Aguinaldo (1869–1964). He is portrayed as a compassionate leader of the Revolution, who decides to safeguard del Pilar from accusations of treason. This part of the novel ends with the heroic death of the main hero, still holding his beloved’s handkerchief – a scene seemingly based on the contemporaneous American accounts of objects found on del Pilar’s corpse¹⁷. The ending (*Owari*) portrays a hopeful Dolores, who after leaving the Philippines with her father constantly reads various accounts of the war in search of any information

¹⁷ Dolores Jose from *Momoiroginu* refers to a woman who was frequently mentioned in a number of accounts written after the death of del Pilar as his last lover. A romantic view of del Pilar’s sacrifice and love, symbolized by a handkerchief embroidered with a name of his beloved (although the name Dolores or her surname, sometimes rendered as Hosea, was not included in all versions of the story) that supposedly was in his possession at the time of his death, was probably popularized by American journalists and English-language media – for example articles by John T. McCutcheon and Richard Henry Little or texts in *The Manila Freedom* newspaper (Joaquin 1977: 198–199, 201–202). I have been unable to access these sources directly, but it appears that especially the McCutcheon and Little’s accounts were widely reproduced or referenced in other publications and papers of the end of the 19th and early years of the 20th centuries – for some examples see: *Boston Evening Transcript*, 22 April 1901; Bridgman 1903: 282–288; Larned 1901: 383. Yamada was most probably directly influenced by information on her and del Pilar published in Mariano Ponce’s (1901: 179) *Nan’yō-no Fūun* (where her name is spelled “Dolores Fosé”, Dororesu Hosē in *katakana*). However he has provided his own additions, like making Dolores Spanish and a daughter of a colonial official.

about her beloved. She is initially exhilarated by news of del Pilar's heroism, however her elation comes to an end when she reads the story of his death on the battlefield – her only consolation being the fact that in his final moments he was still holding her handkerchief.

The political themes of the novel may not seem strongly apparent in the above overview of the plot, but they appear quite prevalently, often in the form of quite sudden interjections, for example long monologue-like expositions of arguments and ideals by the protagonist. Yamada's political concerns are presented immediately at the beginning in the foreword (*Hashigaki*). This short introduction frames the Filipino-American War as a conflict rooted in American racial prejudices, while also hinting at the possibility of a similar threat to Japan:

The lovely people of the Philippines are now groaning as they bleed and are treated with steel. What is the reason for this? I have doubts: is it not the consequence of racial prejudice? They, a certain race, constantly scream about the yellow peril, and the after-effects of that...reach everyone who is not a member of the white race.

Ah! Cuba¹⁸ inhabited by the white race has already gained independence. What about the non-white Philippines? As we can see: not yet!

I have a strong feeling. The Philippines is the southern neighbor of the Empire of Japan. The great waves of racial prejudice roar as they already fall upon our shores (Yamada 1902c: *Hashigaki*).

This concern about the geopolitical consequences of the Filipino-American War for the Japanese, coupled with a certain fear of racial prejudice is also seen in the main text of the novel. In a conversation with his beloved Dolores, del Pilar recalls the harsh treatment of his uncle by the authorities. He cites a series of arguments advocating harsher punishments for the Filipinos, which he overheard from one of the officials – arguments based on a racist rhetoric of supremacy of the “enlightened” (*kaimeijin*) Spaniards/Europeans over the “savages” (*yaban*). Then del Pilar presents his own view on the issue of anti-Asian prejudice in a matter not too dissimilar to the foreword mentioned above:

¹⁸ One of the reasons for the outbreak of the Spanish-American War was the American support for the Cuban War of Independence (1895–1898) that slightly preceded the Filipino Revolution. The Treaty of Paris that ended this conflict avoided the question of Filipino independence and at the same time stipulated formally that Cuba would become an independent nation. In reality, the Americans still interfered in Cuban affairs for the next few decades. See: Tucker 2009: 147, 464–465.

It is a common thing for this bunch, that calls itself Westerners or the white race, to discriminate and switch from affection to hate according to the race, while at the same time priding themselves on being civilized or proclaiming themselves enlightened. We need not look far for examples, as we have a close one in the Empire of Japan. Even though this country has developed to such a high degree, even though it has progressed so much in civil and military matters, do not the Westerners think of its people as if they are a different species of animals, as if they are only slightly superior to savages? (Yamada 1902c: 71)

The supposedly Filipino protagonist seems to be more enraged by the treatment of the Japanese than his own people, as he remarks on the yellow peril discourse or the creation of discriminatory regulations to hinder Japanese emigration. Del Pilar expresses his sympathy for Japan subjected to this treatment, even though it had just emerged victorious from a war (presumably the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95). At the same time, the protagonist creates an imagined figure of a Japanese person that similarly sympathizes with the plea of the Filipinos. This rhetorical device of creating a link of solidarity between the Japanese and the Filipinos can be interpreted as a form of Yamada's self-insertion as an embodiment of this "compassionate Japanese" (Yamada 1902c: 71–72). However this solidarity discourse in *Momoiroginu* is built not only on the basis of insertions of political arguments into the overall plot, but also on transtextual rhetorical devices – using other texts to reinforce the geopolitical themes of the novel.

3. Intertextuality and hypotexts in *Momoiroginu*

While *Momoiroginu* does not reveal its transtextual connections or works referenced in its production as clearly as *Aginarudo*, it may be surmised that one of the main sources of information on the figure of Gregorio del Pilar was Mariano Ponce's *Nanyō-no Fūun*. Ponce's book contained several short biographical descriptions of important Filipino figures of the independence movement, including del Pilar. Although Yamada does not mention this source in *Momoiroginu*, it is highly probable that at the time of writing he was already familiar with its contents, as later that year the full text of this biographical note appeared as a paratext in the supplement (*furoku*) to the abovementioned *Aginarudo*¹⁹. The possible inspiration by this note in *Momoiroginu* can also be surmised from the fact that Yamada introduces

¹⁹ See: Yamada 1902a: *Furoku* 1–9.

and cites the same sources as Ponce²⁰. These two intertextual references are respectively an article on the Filipino-American War by a French journalist Jean Hess²¹ and an article on del Pilar's death published in an English-language newspaper *Manila Freedom*²². It has to be stated that while similar (especially in the word selection), the translations in Yamada and Ponce's books are not identical – meaning that if Yamada was in fact familiar with *Nan'yō no Fūun* at the time of writing, he decided to either rewrite or entirely re-translate (assuming he had direct access to these sources, i.e. from Ponce himself) these passages²³.

