

Plagiarism, Hiroshima, and Intertextuality: Ibuse Masuji's *Black Rain* Reconsidered

Yi-ling Lin *

Abstract *This paper examines the ongoing controversy about whether or not Ibuse Masuji plagiarized (tōsaku/hyōsetsu/tōyō) from the diary of Shigematsu Shizuma, the most important source that Ibuse used in writing his highly acclaimed a-bomb novel Kuroi ame (Black rain, 1966). By analyzing the contexts of Ibuse's composition, the strategies and motives of Toyota Seishi (who initially stirred up the plagiarism controversy), and the textual difference between Ibuse's novel and Shigematsu's diary, this paper demonstrates that the accusation of Black Rain as a work of plagiarism is a decontextualized and misleading oversimplification that neglects the complex process of literary creation. The intertextual inquiry not only shows that Ibuse's augmentation of the diary has transformed his most important source and created new meanings but also calls for a rethinking of the place of intertextuality in relation to the creative process in the extraordinary number of plagiarism cases in twentieth-century Japanese literature.*

Key Words: Ibuse Masuji, *Black Rain*, plagiarism, Hiroshima, intertextuality, modern Japanese literature

Interdisciplinary Fields: Japanese literature and information ethics

INTRODUCTION

KUROI ame 黒い雨 (Black rain, 1966), written by Ibuse Masuji 井伏鱒二 (1898-1993), has been acclaimed as a masterpiece of Japan's postwar literature and has been viewed as the quintessential a-bomb novel. When Ibuse's story was initially serialized in the monthly literary magazine *Shinchō* 新潮 (New tide) from 1 January 1965 to 1 September 1966, it received a lot of attention. After its publication in book form on 25 October 1966, it brought Ibuse two distinguished awards in a row within two months. First, the writer was awarded the Order of Cultural Merit (*bunka kunshō* 文化勲章), Japan's most prestigious literary and cultural award bestowed by the emperor, on 3 November. After that, the writer was awarded the Noma Literary Prize (*Noma bungeishō* 野間文芸賞), offered by Japan's eminent publisher Kōdansha 講談社, on 17 December. The novel was adapted into a

television drama in 1983 and a film in 1989. The latter, directed by Imamura Shōhei 今村昌平 (1926-2006), was the winner of several Japan Academy Awards and brought Ibuse's novel into focus again. The translation of the novel into more than ten languages also contributed to Ibuse's emerging international fame.

Ibuse became somewhat embarrassed by the great success of *Black Rain* because of the documentary nature of his work. He expressed his embarrassment in the remarks he made upon receiving the Noma Literary Prize. In the printed version of the remarks, he noted,

[T] his work is written based on miscellaneous information picked up from newspaper clippings, doctors' medical sheets, notes, documents, rumors heard on the grapevine, stenography, reference books, and recordings, so it is in a reportage style and cannot be called a novel in the true sense of the word. Because of this, I feel embarrassed to be receiving this Noma Prize.¹

In his oral presentation of the remarks, he modestly emphasized, "[*Black Rain*] could just as well be said to be 'written and edited' by Ibuse Masuji . . . I find it hard to be unabashedly happy about this."²

Ibuse's documentary approach actually shows that he was trying to be morally responsible for depicting an atrocity that he himself did not experience. He was not a hibakusha 被爆者 (a-bomb victim). During the war, he and his family were evacuated to their old family estate in Kamo 加茂. On the day the atomic bomb fell, he was in the city of Fukuyama 福山. It was his hibakusha friend Shigematsu Shizuma 重松静馬 (1903-80) who motivated him to write the a-bomb novel. Ibuse came to know Shigematsu after the war when Shigematsu offered to show Ibuse some Edo documents stored in a warehouse in Kobatake 小畠, a village near Ibuse's refuge place Kamo. After Ibuse moved back to Tokyo, he still visited Hiroshima 広島 prefecture frequently and met with Shigematsu. Resentful that the memorial activities for the atomic bombing of Hiroshima had become ceremonies devoid of meaning and that the suffering of hibakushas was being forgotten, Shigematsu suggested to Ibuse that he write about that catastrophe by using the experience of his niece Takamaru Yasuko 高丸安子 (1925-60).

Yasuko was at Ujina-chō 宇品町 on the day the atomic bomb fell. Although she was not bombed directly, she encountered difficulty getting married after the war because of rumors that she would develop radiation sickness. She eventually got married and bore two children but did die of radiation sickness, which was likely to be caused by her exposure to the radiation-polluted air when she, Shigematsu, and Shigematsu's wife moved from Ujina to Furuichi-chō 古市町 in the wake of the atomic bomb explosion. Shigematsu offered to send Ibuse the diary that Yasuko kept during

her illness. Inspired by Yasuko, Ibuse started a serialized story entitled *Mei no kekkon* 姪の結婚 (The marriage of a niece) in the monthly magazine *Shinchō* in January 1965. After writing some installments, Ibuse asked to see Yasuko's diary, but Shigematsu found out that her family had burned it, for they found it too agonizing to read. Ibuse then asked to see Yasuko's medical sheets, discovering that they also had been destroyed after her death. Ibuse therefore had to change his writing strategy. He decided to rely mainly on Shigematsu's diary about his experience of being bombed at Yokogawa 横川 Station. (Shigematsu had sent a transcribed copy of his diary to Ibuse in July 1962.) In addition, Ibuse also collected diverse materials on Hiroshima and visited more than fifty hibakushas. His research process was again facilitated by Shigematsu's help. Ibuse's change of writing approach was part of the reason that he renamed his story *Kuroi ame* (Black rain) in the eighth installment of his serialization.³

Ibuse's documentary approach was scrutinized critically by Toyota Seishi 豊田清史 (1921-), a tanka poet in Hiroshima, who stirred up a controversy in the 1990s about whether or not Ibuse plagiarized from his most important source, Shigematsu's diary, in writing *Black Rain*. This controversy compromised Ibuse's reputation for years, to the extent that plagiarism is still an issue in Ibuse studies. I believe that Toyota deliberately misled the public on the question of plagiarism, as I will demonstrate in the pages that follow.

