biographical works often "seek to disrupt male-dominated culture and deny the assumed centrality and universality of masculine values" (p. 133).

In countering some Japanese feminist scholars, Inoue Kazuko among others, Sherif argues that "[t]he fact Kōda's conceptual basis lies apart from critical approaches such as feminism and gender studies does not make her antifeminist . . . it would be a mistake to obscure Kōda's achievements as a writer simply because her writings do not fit neatly into familiar social and ideological frameworks of Anglo-European feminism" (p. 133).

To truly convince the reader that this is so, some definition of Anglo-European feminism(s), more extensive quotations of Japanese feminists, and an overview of Kōda criticism would have been helpful. Her conscious choice of the word "personhood," rather than "womanhood," also reflects the author's ambiguous position and seems to contradict her frequent apologia for Kōda the not-antifeminist. Sherif's point, that as a gazer the female protagonist in *Flowing* needs to become an asexual being like a nun in order to survive in the world of the geisha, challenges the feminist notion of female sexuality which allows women—whether married, single, or divorced, or mothers/ homemakers—to be fully human.

Despite certain analytical gaps, then, and her relative inattention to the feminist context, Sherif's *Mirror* is a valuable work for anyone who wishes to understand and appreciate the continuity of the Confucian aspects of the traditional Japanese artistic and literary heritage, a heritage that nurtures refinement of character, discipline, and the "rhetoric of humility and inadequacy" (p. 54).

MICHIKO NIIKUNI WILSON
University of Virginia

Great Mirrors Shattered: Homosexuality, Orientalism, and Japan. By JOHN WHITTIER TREAT. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. xi, 241 pp. $27.50.

It was returning GIs, or the war-trained, who established what the English-speaking world knows as Japanese Studies. Men acquired Japanese wives as adjuncts to their scholarship, or retained fond memories of trysts. The institutionalization of structural disequilibrium, arrogation of representational power, and sexual fetishization—what we call Orientalism—was effected. The original explicator of this exegetic mode, Edward Said, dealt with the Arab world, but Japan offers something for study too. Said assumed heterosexuality to be the Orientalist's governing orientation, which, even if true for Arabic lands, has never been so for operators in Japan. In fact, the overlap between Japanese Studies pundits and gays is remarkable, and has not ceased to be so with the demise of the Occupation generation. The concomitant way that homoeroticism must have colored aspects of our discipline is a theme never openly addressed, though no doubt often mused on. Any linkage is bound to be subtle. John Whittier Treat, now professor of Japanese Literature at Yale, is rightly scornful of those who assume gayness leads necessarily to attention to overtly sexual writers (pp. 88–89) or to "the hypersensitive, the perverse" (p. 201). We gay men are a varied lot. Thus, the triple nexus of homosexuality, Orientalism, and Japan is an enthralling subject. I must state that this book, couched as a "memoir" (p. ix) and deliberately shunning scholarly precision, is a missed opportunity to address it.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2658988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The term "great mirror" (*ōkagami*) derives from the medieval chronicle, but was attached to the realm of eros in 1678 by Fujimoto Kizan in his *Shikidō ōkagami* (Great Mirror of Sexual Behavior). Treat seems unaware of this, but he does refer to the better known book that first coupled the term with man-boy eroticism (*nanshoku*)—Saikaku's succinctly named *Nanshoku ōkagami* of 1687. Treat deploys the "great mirror" as the mythic construction of gay Japan, hence his "mirrors"—we all have our fantasies. He scarcely dwells on the simile, though, and a defect of his chosen memoir mode is that it makes for skating over important topics with the most casual of analyses. Treat does not deal with the Edo period, so the Saikaku reference is a red herring anyway (or perhaps it is a marketing bait). This allows him to escape such matters as what proximity "*nanshoku*" has to "homosexuality" and "gayness." He lacks the tenacity to resolve many issues he broaches, and this would have been a tough one. The mirror theme only comes up once: on Treat's last morning in Japan his shaving mirror portentously breaks—shattering his illusions. Subtle it is not.

Treat's book is, in fact, marvelously unrelated to its subtitle too. His book is about AIDS, which, beginning in the late 1980s, turned the foreigner in Japan into the bringer of fear. Treat was in Japan in 1991 when the country was convulsed by its "AIDS scare" (so was I actually, for the first part of it, although my experiences in Tokyo's gay world conform little with his). That he was there justifies his genre, but we are nearly ten years on, and while the story would make good history, this memoir is largely redundant. The text rattles us through pronouncements by government or medical authorities and the like (mostly from the *Japan Times*, which is unimpressive). This is interlaced with Treat's daily routines, flashbacks to previous stays, and much sophomoric badinage about drinking and not getting down to work (the Japan Foundation was paying for this stint, but Treat is repeatedly mean-spirited about them). And there are plenty of kiss-and-tells of our author's sexual conquests. This double plot (AIDS and Treat's life-and-times) is overlain with citations from Orientalist writers of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (Kipling, Burton, Loti), which do deepen the concerns of the present, and from medical-metaphorists (H. G. Wells, Mann). One repeated vehicle in the narrative is Treat's boyfriend, Tetsuji, who can be seen resonating with Tadzio from *Death in Venice*, but most readers will have cottoned on long before page 166 when we get "TadzioTetsujiTadzio-TetsujiTadzioTetsuji."