It seems that Yamada's transtextual grappling with contemporaneous sources of information was calculated to amplify the romanticized image of del Pilar. At the same time, the appraisal of his valor in the face of death is also extended to words of praise for the Filipinos as a collective. By using the words of a Westerner (Hess), Yamada tries to discredit racist/anti-Asian ideas in general. Hess – and by extension Yamada, who cites the relevant fragments of the Frenchman's text – criticizes the Americans for their prejudices (i.e. "These Filipinos are neither the brutes nor the grotesque figures nor the savages they have been made to appear by the Americans"), but also compares del Pilar and other young Filipino officers and soldiers in a sort of transracial parallel to the "heroes of Corneille" or the participants of the French Revolution (Hess 1899a, 1899b: 16). Yamada, seemingly to create a parallel more familiar to his Japanese readers, also utilizes the same

²⁰ These two sources are introduced in a diegetic manner – del Pilar's lover Dolores reads them with abated breath, yearning for any news about her sweetheart. The quotes are interspersed with descriptions of Dolores' thoughts and reactions as she reads the articles.

²¹ Published in French in *Le Figaro* newspaper on 28 July 1899. A slightly abbreviated English translation has also appeared soon after in an American newspaper: *The Public* from 19 August 1899. The parts quoted by both Ponce and Yamada do not significantly differ between the French original and the English translation, making it hard to determine which version Yamada and Ponce may have used in their renditions. However *The Public*'s translation as well as Ponce and Yamada's quotations all omit one sentence present in *Le Figaro* (with a reference to the death of Hoche), making it quite plausible that it was the American text that was the basis for both *Nanyō-no Fūun* and *Momoiroginu*. Compare: Hess 1899a, 1899b; Ponce 1901: 176–178; Yamada 1902c: 146–153.

²² I have not been able to gain access to this source, therefore I have not been able to compare its translation in *Nanyō-no Fūun* and *Momoiroginu*.

²³ In the case of translations from Hess's article, the differences are mainly stylistic. In the case of *Manila Freedom*, the divergence is more considerable. Compare: Yamada 1902c: 146–153, 155–157; Ponce 1901: 176–179. This sort of "creative plagiarism" would not be surprising, considering the fact that the first volume of Yamada's *Aginarudo* consisted in large parts of either uncredited translation/rewriting of parts of Wildman's *Aguinaldo*, while the second volume was partly a rewriting of some passages of Ponce's *Nan'yō-no Fūun*. Another reason for this rewriting in *Momoiroginu* may have been connected to style – Yamada wrote in *genbun itchi*, while *Nan'yō-no Fūun* was written in a more classical style.

device by transtextually delving into Japan's own past in an earlier part of *Momoiroginu* – the scene of the night before del Pilar's final battle.

In a dialogue between del Pilar, and the leader of the revolution, Emilio Aguinaldo, Yamada introduces the story of Oyamada Takaie's sacrificial last stand in order to safeguard his lord – Nitta Yoshisada²⁴. Although Yamada does not mention the title, it can be assumed that he refers to the account of Oyamada's fealty from *Taiheiki*. This anecdote is not presented through a figure of a detached narrator, but directly through the main character's mouth, as a story seemingly close to the heart of another important Filipino historical figure, José Rizal²⁵:

– Your Excellency, I am sure you know that the martyr Rizal, whom we should honor as our senior, constantly granted us with intangible lessons as a novelist and poet among the patriots. However, were you aware that while still alive, he relayed to us a touching story of a certain old Japanese warrior called Oyamada Takaie? (...)

– I have not heard about this. I did not know. Oyamada Takaie?

– Yes, Oyamada Takaie. Rizal constantly looked up to the brilliant light of the Land of the Rising Sun – the Empire of Japan. I am sure you know that finally he has thoroughly studied Japanese history.

– Of course, I knew that.

– Rizal spoke of Oyamada Takaie with great joy. He even said that he was thinking of writing a historical poem or a novel about him. Truly the figure of Oyamada is quite small in the annals of Japanese history. But the purity, the nobility of his heart was like that of a living god (...)
(Yamada 1902c: 134–135).

It seems that through such a convoluted rhetorical device Yamada aimed to bolster the idea of some sort of a special cultural or even racial kinship between the Japanese and Filipinos. This unexpected interjection in the

²⁴ A minor warrior mainly known from the aforementioned sacrifice during the battle of Minatogawa in 1336. This episode is a part of the famous war epic *Taiheiki*. See: H. Yamashita 1983: 79–82.

²⁵ Rizal had certainly expressed some interest in Japan and even visited the country for a period of about a month and a half (see: CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 41–44), although it would have been highly improbable for Rizal, much less for del Pilar, to know about such a marginal Japanese historical figure. As Hau and Shiraishi (2009) point out, Japan, along with ideas of Asianist solidarity, seemed to not figure as profoundly in Rizal's own political imagination as in other people's fantasies of him. What should also be noted is that at the time of writing Yamada seemingly did not know about Rizal's stay in his country, as even in his later book *Aginarudo* he pointed out that the Filipino national hero's "corporeal feet did not step on the Japanese Empire's [soil]. However his spiritual feet have indeed widely traversed Japanese ancient history and biographies" (see: Yamada 1902a: 200–201).

novel also guides the reader to a reevaluation of earlier parts of the story as an analogy between the Aguinaldo-del Pilar and Nitta-Oyamada relations²⁶. Aguinaldo, in a fashion similar to Nitta, saves del Pilar's life by shielding him from possible accusations of colluding with the enemy. At the same time, Yamada through this narrative transtextual reference foreshadows the death of the main hero in a similar fashion as Oyamada.