As a friend of Shigematsu, Toyota read Shigematsu's diary in the 1950s and published a small portion of it more than once in his tanka magazine *Kagen* 火幻 (Illusion of fire), the earliest being in its August 1959 issue.⁴ Believing that non-hibakushas were unable to write about the atomic bombing, Toyota questioned Ibuse's success. For Toyota, Shigematsu's hibakusha identity conferred authenticity to his writing and so Shigematsu's diary was better than Ibuse's novel.⁵ Toyota felt "sad" (*kanashii* 悲しい)⁶ and "sorry" (*oshii* 惜しい)⁷ that Ibuse gained all the attention but did not use a note to credit his most important source, Shigematsu's diary, when *Black Rain* was first serialized in magazine and later published in book form for the first time in 1966. When Ibuse used a memorandum (*oboegaki* 覚え書, p. 448) to explain his writing approach and to credit his sources in the 1986 edition of *Black Rain*, which is in the sixth volume of *Ibuse Masuji jisen zenshū* 井伏鱒二自選全集 (The complete collection of Ibuse Masuji's self-selected works),⁸ Toyota interpreted that memorandum as Ibuse's belated acknowledgement that he was unable to write about the atomic bombing and so he had to use many hibakusha accounts. As Ibuse's fame increased with the adaptation of *Black Rain* into a film of the same title directly by Imamura Shōhei, Toyota decided to make public the existence of

Shigematsu's diary and then to publish it, regardless of the reluctance of the Shigematsu family.⁹ Toyota first hinted that Ibuse's *Black Rain* was a work of plagiarism through an NHK television program in late September 1988¹⁰ and then used his own copy of Shigematsu's diary to write the book "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki* ("Black rain" and Shigematsu's diary), which was published in 1993. A major component of that book was a chapter-by-chapter examination of Ibuse's novel against Shigematsu's diary in order to demonstrate that Ibuse used the diary too extensively and to suggest that Ibuse's novel was over-acclaimed. Due to the fact that the Shigematsu family did not approve publishing the entire diary, in his book Toyota only published two long passages of the diary (pp. 117-18, 156-57) and provided summaries and explanations for the rest of the diary, sometimes with short quotations of it. According to Toyota, Shigematsu gave him his original diary as a gift in 1965. Toyota's story about his possession of the diary is problematic, as I will show later.

In his later publications, Toyota criticized Ibuse more and more scathingly. He explicitly used the terms "*tōsaku*" 盗作,¹¹ "*hyōsetsu*" 剽窃,¹² and "*tōyō*" 盗用¹³ to argue that Ibuse plagiarized from Shigematsu's diary. The debate about whether or not Ibuse committed plagiarism did not lessen after Shigematsu's diary was published in its entirety in 2001.¹⁴ Echoing Toyota, Inose Naoki 猪瀬直樹 and Tanizawa Eiichi 谷沢永一 criticized Ibuse's initial silence and his tendency to use documents.¹⁵ Nonetheless, they, like Toyota, did not take into consideration sufficiently the contexts of Ibuse's composition and the textual difference between Ibuse's novel and Shigematsu's diary. Therefore, I suggest a re-examination of the plagiarism controversy. My re-examination proceeds along the following three lines: the contexts of Ibuse's composition, the strategies and motives of Toyota, and the textual difference between Ibuse's novel and Shigematsu's diary. I argue that the accusation of *Black Rain* as a work of plagiarism is a decontextualized and misleading oversimplification that neglects the complex process of literary creation. The intertextual inquiry shows that Ibuse's augmentation of the diary has transformed his most important source and created new meanings: Ibuse has elevated the single event of Hiroshima to a symbol of Japan's victimization in order to articulate the Japanese collective desire for peace.

THE CONCEPT OF PLAGIARISM VERSUS THE CONTEXTS OF IBUSE'S COMPOSITION

"Plagiarism" is the English translation for "*tōsaku*," "*hyōsetsu*," and "*tōyō*," the three terms that Toyota used to criticize Ibuse's extensive use of

hibakusha accounts. Alexander Lindey offers a clearer definition of the term “plagiarism” than most dictionaries do: “Plagiarism is literary—or artistic or musical—theft. It is the false assumption of authorship: the wrongful act of taking the product of another person’s mind, and presenting it as one’s own. . . . There can be no plagiarism without the thief’s posing as originator [.]”¹⁶ *Nihon kokugo daijiten* 日本国語大辞典 (Japanese language dictionary)¹⁷ provides helpful definitions for the Japanese terms that stand for plagiarism: “*tōsaku*” refers to the unauthorized representation of another’s work as one’s own, or a work that is presented in this manner; “*hyōsetsu*” refers to the act of stealing another’s work, such as poetry, prose, and/or editorials, and representing it as one’s own; “*tōyō*” means using by stealth or using without permission.¹⁸ Although “*tōsaku*,” “*hyōsetsu*,” and “*tōyō*” can be treated as synonyms for plagiarism, “*hyōsetsu*” is the most formal and serious term. When Toyota used the term “*hyōsetsu*,” his accusation became stronger and more austere in tone. In journalism, the term “*mudan in’yō*” 無断引用 is widely employed to designate using/quoting/citing without attribution. The implication of “*mudan in’yō*” is less serious than *tōsaku*,” “*hyōsetsu*,” and “*tōyō*,” for it suggests that the author may have neglected to provide attribution. In addition, the term “*pakuri*” (ぱくり) is used in slang to refer to imitating things as they are or plagiarizing from another’s work. None of these terms is a legal term in the copyright laws of Japan, but the act of “*tōsaku*,” “*hyōsetsu*,” “*tōyō*,” “*mudan in’yō*,” and “*pakuri*” may result in copyright infringement.