Treat invokes Said's *Orientalism* in several places. But whereas Said sought to unpack Orientalist writing as a beginning of righting the terrible wrongs such thinking had done (he's from Palestine, he knows), Treat is Orientalist by design and revels in the stance. He will not restore any part of the power of representation with the represented, and he unloads his views in the same idiom as the writers from whom Said was scrupulous to distance himself. To be fair, we had told at the outset that Treat defines Orientalism "without irony" as "the Western study of everywhere else" (p. ix). I can only guess this book's continuum with past mistakes is intentional. But I was not always sure. How are we to respond to a passage like this: "Tetsuji was asked by the Japanese people sitting next to us to take their picture with an impossibly complicated camera, but fortunately my white skin spared me from similar requests. What Japanese would ask a foreigner a favor, or even think he could understand his requests" (p. 115). It's all there: the fiendish camera, the morbidly racist Japanese who never learn even though here they are flying back from Hong Kong. Unaware that the quip about Japanese ideas of the language skills of "foreigners" (whatever they are) directly contradicts what Treat wrote earlier (p. 78), we continue: "Tetsuji did not mind helping his fellow countrymen celebrate their little sojourn away. He

https://doi.org/10.2307/2658988 Published online by Cambridge University Press

was in fact glad to oblige. I think: yes, he is Japanese, isn't he." Frankly, I think Tetsuji, who is dumped by Treat so he can pursue American lovers, is lucky to have escaped so he didn't have to listen to patronizing comments any longer. Treat decides "in favor of America and my career and, as a corollary, against Tetsuji's happiness" (p. 52). Readers who can discover irony in this sort of episode may enjoy the book more than I did.

"Rice queens are made not born" (p. 78). This story is of how one was unmade. Each time the author appears, people "admire" him, are "impressed by" him, want to sleep with him. It is further announced that Japan is "a country full of bottoms" (p. 29). Treat is in demand. Once a boy sheds his proper role and penetrates Treat. This Oda (note the name) is from Ryukyu (honorary "America"), but in the narrative Treat is still firmly in control. "I lowered myself onto him, and let his cock go as deep as it [*sic*] wanted" (p. 174). But, "it had been a long time since I'd let a Japanese fuck me." Oda is promptly felled by tongue cancer. His face is "scooped out by doctors" (p. 176), probably incompetent, since Japanese medicine is the cause of much indignation in this book (pp. 3, 62–63, 113, 121, etc.). But Oda is now as Treat likes his Japanese—faceless. As he sat on Oda's penis he was thinking, "*this* is how I'll become Japanese, this is the way that I can be what *they* are and I am *not*" (p. 175). Unsurprisingly, given the *modus operandi* , "for years I wanted the Japanese to accept me. . . . But I never succeeded" (p. 62).

This kind of personal writing is common in queer theory. Its very correct intent is to erode the pretense of academic objectivity and to reinstate the authorial body. Homosexuals are categorized by their bodily actions, and, since AIDS, we have a special epidemiology too. Before going to Japan in 1991, Treat suspected he was HIV+. His own body was implicated in the AIDS going on around him. Given that he was researching a book on atomic bomb literature, he found the perfect metaphor." "AIDS victim"/"Americans" were conveyors of an insidious radiation/virus that destroyed bodies from within. I liked this conceit at first. But I found it fell apart when one considers the A-bombs outwardly as well as irradiating, and that Treat drops a couple of hints that he pretty soon knew he was not positive. His arrogation of such language would be fine in a work of fiction. I leave it to those who are themselves HIV+ to determine whether this is tasteful in a memoir.

TIMON SCREECH
School of Oriental and African Studies,
University of London and Sainsbury Institute

The Russo-Japanese War in Cultural Perspective, 1904–05. Edited by DAVID WELLS and SANDRA WILSON. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999. xiii, 213 pp. $59.95.

A decade after the demise of the Soviet Union, Russia's political and economic future remains uncertain, and the historical question of Russia's identity in the world gathers growing importance. Japan continues its perennial preoccupation with the "Northern Territories" problem, but no solution is in sight. How will the intellectual communities of the two countries respond to these challenges at the dawn of the new century? This reviewer finds *The Russo-Japanese War in Cultural Perspective, 1904–05* quite relevant to our contemporary issues despite its concern with the war of almost a century ago.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2658988 Published online by Cambridge University Press