4. “Invisible” sources: problems of hypotext identification in *Aginarudo: Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*

Among Yamada's publications on the Philippines *Aginarudo* can be considered the most extensively studied piece, considering the fact it is at least mentioned in a number of scholarly works (CuUnjieng Aboitiz 2020: 66; Hayase 1999: 38, 47; Ikehata 2001: 225–227; Serizawa 2015: 77; Shimizu 1998: 214–216, Tsuchiya 2013: 63–82, Yamashita 2000: 89–94). Still the volume of in-depth studies is by no means sizable, as only four of these works (Tsuchiya 2013, Ikehata 2001, Yamashita 2000, Shimizu 1998) provide some form of analysis of the contents of Yamada's book. Moreover, the aspect of transtextuality, meaning the problem of pinpointing sources of information (hypotext-hypertext relations) in *Aginarudo*, has been partly addressed only by Ikehata (2001) and Yamashita (2000), while Tsuchiya (2013) and Shimizu (1998) seem to treat this work as a somewhat original creation²⁷. A close comparative reading of *Aginarudo* and texts that are the most easily identifiable as possible hypotexts, provides a rather complicated picture of the “originality” of Yamada's publication.

Both Ikehata (2001: 225) and Yamashita (2000: 89–92) point out the indebtedness of *Aginarudo* to Mariano Ponce, however only Ikehata directs attention to the analysis of the similarities and differences between *Aginarudo* and Ponce's *Nan'yō-no Fūun*²⁸:

²⁶ Yamada (1902c: 138) leaves no room for any ambiguity as del Pilar clearly states: “An Oyamada Takaie. Pi... Pilar just may become an Oyamada Takaie for you, Your Excellency... I may die on the battlefield”.

²⁷ However, both works name *Nan'yō-no Fūun*. Tsuchiya (2013: 319), although only in a footnote, mentions that in the ‘main text’ (*honbun*) of Yamada's book it is visible that the author referenced (*sankō*) Ponce's publication, but no further comments regarding the extent of this “referencing” is provided.

²⁸ Yamashita describes the circumstances that led Yamada and Ponce to cross paths in Japan. She also mentions *Nan'yō-no Fūun* before delving into her analysis of *Aginarudo*, as well as other Filipino-themed texts of Yamada like *Momoiroginu*. She does not however directly state anything regarding any direct similarities in the contents of those two texts and states only that: “In other words, for Yamada this text [*Aginarudo*] was an expression of a spiritual solidarity and support for Filipino patriots and revolutionaries like Rizal or Aguinaldo, that he got to know of through Ponce, as well as an expression of compassion towards the Filipinos in their plight and in the face of the setbacks in the revolution” (Yamashita 2000: 93).

Aginarudo (2 volumes) is not what we might call a biography of Aguinaldo, but a historical tale [*shiwa*] of Filipino struggles for independence in which Aguinaldo is the main character. In terms of its contents, there are parts based on Ponce's *Nan'yō no Fūun*. There are also rich descriptions based on the author's own source collection: descriptions of Katipunan²⁹ and Bonifacio³⁰, which Ponce has ignored, and more than half of the first volume is taken by information about Rizal. The probability that the author has thoroughly read English-language newspapers and literature on Aguinaldo and Rizal is quite high (Ikehata 2001: 225).

Ikehata's article then follows with a long list of historical falsehoods and inaccuracies, all of which can be explained by the fact that Yamada has probably not performed that extensive of a "source collection" as stated above. Both the abovementioned lengthy parts on the figure of Rizal, seemingly quite inexorably inserted into a biographical narrative about a completely different figure, as well as all of the erroneous information³¹ pointed out by Ikehata in the quote below are contained in a single source – Edwin Wildman's *Aguinaldo*³²:

However historical inaccuracies stand out in the parts of the first volume focused on the period just before and after the outbreak of the revolution. For example the account full of ups and downs about the plot of rebellion which had been leaked to the Spanish authorities by a certain girl, who had unrequited feelings for Aguinaldo, and due to that Aguinaldo was arrested, subsequently broke out of prison and fled to Hong Kong is completely erroneous. Also false is the story of how the

²⁹ Katipunan – a revolutionary Filipino organization formed in 1892 by Andrés Bonifacio among others. See: Tucker 2009: 313–314.

³⁰ Andrés Bonifacio (1863–1897) was one of the founders of the Katipunan and the leader of the Philippine Revolution in its early stage. Due to internal power struggles he was put under trial and executed possibly on Aguinaldo's orders. See: Tucker 2009: 65.

³¹ There are also further inaccuracies in the spelling of names of two figures that Yamada seemingly picked up from Wildman: Rizal's brother is misnamed as Ponciento (Ponshento in Yamada's book) instead of Paciano, and Rizal's lover's name is spelled as Josephine Brackin instead of Josephine Bracken. While Paciano's name in some sources, both contemporary and more modern, has been rendered as Ponciano, I was not able to find any example of the spelling "Ponciento" other than Wildman's and Yamada's books. On one example of an early misnaming of Paciano see: Nery 2011: 97.

³² The narratively sudden and not adequately justified biography of Rizal in Yamada's book even starts at roughly the same point as the narrative in Wildman's *Aguinaldo*. Close comparison of the contents of both publications further solidifies the thesis that Yamada built most of his narrative as a transtextual patchwork of translations/paraphrases/rewritings of contents from a select number of hypotexts interspersed with some original ideas – mainly political digressions.

conflict of opinions regarding the validity of the rebellion between Aguinaldo, who had just returned to Cavite from Hong Kong, and the Katipunan leader, Bonifacio, ultimately was supposed to result in assassination of Bonifacio by Aguinaldo just before the outbreak of the revolution. Moreover, this difference of opinion is explained as follows: Aguinaldo supposedly insisted on an immediate revolution, while Bonifacio maintained that it is too early for that. This is in complete opposition to the currently clear historical facts (Ikehata 2001: 225).