An investigation of the historical contexts of Ibuse’s writing process in terms of the lexical definition of “*tōsaku*,” “*hyōsetsu*,” and “*tōyō*” is useful in demonstrating whether or not Ibuse committed plagiarism. Although Toyota’s accusation of plagiarism was mainly directed at Ibuse’s use of Shigematsu’s diary, in this section I also explore Ibuse’s use of the hibakusha Dr. Iwatake Hiroshi’s notes about his experience of being bombed at the army hospital in Hiroshima in order to have a more thorough examination of the writer’s attitude toward his two major models. The contexts of Ibuse’s composition show that the case of plagiarism in *Black Rain* is not convincing, for Ibuse gained consent from Shigematsu and Iwatake to use their accounts. After reading Shigematsu’s transcribed diary, Ibuse wrote a letter to Shigematsu on 29 March 1963, making it clear that he would not use the diary without Shigematsu’s permission: “In truth, I had been thinking of writing a novel by borrowing various episodes from your diary, but I left it unwritten because it would have been wrong to steal the material without your consent and I, myself, have no actual knowledge of what happened. It has felt as if I have useless treasure in my possession, or that I am a dog being forced to wait to eat the food in front of him. . . . I

am planning to pay you a visit and return the diary."¹⁹ In response, Shigematsu wrote Ibuse on 8 April 1963, telling Ibuse that it was all right to keep the diary at his hand and use it as he pleased and that he was willing to help Ibuse with research on the atomic bombing.²⁰ Even so, Ibuse was still hesitant. He wrote Shigematsu on 4 July 1963 and voiced his view that writings on the atomic bombing by hibakushas were more likely to "pierce one's heart."²¹ It was not until his 19 September 1963/1964 letter to Shigematsu that Ibuse noted he was going to write an a-bomb story by using Shigematsu's diary.²² Ibuse and his magazine publisher Shinchōsha therefore paid Shigematsu 150,000 yen (equivalent to about 1,500,000 yen in the present currency) for providing his diary as the most important source of Ibuse's story.²³ Ibuse also gained consent from Iwatake to use his notes. According to Iwatake, when Ibuse was visiting hibakushas in Hiroshima, he heard about Iwatake's experience of being bombed. Ibuse then paid Iwatake a visit in Tokyo and borrowed his notes on Hiroshima. Iwatake pointed out, "After a while, I received a phone call from Mr. Ibuse. The purpose of the call was to ask if I would allow him to use some of my notes as he had found them extremely helpful. I replied that if they would be useful to him, he was free to use them."²⁴ Ibuse's asking for Shigematsu's and Iwatake's permissions to use their materials shows that he respected intellectual property and was conscious of copyright issues.²⁵ Furthermore, the fact that Ibuse used Iwatake's real name and put Iwatake's notes in quotation marks demonstrates that he was aware of the ethics of the writing profession and was observing them. Although Ibuse followed the historical Shigematsu's request to use his and his wife's names, he altered Shigematsu's name slightly. He reversed the order of family and given names of the historical Shigematsu Shizuma and used different kanjis for the name Shizuma.²⁶ Ibuse's slight change of the historical Shigematsu's name suggests that he was adapting Shigematsu's diary.²⁷

In addition to the private arrangements, Ibuse made public announcements repeatedly about his documentary approach and his use of Shigematsu's diary and Iwatake's notes when he was asked about the novel. Obviously, Ibuse did not want the public to mistake the hibakusha accounts in his novel for his own creations. Although it is difficult to determine exactly when Ibuse made his earliest announcement, his 1 September 1965 interview article "Sakka no sugao" 作家の素顔 (The writer's real face)²⁸ and his 11 July 1966 interview article "Ibuse bungaku ni tsuite" 井伏文学について (About Ibuse's literature)²⁹ at least show that Ibuse's documentary approach was known to the public as early as when *Black Rain* was still serialized in the magazine.³⁰ Ibuse's 20 August 1966 interview article "Watakushi no kotoba" 私の言葉 (My words) (in which Ibuse explained his

use of a hibakusha friend's diary)³¹ and the anonymous 25 September 1966 article in *Sandē mainichi* サンデー毎日 entitled "Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* to Ibuse Masuji" 原爆小説『黒い雨』と井伏鱒二 (A-bomb novel *Black rain* and Ibuse Masuji) (in which Shigematsu and Iwatake were interviewed about Ibuse's utilization of their materials)³² further demonstrate that Ibuse publicized his use of Shigematsu's diary and his verbatim use of Iwatake's notes before *Black Rain* was published in book form and won awards in late 1966. Hence, the fact that Ibuse did not specify Shigematsu's and Iwatake's names in the printed version of the remarks he made upon receiving the Noma Literary Prize in December 1966³³ should not be viewed as Ibuse's deliberate intention to hide his use of their accounts. In his talks and interviews afterwards, Ibuse was consistently candid about his documentary approach and his use of hibakusha accounts, although he did not mention Shigematsu's and Iwatake's names all the time.³⁴

The fact that Toyota knew these contexts undermines his own accusation of plagiarism against Ibuse. According to Toyota's books, he knew that Shigematsu allowed Ibuse to use his diary, that Ibuse's publisher paid Shigematsu money for providing his diary for Ibuse,³⁵ that Ibuse asked for permission from Iwatake to use his notes,³⁶ and that Ibuse publicized his use of Shigematsu's diary before *Black Rain* won awards.³⁷

Readers not knowing the contexts of Ibuse's composition are likely to be misled by Toyota's plagiarism accusation because, as Toyota criticized, Ibuse did not use any notes to credit his sources at the initial publications of *Black Rain* in the 1960s.³⁸ Nevertheless, the lack of documentation cannot serve as evidence of Ibuse's plagiarism, for documentation about the sources in a novel was not a common practice in Japan in the 1960s. The Japan Writers' Association (*Nihon bungeika kyōkai* 日本文芸家協会) (formerly *Bungeika kyōkai*, founded in 1926 and reorganized with the name *Nihon bungeika kyōkai* in 1946) did not establish guidelines until 1978 concerning the crediting of sources in novels published in different formats. The guidelines suggested that a note about the sources should be located at the end of a book (*tankōbon* 単行本) and at the end of each installment when the story is serialized in a magazine.³⁹ The lateness of the guidelines is due to the fact that documentation was not expected in the genre of novels. As Daphne A. Jameson has pointed out, novels are a genre that does not require documentation. Although historical facts and details from outside sources are allowed to be included in novels, documentation is completely omitted. Willa Cather's *Death Comes for the Archbishop*, Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*, and Umberto Eco's *Foucault's Pendulum* incorporate considerable historical information, but no one expects to find endnotes or a bibliography.⁴⁰

The Japan Writers' Association was driven to establish documentation

guidelines in novels because of a number of plagiarism cases in Japan's literary world in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Yamazaki Toyoko 山崎豊子 (1924-) and Niwa Fumio 丹羽文雄 (1904-2005) were accused of plagiarism in their novels. Yamazaki thus temporarily withdrew from the Association and Niwa resigned his post as President there.⁴¹ In attacking, in the 1990s, Ibuse's lack of documentation, Toyota mistakenly applied standards to a work published before those standards had been set. At best, such a tactic was uninformed. At worst, if Toyota was intentionally anachronistic in his application of standards, the tactic was consciously and deliberately destructive.

POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE PLAGIARISM CONTROVERSY

As a matter of fact, Toyota's use of false and/or misleading evidence in his plagiarism accusation against Ibuse suggests that he was consciously and deliberately destructive. First, Toyota spread a rumor that Ibuse and his wife gave the Shigematsu family money in order to suppress the publication of the diary and conceal the writer's slavish use of it. That rumor has been refuted by Shigematsu's adopted son-in-law.⁴² Second, Toyota attributed to Shigematsu the aphorism: "If only we'd been born in a *country*, not a damn-fool *state*."⁴³ That aphorism, however, was written by Ibuse himself, based on his experience as a conscripted soldier in Malaya during the war.⁴⁴ Third, in his writings in the 1990s, Toyota quoted several passages from Shigematsu's diary and juxtaposed them with corresponding passages in Ibuse's novel in order to highlight the similarity between the diary and the novel; nonetheless, the inconsistencies between the same diary passages that Toyota quoted suggests that he distorted the diary in order to make the diary resemble Ibuse's novel more than is in fact the case.⁴⁵

As the third point plays a crucial role in Toyota's plagiarism accusation, it merits further exploration. In his 1993 and 1996 books, Toyota explained that he possessed a xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary so that he could compare the diary with Ibuse's novel. Toyota noted that Shigematsu gave him his "original diary" (*genpon* 原本) as a gift to commemorate their friendship on 6 August 1965, after Shigematsu attended an antinuclear conference in Hiroshima and paid Toyota a visit. But because Ibuse did not return to Shigematsu his transcribed diary after *Black Rain* won high acclaim, Toyota made a photocopy of Shigematsu's diary and returned its original copy to Shigematsu in November 1966.⁴⁶ Sōma Shōichi (who paid Toyota a visit to read his xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary in 1996 and paid the Shigematsu family a visit to read Shigematsu's original diary in spring 1997) first noticed that the diary passages Toyota quoted in his works

deviated from Shigematsu's original diary. Sōma then wrote articles in *Tōkyō shinbun* 東京新聞 (Tokyo newspaper) in 1997 and 1998 to suggest that Toyota distorted Shigematsu's diary. In response, Toyota wrote (also in *Tōkyō shinbun* in 1997 and 1998) that he did not distort Shigematsu's diary but used another version of it. Toyota claimed that, in addition to a xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary, he also possessed a transcribed copy of it and that its genesis was as follows: Toyota met with Shigematsu at the Himetani 姫谷 teahouse in Fukuyama in April 1960. Toyota transcribed Shigematsu's diary first and then Shigematsu transcribed the diary based on Toyota's transcription. Toyota kept the copy he transcribed and Shigematsu sent the copy he transcribed to Ibuse in April 1960. Toyota emphasized that the diary passages he quoted in his works in the 1990s were all based on the transcribed rather than the xeroxed copy, because the transcribed copy was "the definitive version" (*ketteiban* 決定版) of Shigematsu's diary, having exactly the same content as the diary copy that Shigematsu sent to Ibuse. Due to the definitive nature of his transcribed copy, Toyota called it a duplicate of "the original copy" (*genpon*) of Shigematsu's diary. In order to convince people, Toyota declared that he would send his transcribed diary to the Museum of Modern Japanese Literature (*Nihon kindai bungakukan* 日本近代文学館) and let them determine whether his transcribed diary was authentic.⁴⁷

Toyota's articles in *Tōkyō shinbun* actually generated more problems than they solved. To begin with, they did not explain the inconsistencies between the same diary passages that Toyota quoted. As we can see in the example in the appendix, the same passages that Toyota quoted from the single definitive version of the diary show three variations. Moreover, Toyota's articles in *Tōkyō shinbun* produced two new inconsistencies. First, Toyota noted in his 1993 and 1996 books that his xeroxed copy was a reproduction of "the original copy" (*genpon*) of Shigematsu's diary. In this way, Toyota's statement in *Tōkyō shinbun* in 1997 and 1998 that his transcribed rather than his xeroxed copy was a duplicate of "the original copy" of Shigematsu's diary is a self-contradiction. Second, if Toyota's transcribed copy was the definitive version of the diary as he declared in the newspaper, his initial silence about this in his earlier (1993 and 1996) books (in which he only mentioned his xeroxed copy of the diary) is a suspicious discrepancy. Furthermore, the fact that Toyota did not keep his promise to send his transcribed diary to the Museum of Modern Japanese Literature undermines the credibility of his story.