The above story of the girl who leaked information about the rebellion seems to be directly taken by Yamada from Wildman's book³³ and significantly lengthened through the process of novelization – the adding of dialogues, internal monologues etc. – of the dry narrative form of the original. The consequence of this in both accounts is the arrest and then the escape of Aguinaldo from the country, as rightly pointed out by Ikehata, a story contrary to the historical facts³⁴. According to both Wildman's (1901: 22–23) and Yamada's (1902a: 72–73) books, Aguinaldo was supposed to pass himself off as a Chinese and joined the Hong Kong "Marine Police". Once again Yamada not only copies the incorrect facts, but he also goes beyond the transtextual link with his original source and provides some embellishments of his own – similarly to the abovementioned *Momoiroginu* in a manner reminiscent of the Japanese "political novel genre".

5. Between the transtextual and original content: narrative of solidarity in *Aginarudo: Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*

According to Yamada, before leaving the Philippines Aguinaldo was supposed to consider fleeing to Japan. In this particular passage, Yamada attempts to establish a link of solidarity between the Japanese and the Filipinos by portraying the latter as full of reverence for the ascendant Japan – both on an individual (Aguinaldo's respect) as well as collective level. But to the narrator's chagrin this feeling is not fully reciprocated by the Japanese, who remain largely ignorant to the plea of the Philippines:

³³ All the main details are roughly the same: the girl angry at Aguinaldo's lack of interest in her leaks information to a Spanish officer named Seville (in Yamada's book rendered in *katakana* as Sebire) that courted her before. Then she feels remorse, gets the Spaniard drunk and informs her brother, a rebel himself, about her misdeed. After that the rebels, with Aguinaldo as their leader, decide to kill Seville. Compare: Wildman 1901: 22–23; Yamada 1902a: 34–66.

³⁴ Aguinaldo only left the Philippines for Hong Kong more than a year after the outbreak of the revolution after signing a truce known as the Pact of Biak-na-bato, subsequently broken by the Spanish. See: Tucker 2009: 8–9, 58–59, 291.

However, there was a certain decision he made before his escape. He simply could not stay in the country. If he was to be caught again the death penalty was certain. The closest place for an escape is Taiwan. Should he go and hide there? Or should he cross to Hong Kong from there? If not, maybe he could go to the Japanese mainland? Certainly Taiwan is the closest. Taiwan has only just become a territory of the Japanese Empire, so it was great for hiding oneself, but it was inconvenient for maintaining contacts with his compatriots. The Japanese mainland, or rather Tokyo was preferable. No, it was not simply preferable. With the Korean problem as a catalyst Japan has dealt harshly with China, but every single soldier of that country has propriety worthy of a master of humanitarianism [*jindō-no shi*], of a warrior fighting for justice [*gisen-no hei*]. Japan has spread its fame across the world both in the martial and civil aspects. Tokyo is a worthy capital, a focal point for the talented people of the nation. If he could stay there, maybe Japan would help him in whatever way it was able to. In fact it has helped the Koreans Kim Ok-gyun and Park Yung-hyo, who found themselves in exile.

And indeed, for a brief moment the thought burned like fire in his breast. However, after further consideration, even if he had such ideas, he did not know if Japan would agree or not.

Even Aguinaldo thought that due to the Spanish interference, the Japanese probably did not adequately understand the truth about the progress of the Philippines. He could not help but think that it would probably be useless to go to a place, where he would not be understood and would have to beg for help starting from explaining everything from the beginning. In other words Aguinaldo adored the country of Japan, but deep down he was not decided enough to go there and try. He truly had a great appreciation for the Land of the Rising Sun that conducted a 19th century righteous war by using the conveniences of the 19th century. (...) ³⁵

We truly weep because of that. We cry from two perspectives: one of reason, one of emotion. From the point of view of reason? Because there was no need for the immoral act of suppressing free will. From the perspective of emotion? Because they looked up to the authority of our empire, admired the benevolence [*toku*] of our Emperor, looked

³⁵ What follows in the abridged part is a story of how allegedly Aguinaldo had thought of a project for a flag with a sun motif based on the Japanese one. It is uncertain if it was in reference to one of the flags of the Katipunan or whether this supposed connection (not present in either Wildman's or Ponce's books) of those flags was Yamada's original idea or something he heard in conversation with Ponce or someone else. Nevertheless this fragment has itself provided a basis for a further transtextual link, as this claim of Yamada has been later approvingly revisited during the Pacific War by Kimura Ki (see section 7).

fondly at the righteousness [gi] of our nation and yearned to take the same steps on the path of civilization as we did. If we go a step further we can also say: because the Filipinos had a sort of impossible to put in words, inexplicable affection towards us (Yamada 1902a: 69–72).

Fragments presenting such a hypothetical tie of racial solidarity and affinity between the Filipinos and the Japanese are interspersed in the overall narrative in other places as well – for example in a lengthy, political in character dialogue between Rizal and his white lover, Josephine. In this section Yamada’s Rizal links his personal problems – refusal of the British authorities to sanction his interracial marriage to Josephine – with Western imperialism and racism symbolized by their treatment of the Chinese and even the Japanese:

His [Rizal’s] face turned almost white as blood left it due to a burst of anger.

– It is somewhat embarrassing to just say it, but the refusal to join us in marriage was also probably caused by the current prevalence of extremely prejudiced argumentation among the whites, who switch from love to hate depending on race. See, you were able to express your true feelings towards someone unworthy as me, someone who from the point of view of your people, the white people, is a member of a different race, precisely because you already were void of such a racial prejudice. But listen to me closely. Currently, the white race is conceited and self-absorbed. They think as if all that is the highest, the most beautiful, the truest is their exclusive domain. For this reason the Spanish government has cruelly mistreated my compatriots, as if they were some beasts or birds [*kinjū*]. And that is also why now the likes of Australia or the United States exclude the people of China or Japan in a way that is close to persecution (Yamada 1902a: 137).