Later, the discovery of the complete volumes of Shigematsu's original diary in 1999⁴⁸ and the discovery of the correspondence between Ibuse and Shigematsu in 2000⁴⁹ make clear that Toyota's knowledge of Shigematsu's

original diary and of the definitive transcribed diary that Shigematsu sent to Ibuse is false. Therefore, Toyota's story about his transcribing the original diary with Shigematsu and about his possession of the definitive transcribed diary is demonstrably a concoction. Shigematsu's original diary, in four volumes, covers several overlapping periods within the ten wartime days from 6 to 15 August 1945 and a postwar period up to about 1960. The first volume covers the period from 6 to 10 August 1945; the second, from 7 to 13 August 1945; the third, from 11 to 12 August 1945; the fourth, from 14 to 15 August 1945 plus a brief account "*Hibaku sonogo no kotodomo*" 被爆其後のことども (After being bombed) about Shigematsu's health after the war and Yasuko's life until her death in 1960. The last two volumes, not discovered by the Shigematsu family until 1999, are regarded as the sequel of the diary. Because the third volume is a clean copy (*jōshokō* 浄書稿) of the part covered in the second volume, scholars tend to discount the third volume and refer to Shigematsu's original diary as having three volumes.⁵⁰

Shigematsu wrote Ibuse on 26 June 1962, offering to send Ibuse his diary.⁵¹ Ibuse replied to Shigematsu on 2 July 1962, showing his interest in reading the diary.⁵² Shigematsu then sent his transcribed diary to Ibuse on 11 July 1962⁵³ and Ibuse received the diary on 15 July 1962.⁵⁴ The transcribed diary that Shigematsu sent to Ibuse included diary entries for the ten wartime days from 6 to 15 August 1945, as Shigematsu himself noted in his 26 June 1962 letter to Ibuse.⁵⁵ At the same time, that diary also included the account "*Hibaku sonogo no kotodomo*," for some episodes in Ibuse's novel have a source in that account. For example, Ibuse's episodes about how the hibakusha's inability to work is satirized as idleness,⁵⁶ how Shigematsu's and Shōkichi's 庄吉 teeth start to fall out after the war and Shōkichi grows a mustache to improve the appearance of his upper lip,⁵⁷ and how Shigematsu gets eruptions the size of beans on his scalp⁵⁸ are modeled on the passages in the account "*Hibaku sonogo no kotodomo*" in Shigematsu's diary pp. 206-8, 205-6, and 209-10 respectively.

However, Toyota asserted that Shigematsu's original diary, in two volumes, covered a period of eight days, from 6 to 13 August 1945.⁵⁹ Obviously, Toyota did not know that Shigematsu's original diary and the transcribed diary that Shigematsu sent to Ibuse included entries for 14 and 15 August 1945 and the account "*Hibaku sonogo no kotodomo*." Furthermore, Toyota is completely mistaken when he insisted in *Tōkyō shinbun* that Shigematsu sent his transcribed diary to Ibuse in April 1960.

Toyota's story about his possession of a xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary is also a fabrication. Toyota claimed that he made a photocopy of Shigematsu's original diary, which Shigematsu gave him in 1965. Nonetheless, according to Shigematsu's adopted son-in-law, Toyota paid

the Shigematsu family a visit on 27 June 1988 and took, without permission, the first two volumes of Shigematsu's original diary to make an unauthorized photocopy. Only after he had the diary in his possession in 1988, did Toyota invent the story about Shigematsu's giving him the diary and accuse Ibuse of plagiarism and of attempting to suppress the publication of Shigematsu's diary.⁶⁰ In sum, it was not Ibuse who abused Shigematsu's trust and exploited the diary; it was Toyota.

Toyota published a small portion of Shigematsu's diary in the August 1959 issue of *Kagen*. At this time, Toyota had only a partial understanding of the diary. Why this is so can be explained by considering Shigematsu's writing process. Shigematsu kept memorandums about his experience of being bombed during the war. Starting from September 1945, he copied down his memorandums in his notebook intermittently. It was not until spring 1949 that he determined to elaborate his memorandums into a full-fledged diary, with the hope that his diary could help future generations to understand the atomic bomb tragedy. Some time after he completed the diary entries for 6 to 13 August 1945 in two volumes in about 1951, he sent the two volumes to Toyota. (Shigematsu was a member of Toyota's tanka club.) After publishing a small part of Shigematsu's diary in the August 1959 issue of *Kagen*, Toyota returned the diary to Shigematsu. When Shigematsu attended the fifth international antinuclear conference on 6 August 1959, he was aware that common people did not have knowledge of the atomic bombing and did not understand the suffering of hibakushas. The awareness motivated Shigematsu to continue working on the entries for 14 and 15 August 1945 in the last volume of his diary. He completed all diary entries for 6 to 15 August 1945 on 10 January 1960, as he himself dated in his diary. His niece Yasuko's death on 21 January 1960 strengthened his antinuclear and antiwar determination. He then transcribed his diary into a clean copy and completed the transcription in February 1961. After Ibuse asked Shigematsu for the diary in his 2 July 1962 letter, Shigematsu added the brief account "*Hibaku sonogo no kotodomo*" as a postscript to both his own original diary and his transcribed diary for Ibuse.⁶¹ Because Toyota did not know Shigematsu's efforts at the last diary volume, he considered the first two volumes that he took from the Shigematsu family on 27 June 1988 to be the complete diary and so provided mistaken descriptions for Shigematsu's original diary.

The fact that Ibuse did not return to Shigematsu his transcribed diary after writing *Black Rain* took a central role in Toyota's plagiarism accusation, for that fact serves as the setting for Toyota's story about his possession of a xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary. Ibuse explained his lapse in two versions—probably given the passage of time, he could not remember the cir-

cumstances exactly. In one version, he cut the diary into pieces,⁶² perhaps in order to use its different sections in his own novel. In another version, having used the diary, he burned what was left.⁶³ Toyota misleadingly took Ibuse's explanation as evidence that Ibuse was deliberately hiding his most important literary source in order to be seen as the principal creator of *Black Rain*. In emphasizing that Shigematsu died in 1980 "grieving" (*nageku* 嘆く) over the fact that Ibuse did not return to him his transcribed diary,⁶⁴ Toyota sought to arouse public resentment against Ibuse. Toyota's sole focus on Ibuse's not returning the diary is misleading, for a larger context shows that Shigematsu was "satisfied" (*manzoku* 満足) and "glad" (*yorokobu*) that Ibuse's use of his diary made the hibakusha's sufferings, lives, and feelings widely known.⁶⁵ Shigematsu's wife also pointed out in 1988 that Shigematsu was "thankful" (*arigatai*) and "glad" (*yorokobu*) that his diary was known abroad owing to Ibuse's work.⁶⁶

In sum, Toyota's accusation of plagiarism against Ibuse in the 1990s is principally the culmination of a long-term resentment about Ibuse's success in writing *Black Rain*. Although Toyota did show some appreciation for Ibuse's novel and praised Ibuse as "a master craftsman" (*meikō* 名工) who made good use of Shigematsu's diary,⁶⁷ a scrutiny of Toyota's books suggests that his underlying stance toward Ibuse's success is resentment. In 1971, he commented that the success of *Black Rain* was "unreliable" (*shin'yō dekinai* 信用できない), for many people simply echoed the praise of the novel without reading the novel itself.⁶⁸ In 1984, he emphasized that many people commended *Black Rain* because they did not know the "weight" (*omomi* 重み) of Shigematsu's diary in the novel.⁶⁹ In 1991, when he introduced the hibakusha Sasaki Sadako 佐々木禎子 (1943-55), he mentioned, digressively, that the success of *Black Rain* was "unexpected" (*omoigakenai* 思いがけない).⁷⁰

Although we are unable to know exactly why Toyota launched a misleading plagiarism accusation to destroy Ibuse's reputation, we may formulate three, not mutually exclusive, assumptions about Toyota's motives. First of all, if Toyota *was* a hibakusha (as he declared himself to be),⁷¹ his attack on Ibuse may stem from his anger and humiliation that a non-hibakusha succeeded in writing what has come to be accepted as *the* novel of the atomic bombing. An issue peculiar to a-bomb literature is the hibakusha's belief that only hibakushas were entitled to write, and were able to write convincingly, about the atomic bombing. Many hibakushas felt that a non-hibakusha like Ibuse could not adequately depict their suffering, pain, and agony.⁷² Although hibakushas had feelings of "fear" and "guilt" about their experience of being bombed, that unique experience also gave them a sense of "pride."⁷³ In this way, a non-hibakusha writer's appro-

priation of the hibakusha experience would sever their intimate connection with the atomic bombing and would overstep “the boundary of ethical privilege” in writing about that catastrophe.⁷⁴ In his books, Toyota repeatedly emphasized that writers who did not experience the atomic bombing were unable to write about it.⁷⁵ Even though Ibuse relied extensively on Shigematsu’s diary, Toyota maintained that *Black Rain* “did not do a good job of depicting the grave realities of the atomic bombing”⁷⁶ but had an air of jest, frivolousness, and exaggeration as the consequence of Ibuse’s “bystander’s” (*bōkanshateki* 傍観者的) stance.⁷⁷ Toyota’s mentality is understandable but unfair. As John Whittier Treat observed, “[t]he sort of literature written by a non-victim should not be required to ‘compete’ with one written by a hibakusha, if for no other reason than because the premise of how knowledge of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is to be grasped is so utterly contrary between any two such works.”⁷⁸ In fact, Ibuse’s choice of a documentary approach suggests that he was trying to be morally responsible for presenting the atomic bombing that he himself did not experience, or he would be criticized as unethical in simply using his imagination to write about that atrocity. In his talks and interviews, Ibuse repeatedly emphasized the journalistic nature of his novel. As he said, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima was an “unprecedented event” (*zenrei no nai koto* 前例のないこと) and could not be reached by “imagination” (*kūsō* 空想);⁷⁹ thus, he “did his best” (*dekirudake*) to write down facts.⁸⁰

Toyota also criticized Ibuse for not sufficiently acknowledging his debts to the hibakushas who offered him their accounts. Toyota observed that, unlike the non-hibakusha writer Ōe Kenzaburō 大江健三郎 (1935-), who donated part of the royalties he earned from his a-bomb work *Hiroshima nōto* ヒロシマ・ノート (*Hiroshima notes*, 1965) to hibakushas, Ibuse did not pay all the hibakushas for the documents they provided, even though he earned handsome royalties from different versions, translations, and adaptations of *Black Rain*.⁸¹ It may be true that Ibuse did not financially contribute to the hibakushas, but it does not follow that he was nonchalant about them. His efforts at faithfully presenting the atomic bombing suggest he was respectful of the hibakusha experience. His use of character names that bear great similarity to or remain identical to the names of the hibakushas may be regarded as his recognition of his obligation to them. Furthermore, his signing an antinuclear appeal in 1982 was his practical action to prevent such events as the atomic bombing of Hiroshima from happening again.⁸²