The above critique of racial prejudices of the Western world continues over the span of the next few pages (Yamada 1902a: 138–148), before Yamada returns to his main narrative based on Wildman’s text. Among Yamada’s other additions, rhetorical strategies slightly reminiscent of the Oyamadadel Pilar parallel from previously analyzed *Momoiroginu* are also apparent: providing metaphors and comparisons culturally familiar to the intended Japanese audience³⁶. Some of them are simply based on a common cultural

³⁶ Some of those are references to known episodes from Chinese history familiar to classically educated Japanese. As those are less relevant for this paper I will not mention particular examples and focus only on Japanese parallels.

code and understanding of certain character traits of famous historical figures: Aguinaldo is compared to Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Tokugawa Ieyasu, Rizal to Rai San'yō or Sakura Sōgorō (Yamada 1902a: 100, 110–111, 116). The most interesting example seems to be the parallel employed towards Josephine Bracken, as it seemingly expands on a juxtaposition already present in Wildman's (1901: 32) narrative, where she is compared to Joan of Arc, as she is described to take part in some battles of the revolution. Yamada (1902a: 208–209) repeats this comparison, but also adds a Japanese counterpart – the female warrior Tomoe Gozen.

Other parallels have a more transtextual character, as they are juxtapositions of certain circumstances to analogous stories from Japanese history. For example, an account of Aguinaldo's shrewdness in making use of the widespread superstitious belief in *anting-anting* amulets (also seemingly taken from Wildman's book, compare Wildman 1901: 18–20, Yamada 1902a: 29–32) to present himself as impervious to bullets is supplemented by comparisons to three Japanese instances. Yamada begins by analyzing the psyche of the superstitious masses when they are told seemingly miraculous stories about “great men” and juxtaposes the case of Aguinaldo with the supposedly divine intervention that enabled Nichiren to survive attempted execution at Tatsunokuchi. Directly after this, Yamada (1902a: 32) states that Aguinaldo consciously made use of exaggerated stories about him and *anting-anting* amulets by making this his version of “Ushiwaka's [Minamoto no Yoshitsune] art of swordsmanship mastered directly from Sōjōbō” or “[Nitta] Yoshisada's prayer for the parting of the sea water”³⁷. Parallels of similar nature are also employed in the second volume³⁸.

6. Problem of choice: selection biases in treatment of hypotexts in *Aginarudo Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*

There is another aspect of Yamada's use of transtextual techniques to create a narrative of solidarity that should be noted: his decision process regarding the matter of when to establish or when to sever the hypotext-hypertext link

³⁷ Sōjōbō refers to a *tengu*, who in legends was often associated with teaching Yoshitsune martial techniques. Sometimes also called Kurama tengu. McCullough 1966: 37–38. In the second volume (Yamada 1902b: 235–236) there is also another simile using a story connected with Yoshitsune – the so-called “Reverse Oar Controversy” (*sakaro*), see: McCullough 1966: 32–34.

A reference to a story included in *Taiheiki*. Nitta offers a prayer to the dragon-god and throws his gold-mounted sword into the sea. Soon after that the tides lowered and enabled Nitta's armies safe passage to start their attack on Kamakura. See: McCullough 1959: 289–292; Yamashita H. 1980: 103–107.

³⁸ For example the decision to fortify in the mountains in Biak-na-bato is compared to Kusunoki Masashige's selection of Chihaya as a base for resisting the enemies of the court. See: Yamada 1902b: 235 [page numbers continue from the first volume].

between his own work and its two main sources. As already has been mentioned, the first volume of *Aginarudo* is fairly faithful to the contents and the structure of Wildman's book, whereas the second volume is largely based on Ponce's *Nan 'yō-no Fūun*. This transition from one hypotext to the other is observable only a few pages into the second volume of *Aginarudo*, as the narrative starts to diverge from Wildman's account and employs information provided in Ponce's book³⁹. Therefore in the first part of the second volume of *Aginarudo*, a transtextual link with both of those sources is maintained⁴⁰. However, after chapter 12 of Yamada's work, it seems that the hypotext-hypertext connection with Wildman's publication has been severed, while Ponce's *Nan 'yō-no Fūun* assumes the role of the most visible (but not the only) source of information, albeit now relayed in a less disciplined, fragmentary manner⁴¹. There are several plausible reasons explaining why Yamada may have decided to change his primary hypotext at this particular moment. Firstly, he may have simply preferred Ponce's book due to his own pro-Filipino stance on the conflict and being a member of the same social network. However, because *Nan 'yō-no Fūun*'s account of the start of the revolution was scarce (only about ten pages), Yamada was unable to properly utilize it in order to provide a detailed introduction of the plight of the Filipinos. As Yamada's narrative chronologically converged with the beginning of more detailed parts of Ponce's book, he may have decided to switch to a personally preferable source. Secondly, Wildman's account contained racial biases against Filipinos as members of the "Malay race", as well as justifications for the American takeover of the Philippines⁴².

³⁹ Seemingly the first passage taken from Ponce is an account of rapid changes in the Spanish chain of command due to their failure in suppressing the revolution. Compare: Wildman 1901: 42–43; Ponce 1901: 11, Yamada 1902b: 226.

⁴⁰ This thesis is substantiated by the next part of *Aginarudo* – an account of negotiating a truce (resulting in the Pact of Biak-na-bato) that is basically a patchwork of information from both Wildman and Ponce's books. Yamada even directly refers to Ponce's work, although he does not mention Wildman. Compare: Wildman 1901: 44–47; Ponce 1901: 12–15, Yamada 1902b: 238–244.

⁴¹ In parts of the second volume Yamada switches to a non-narrative, essayistic and polemical mode with more overt (but still not detailed) information on his references. For example he provides a critical analysis of a newspaper article from the Boston Advertiser and references and quotes in English parts of a letter sent by four Filipino exiles to the American president Theodore Roosevelt. Yamada mentions that a printed text of this letter was obtained by Yamagata Teizaburō, hinting that he probably gained access to it through this connection. Coincidentally the same letter was also reprinted in *The Public* newspaper, mentioned earlier in the analysis of *Momoiroginu*. See: Apacible et al. 1901.

⁴² Wildman portrayed the idea of Filipino independence as a form of conceit, at the same criticized also the Spanish authorities, trying to portray America as a more developed and benevolent nation. Certain generalizations about the Filipino people are frequently interspersed in his narrative, for example:

– elements incompatible with Yamada’s own pro-Filipino predilections, as well as his goal of creating good will towards Filipino struggles among his compatriots. Moreover, Edwin Wildman was the brother of Rounsevelle Wildman, the American consul in Hong Kong at the time of the Filipino revolution, and also performed duties as the vice consul. Rounsevelle was one of a number of American diplomats in the Far East, engaged in the unclear and insufficiently documented process of negotiating between the revolutionaries and Americans regarding cooperation in fighting the Spanish (Kennedy 1990: 197–207). This meant that to some Filipinos the Wildman brothers were to some degree implicated in what they deemed the giving of false promises of independence. It is unclear whether Yamada was cognizant of this familial connection of the Wildman brothers, but if he was, it may have been another reason to deem *Aguinaldo: A Narrative of Filipino Ambitions* as not satisfactorily trustworthy. Whatever the reasons may have been, it seems highly plausible that marginalization of Wildman’s account as a hypotext in the second volume of Yamada’s work was not a coincidence, but a conscious decision connected to his rhetorical strategies.

7. From hyper to hypotext, or later reappraisal of *Aginarudo Firipin Dokuritsu Senwa*

Japanese geopolitical interest in the so-called Nan’yō region began growing stronger as the Meiji state formed and elites searched for opportunities to create a foothold for expanding the position of Japan in the international arena. Publications on this topic, like Shiga Shigetaka’s 1887 travelogue *Nan’yō-no Jiji*, started to appear in the 1880s and 1890s. At the same time Japanese vessels traveled and explored the waters of the Pacific, leading to some moderate gains for the country in the form of the Volcano Islands – Kazan-rettō (Peattie 1988: 1–33). However according to Tsuchiya (2013: 63) the number of publications concerned with the region gradually increased in the Taishō period and truly exploded with the start of the Pacific

“On this trip an incident occurred, which, though insignificant in itself, is important in its bearing on the study of Malay character. For any attempt to penetrate into the central meaning of the Filipino movement, at least in the form which has confronted the United States, will be impossible until one understands the peculiar cock-sparrow vanity, the ineffable toy dignity, of the strange little, grave little brown man, whose character was the hinge on which the door of the revolution swung. Better, perhaps, than anything of record is the conceit of Aguinaldo, illustrated in the incident that occurred on this occasion. It is hardly just to call this a fault in him. It is not a thing to be criticized or condemned, but it is a fact to be seen and understood simply as a fact. The explanation of this curious vanity is that Aguinaldo is a Malay” (Wildman 1901: 73–74).

War in the Shōwa period⁴³. He concludes that this peak of interest was set in the following context:

Of course the background for this was a media environment bent on shaping the nation state, while simultaneously coping with real demand, as well as the policy/plan of the state based on ideas of ‘Greater East Asia’, ‘southern advancement’, ‘starting the war’ [Daitōa, nanshin, kaisen] and the sentiments of the nation that backed those policies. Ultimately from the present point of view it may be possible to point out that all of the above were directed at justifying the act of war (Tsuchiya 2013: 63).

Not all of the works published during the war were new, as there was a number of reprints from the Meiji period, forming a certain re-contextualizing link between the period of the beginnings of Japanese interest in Nan’yō and the new era of wartime propaganda of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. One of these works was Yamada’s *Aginarudo*, republished after a slight revision of the title in 1942 (Tsuchiya 2013: 63–64). It needs to be stressed that the new edition was provided with a metatextual allographic paratext, simply titled *Kaidai* (‘commentary’) and written by Shioda Ryōhei⁴⁴. Similar to Yamada – who, as has been shown, utilized earlier works or hypotexts in order to fulfill the author’s agenda – Shioda in his interpretative commentary appropriates Yamada’s forty-year-old text and re-contextualizes it and its author to fit it to the geopolitical and ideological situation of the Japan of his own lifetime. From the beginning he prepares the foundations for this overarching reinterpretation:

When it comes to determining Yamada Bimyō’s position in the history of literature, mainly his literary activities in the earlier years of the second decade of Meiji period [ca. 1887–1892] are taken into consideration. [A list of his accomplishments follows.] (...) Through these we deem him a person of merit in the period of the formation of new Meiji literature, but while those are undoubtedly great contributions, there are still a lot of other aspects of Bimyō that are deeply connected to the present days – his thoughts and actions during the third decade of Meiji period (Shioda 1990: 269).

⁴³ Tsuchiya bases his arguments on two 1940s bibliometric studies – indexes of publications – on “southern lands” (*nanzō*) in the case of the earlier one and resources on “Greater East Asia” in the later one.

⁴⁴ I have not been able to gain access to the 1942 reissue of Yamada’s text, however I base my further analyses on the 1990 re-printing of *Aginarudo* that contains Shioda’s paratext.

This introduction is followed by a short overview of Yamada's life and career, in which stress is put on his connections with Yamagata Teizaburō and Mariano Ponce, as well as his “feudal” education and ingrained ideas of nationalism (*kokkashugi*) – all in the context of his later patriotic turn in writing activities after being ostracized from the literary establishment (Shioda 1990: 269–270). Shioda also implies that Tōyō Seinenkai – in its idea a broadly pan-Asianist organization for integrating youths from different Asian countries and regions – of which Yamagata Teizaburō was a member, was an ideological forerunner for the idea of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. This network of Yamada's personal connections as well as subsequent analyses of his Philippines-themed writings led Shioda to (over)emphasize the writer's anti-Americanism – an interpretation strongly influenced by propagandistic necessities of Japan embroiled in a war in the Pacific. Tsuchiya (2013: 72–73) points this out in his analysis by juxtaposing Shioda's wartime discourse with one of instances of Yamada softening his criticism towards the United States by referring to himself as a friend of the American people and stressing his faith in American “men of justice [*gijin*] like Mr. Hoar”⁴⁵. This contrast led Tsuchiya (2013: 73) to conclude as follows:

At least from the text as a whole [Yamada's *Aginarudo*] it is difficult to infer up to the degree that it ‘in extreme words reviles the bandit-like actions of the Americans’. Shioda's *Commentary* is detailed in biographical facts on Bimyō, however in parts which interpret the work, projections of its author's subjective and arbitrary views on America can be seen. In other words, through the *Commentary* the way the work should be read is suggested to the readers, and it even may seem that a text from forty years earlier is used to worsen the sentiments towards America in Japan. It happens that the reprinting of a work may not stop only at transmitting it down or introducing it, but it may also become propaganda.