Secondly, in addition to revealing his victim mentality, Toyota’s attack on Ibuse may come from his feeling of being threatened by Ibuse’s success. Toyota has been interested in collecting and introducing hibakusha

accounts since the 1950s⁸³ and he sees himself as an expert of them. As Toyota himself noted, he was using his “professional eye” (*senmon no me* 専門の眼) to choose major works on the atomic bombing for his 1971 book *Genbaku bunkenshi* (A guide to writings on the atomic bombing).⁸⁴ Although Ibuse was Toyota’s senior by twenty-three years, Toyota saw Ibuse as a novice in the field of the atomic bombing. Toyota’s condescension can be detected from his description that Ibuse’s voice was like a “polite boy” (*rei no shōnen* 礼の少年) when they had a talk over the phone in 1965 about Ibuse’s *Black Rain*.⁸⁵

Thirdly, Toyota’s attack on Ibuse may result from his feeling that Ibuse did not sufficiently acknowledge his help with the writing of *Black Rain*. Toyota felt that he helped Ibuse a lot, pointing out that he suggested Shigematsu to send his diary to Ibuse,⁸⁶ that he provided Ibuse with about ten volumes of books on the atomic bombing when Ibuse was writing his novel,⁸⁷ and that he suggested changing the common title *Mei no kekkon* to the praise-winning title *Kuroi ame*.⁸⁸ Toyota noted that, because of Ibuse’s “wariness” (*keikaishin* 警戒心) against him, Ibuse did not publicize his name and acknowledge his advice in changing the title.⁸⁹ Toyota’s statements suggest that he expected Ibuse to publicly mention his name and acknowledge his help. It is difficult to verify whether Toyota played an important part in Ibuse’s writing process, as Toyota himself maintained, and whether Ibuse had publicly acknowledged any help he received from Toyota and had showed admiration for Toyota’s knowledge.

IBUSE’S AUGMENTATION OF SHIGEMATSU’S DIARY

Several scholars have sought to pinpoint the textual difference between Ibuse’s novel and Shigematsu’s diary in order to refute Toyota’s accusation that Ibuse committed plagiarism. For instance, Yamaori Tetsuo 山折哲雄 argued that Ibuse’s recurrent use of the sutra “*Hakkotsu no gobunshō*” 白骨の御文章 (Sermon on mortality) by the monk Rennyō 蓮如 (1415-99), which laments the transience and fragility of human life, reinforces the pathos of the catastrophe of the atomic bombing.⁹⁰ Masumura Teruko 増村照子 argued that Ibuse’s use of onomatopoeia highlights the disastrous effects of the atomic bombing.⁹¹ Maeda Sadaaki argued that Ibuse transformed the diary by providing more specific details in describing Shigematsu’s damaged house and by giving Shigematsu a more objective image.⁹² While all these arguments are true, they are fragmentary readings, for they do not present a complete picture of how and why Ibuse transformed the diary. Therefore, I suggest the need for a re-examination of the relationship between the novel and the diary from the perspective of intertextuality.

This intertextual inquiry should take into consideration the most characteristic of Ibuse's change of the diary. Only then will we be able to obtain a more accurate picture of Ibuse's creative process.

Julia Kristeva is credited with coining the term "intertextuality" and with bringing its theory into focus in the late 1960s. In her essay "The Bounded Text," Kristeva pointed out that authors do not create their texts only from their own minds but from pre-existent texts. As she put it, any text is "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another."⁹³ In other words, there is no independent text; whether or not writers create new meanings out of the texts that they have known before is the criterion to judge originality.

The French literary critic Gérard Genette's deformation and appropriation of Kristeva's idea of intertextuality is especially useful in elucidating the relationship between *Black Rain* and Shigematsu's diary. Unlike most critics who used the term "intertextuality" to refer to how one text relates to the other texts surrounding it, Genette coined the term "transtextuality" to explain similar concepts. Transtextuality literally means "the textual transcendence of the text" and refers to "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts."⁹⁴ One kind of transtextuality suggested by Genette is "hypertextuality," which explores how "a text derive[s] from another preexistent text."⁹⁵ As he stated, hypertextuality refers to "any relationship uniting a text B (. . . the *hypertext*) to an earlier text A (. . . the *hypotext*), upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary."⁹⁶ In Genette's terminology, the source is the hypotext and the derivative is the hypertext. Since Shigematsu's diary is the major source for *Black Rain*, it is the hypotext for Ibuse's hypertext. The most characteristic way in which Ibuse transformed Shigematsu's diary is augmentation.⁹⁷ In addition to using Shigematsu's diary, Ibuse added an omniscient narrator's narrative and diverse accounts of the atomic bombing. Such a strategy of augmentation transforms Hiroshima into a symbol of Japan's victimization and emphasizes the Japanese collective desire for peace.