However it should be noted that Shioda's *Kaidai* was not the only instance of the transtextual revival of Yamada's *Aginarudo* during the Pacific War, as it has also been referred to in one of Kimura Ki's propagandistic texts on

⁴⁵ Rendered as Hōa-shi in the original. Yamada describes this man as a member of the American Congress and devotes a longer segment of his work to his anti-war speech. All of these facts combined seem to suggest that Hōa-shi refers to George Frisbie Hoar (1826–1904), who at the time opposed US imperial ambitions for the Philippines. For the fragment on Hoar in *Aginarudo* see: Yamada 1902b: 330–352. On Hoar in the context of the Philippines see: Tucker 2009: 285–286; Welch 1964.

the Philippines⁴⁶. Kimura was a writer, literary critic and scholar, who had the opportunity to visit the Philippines for around two months after the Japanese Imperial Army occupied it during the war (Kimura 1942: *Jo*). His Philippines-themed texts, similarly to Yamada's publications, betray strong transtextual predilections with references to a vast array of sources – both foreign and Japanese. Due to the limited scope of this paper, an overview of this topic is not possible, however it needs to be noted that a detailed analysis of Kimura's Philippines themed body of works merits further study⁴⁷.

Conclusion

Yamada Bimyō had taken an interest in the plight of the Philippines through a multifaceted convergence of factors. His marginalization from the literary establishment led him to establish new connections and therefore a closer connection to the circles engaged with the Filipino situation. Subsequently this networking, mainly through Yamagata Teizaburō and Mariano Ponce, enabled Yamada to gain access to information and sources that he then utilized in his works. Yamada's somewhat Japanocentric feeling of solidarity with the Philippines resulted in a series of publications that on one hand were meant to familiarize the Japanese readers with the Philippine Revolution and the later American involvement. On the other hand, it expressed grievances and fears towards Western powers and their treatment of Asian countries or societies, and Japan in particular. To Yamada these two matters seemed to be inextricably intertwined, therefore it comes as no surprise that in the works analyzed in this paper, namely *Momoiroginu* and *Aginarudo*, he frequently utilized transtextual rhetorical devices linking the Japanese with the Filipino people. He accomplished this either through references to historical or literary figures and events familiar to the Japanese in order to form analogies, or through more convoluted transtextual measures of mixing rewritings of his hypotexts with his own ideas to form hypertexts that were both derivative and original at the same time. Yamada's works were not only influenced by other publications, but to a certain degree they also became influential in their own right. *Aginarudo* was incorporated

⁴⁶ In a part on the supposed inspiration for the Filipino flag (see footnote 35; Kimura seems to conclude that Yamada meant the Katipunan flag) by the Japanese one. See: Kimura 1942: 305–309; Yamada 1901a: 70–71.

⁴⁷ Some aspects of Philippines-themed sources used by Kimura have been studied by Serizawa (2015), however he was more concerned with the influences of American writings and discourses. There are also seemingly some errors, as in Serizawa's interpretation of one of Kimura's texts that mentions Yamada's *Aginarudo* (i.e. Serizawa mistakes one of works referred to in Kimura's narrative, the *American Oldtimer* magazine, as a source used by Yamada a few decades prior). See: Kimura 1942: 55–56, 307–309; Serizawa 2015: 95.

into new transtextual relations through its propagandistically re-contextualized reprinting during the Pacific War and Japanese occupation of the Philippines, forming an interesting link between the geopolitical concerns of two periods separated by forty years.

References

- Agoncillo, Teodoro A. 1990. *History of the Filipino people*. Quezon City: R. P. Garcia Publishing Co.
- Allen, Graham 2022. *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Apacible, G., E. Riego, Celestino Rodriguez, Cayetano Lukban 1901. “Appeal of the central committee to the president of the United States”. *The Public*, 14 December: 572–575. URL: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101054790298&seq=578> [access date: 9 February 2025]
- Boston Evening Transcript* 1901. “The campaign in Luzon: A brief summary of the war in 1899”. 22 April. URL: <https://news.google.com/newspapers?nid=2249&dat=19010422&id=naY-AAAIBAJ&sjid=nFkMAAAAIBAJ&pg=6350,2867544&hl=en> [access date: 9 February 2025]
- Bridgman, Raymond L. 1903. *Loyal traitors: A story of friendship for the Filipinos*. Boston: James H. West Company.
- Constantino, Renato 1975. *A history of the Philippines: from the Spanish colonization to the Second World War*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- CuUnjieng Aboitiz, Nicole 2020. *Asian place, Filipino nation: A global intellectual history of the Philippine Revolution, 1887–1912*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Genette, Gérard 1997. *Palimpsests: A literature in the second degree*. Trans. Channa Newman, Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hau, Caroline S., Takashi Shiraishi 2009. “Daydreaming about Rizal and Tetchō: On Asianism as network and fantasy”. *Philippine Studies* 57 (3): 329–388.

Hatano Masaru 1988. “Firipin dokuritsu undō to Nihon no taiō [Philippine independence movement and Japan’s responses]”. *Ajia Kenkyū* 34 (4): 69–95.

波多野勝. 「フィリピン独立運動と日本の対応」 『アジア研究』.

Hayase, Shinzo 1999. “Japan and the Philippines”. *Philippine Studies* 47 (1): 30–47.

Hess, Jean 1899a. “Aux Philippines (de notre envoyé special) [in the Philippines (from our special correspondent)]”. *Le Figaro*, 28 July: 3. URL: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k284830x/f3>. item [access date: 4 February 2025].

Hess, Jean 1899b. “A French view of the war in the Philippines”. *The Public*, 19 August: 13–16. URL: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101054790264&seq=323> [access date: 4 February 2025]

Ikehata Setsuho 2001. “Meiji-ki Nihon-ni okeru Firipin-e-no kanshin” [Japanese interest in the Philippines during the Meiji era]. *Ajia Afurika Gengo Bunka Kenkyū* 61: 203–230.

池端雪浦. 「明治期日本におけるフィリピンへの関心」 『アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究』.

Joaquin, Nick 1977. *A question of heroes: Essays in criticism on ten key figures of Philippine history*. Metro Manila: Filipinas Foundation.

Kennedy, Charles Stuart 1990. *The American consul: A history of the United States consular service, 1776–1914*. New York, Westport, London: Greenwood Press.

Kimura Ki 1942. *Manira kikō: Minami-no shinju* [travelogue from Manila: the pearl of the south]. Osaka: Zenkoku Shobō.

木村毅. 『マニラ紀行 南の眞珠』. 大阪：全國書房.

Larned, Josephus Nelson 1901. *History for ready reference: from the best historians, biographers, and specialists their own words in a complete system of history for all uses, extending to all countries and subjects, and representing for both readers and students the better and newer literature of history in the English language*, vol. VI. Springfield, Mass.: The C.A. Nichols, Co.

McCullough, Helen Craig (trans.) 1959. *The Taiheiki: A chronicle of medieval Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press.

McCullough, Helen Craig (trans.) 1966. *Yoshitsune: A fifteenth-century Japanese chronicle*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Nery, John 2011. *Revolutionary spirit: Jose Rizal in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Nihon Kindai Bungakukan (ed.) 1992. *Nihon kindai bungaku daijiten: kijōban* [the great dictionary of modern Japanese literature: Desk edition]. Tokyo: Kōdansha.

日本近代文学館編. 『日本近代文学大辞典 机上版』. 東京都: 講談社.

Peattie, Mark R. 1988. *Nan'yō: The rise and fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885–1945*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ponce, Mariano 1901. *Nan'yō-no fūun: Firipin dokuritsu mondai-no shinsō* [the situation in the South Seas: The truth about the problem of Philippine independence]. Translated by Miyamoto Heikurō, Fujita Suetaka. Tokyo: Hakubunkan.

ボンセ、マリアノ. 『南洋之風雲 比律賓獨立問題之真相』. 宮本平九郎、藤田季莊共訳. 東京都: 博文館.

Serizawa, Takamichi 2015. “Japanese Solidarity Discourse on the Philippines during the Second World War”. *Philippine Studies: Historical & Ethnographic Viewpoints* 63 (1): 71–100.

Shimizu, Hiromu 1998. “Imaging a revolution in the Philippines: Japanese dreams of expanding to the Southern Seas”. In: Elmer A. Ordoñez (ed.). *Toward the first Asian republic: Papers from the Jakarta International Conference on the centenary of the Philippine Revolution and the first Asian republic*. Manila: Philippine Centennial Commission. 208–218.

Shioda Ryōhei 1938. *Yamada Bimyō kenkyū* [study of Yamada Bimyō]. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin.

塩田良平. 『山田美妙研究』. 京都: 人文書院.

Shioda Ryōhei 1990 [1942]. “Kaidai [commentary]”. In: Yamada Bimyō. *Aginarudo: Firippin dokuritsusenwa*. Tokyo: Chūō Kōron. 269–289.

塩田良平. 「解題」. 山田美妙. 『あぎなると フィリッピン独立戦話』. 東京都: 中央公論.

Tsuchiya Shinobu 2013. *Nan'yō bungaku-no seisei: otozureru koto-to omou koto* [the formulation of Nan'yō literature: visits and thoughts]. Tokyo: Shintensha.

土屋忍. 『南洋文学の生成 訪れることと想うこと』. 東京都: 新典社.

Tucker, Spencer C. (ed.) 2009. *The encyclopedia of the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars: A political, social, and military history*. Santa Barbara, Denver, Oxford: ABC-CLIO.

Welch, Richard E., Jr. 1964. “Senator George Frisbie Hoar and the defeat of Anti-Imperialism, 1898–1900”. *The Historian* 26 (3): 362–380.

Wildman, Edwin 1901. *Aguinaldo: A narrative of Filipino ambitions*. Boston: Lothrop Publishing Company.

Yamada Bimyō 1902a. *Aginarudo: Firipin dokuritsu senwa, zempo* [Aguinaldo: The tale of the Philippine independence war, volume one]. Tokyo: Naigai shuppan kyōkai.

山田美妙. 『あぎなると 比律賓獨立戦話』前編. 東京都: 内外出版協會.

Yamada Bimyō 1902b. *Aginarudo: Firipin dokuritsu senwa, kōhen* [Aguinaldo: The tale of the Philippine independence war, volume two]. Tokyo: Naigai shuppan kyōkai.

山田美妙. 『あぎなると 比律賓獨立戦話』後編. 東京都: 内外出版協會.

Yamada Bimyō 1902c. *Momoiroginu: Seiji shōsetsu* [peach-colored silk. Political novel]. Tokyo: Aoki Sūzandō.

山田美妙. 『桃色絹 政治小説』. 東京都: 青木嵩山堂.

Yamashita Hiroaki (annotation) 1980. *Taiheiki 2*. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

山下宏明 校注. 『太平記』 二. 東京都 : 新潮社.

Yamashita Hiroaki (annotation) 1983. *Taiheiki* 3. Tokyo: Shinchōsha.

山下宏明 校注. 『太平記』 三. 東京都 : 新潮社.

Yamashita Michiko 2000. “Nanshin-no manazashi: Meiji 20–30-nendai-ni okeru Firipin-no egakikata [views on southward advance: Portrayal of the Philippines in the second and third decade of Meiji period]”. *Sōgō Bunka Kenkyū* 3: 77–99.

山下美知子. 「南進のまなざし 明治二〇～三〇年代におけるフィリピンの描き方」. 『総合文化研究』