The method that Ibuse used to transform Hiroshima into a symbol of Japan is to reveal the essence of Japan in the episodes he added. Before the publication of Shigematsu's diary, Saeki Shōichi 佐伯彰一 and John Whittier Treat had intuited Ibuse's attempt to represent the Japanese national character in *Black Rain*.⁹⁸ The publication of Shigematsu's diary proves that the representation of Japanese essence is not only an important feature of Ibuse's novel per se but also a crucial strategy that Ibuse used to transform Shigematsu's diary and create new meanings. Ibuse's addition of several episodes in the omniscient narrator's narrative and in Yasuko's diary that

refer to Japanese essence is the effort in this regard. Some of these episodes: the ginkgo tree by Kōtarō's 好太郎 house (under which Shigematsu used to play in his boyhood),⁹⁹ Shigematsu, Shōkichi, and Asajirō's 浅二郎 rearing the carp in order to be able to fish with a completely easy mind,¹⁰⁰ the first extension of postal service to all Japanese major cities in the sixth year of Meiji,¹⁰¹ and Mrs. Nojima's 能島 father's performance of a tea ceremony for Yasuko and other neighbors.¹⁰² Although these episodes that involve diverse aspects of Japan (be they floral, faunal, social, or cultural) are not directly related to the atomic bombing, it is through the reference to the Japanese essence that Ibuse was able to transform Hiroshima into part of it. As the ginkgo tree, the carp, the official postal service in 1873, and the tea ceremony are distinctive features of Japan, so is Hiroshima.

For Ibuse, Hiroshima represents the essence of victimization. Undeniably, the historical Shigematsu's diary offers first-hand information about the damage caused by the atomic bombing, but Ibuse's augmentation of the diary—by adding recurrent episodes about Yasuko's marriage and health problems—enhances the theme of victimization. The historical Shigematsu did not write about his niece Yasuko's marriage problems in his diary. Although the historical Yasuko indeed had marriage problems and Ibuse was inspired by her story, he made a significant change to his source. Unlike the historical Yasuko, the character Yasuko remains unmarried until the end of the novel. The depiction of Yasuko as a victim is made even more explicit by Ibuse's addition of the following episodes: Yasuko is exposed to the public gaze when a lady from the village of Yamano 山野 searching for a marriage prospect asks Kōtarō about Yasuko's health;¹⁰³ Yasuko's marriage agreement with the young man of the Aonos 青乃 is broken because she starts to show symptoms of radiation sickness;¹⁰⁴ Yasuko's illness grows rapidly worse to the degree that Shigematsu shifts his concern from her marriage to her survival;¹⁰⁵ Yasuko's illness becomes so serious that Shigematsu comes to the conclusion that the miracle of her recovery could never come to pass.¹⁰⁶ In order to suggest the possible sources for Yasuko's development of radiation sickness, Ibuse added the following two episodes that do not have a source in the historical Shigematsu's diary. In the first, Yasuko is pelted by the black rain when she gets on a boat to return from Furue-chō 古江町 to Hiroshima.¹⁰⁷ In the second, on their way to taking refuge at Furuichi, Shigematsu asks Shigeko and Yasuko to wrap a towel around their left elbows so that they can crouch down beneath the wires at the streetcar stop at Kamiya-chō 紙屋町; Yasuko grazes her elbow because she has wound the towel the wrong way.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, in contrast to the single generic term "*genshibyō*" 原子病 (radiation disease) that the historical Shigematsu used in his diary to designate his niece's illness (pp. 217,

218), Ibuse, in order to underline the seriousness of the character Yasuko's illness, added episodes about her suffering from almost every a-bomb symptom known: deteriorated sight, constant ringing in the ears, fever, diarrhea, abscess on the buttocks, falling out of hair and teeth, anemia, lack of appetite, attack of violent pain, and periodontitis.¹⁰⁹ Although there are numerous hibakushas in *Black Rain*, Ibuse's choice of Yasuko as the representative of a-bomb victims is instrumental in advancing the theme of victimization because of female's conventional role in "the semiotics of victimology," to use David Der-wei Wang's phrase.¹¹⁰

Ibuse also created a sense of collective suffering by adding the following episodes or accounts that do not have a source in the historical Shigematsu's diary: Sukune Kyūzō's 宿禰久三 brother's recognizing disfigured Kyūzō by his belt,¹¹¹ Shigeko's account "Diet in Wartime Hiroshima,"¹¹² Satō Susumu's 佐藤進 account of the death of the superintendent-general Ōtsuka 大塚,¹¹³ train passengers' talking about the atomic bombing,¹¹⁴ the death of Mitsuda Taka 充田タカ and her son's becoming a human torpedo,¹¹⁵ the death of pupils from the Miyoshi 三次 Girls' High School,¹¹⁶ Tabuchi Jitsuo's 田淵実夫 account of the atomic bombing,¹¹⁷ the death of engineers,¹¹⁸ the loss of city hall employees,¹¹⁹ the death of the mayor Kuriya 栗屋 and his grandchild,¹²⁰ the injury of the deputy mayor Shibata 柴田,¹²¹ Nakao's 中尾 losing touch with his son,¹²² the death of Mitsuda Saki 蜜田サキ,¹²³ school pupils' volunteering for war work,¹²⁴ the work of the relief squad,¹²⁵ Fujita Teiko's 藤田テイ子 search for her brother-in-law,¹²⁶ Ōshima Tamiyo's 大島タミ代 devotion to the injured,¹²⁷ Dr. Iwatake's notes about his experience of being bombed,¹²⁸ and Mrs. Iwatake's reminiscences of the war period and her notes about Dr. Iwatake's recovery.¹²⁹

The collectivity that Ibuse created is not so much about the citizens of Hiroshima as about the citizens of the whole nation. Two episodes that Ibuse added to the historical Shigematsu's diary show the writer's attempt to connect Hiroshima with the Japanese victimization in general. In the first, as the character Shigematsu watches the people who wait to be sent to the Furuichi Station,

one of them yelled, 'I saw it! I saw it!' and dashing out into the courtyard picked up what looked like a scrap of paper that came fluttering down from the sky.

'What've you got there?' said someone. 'A five yen or ten yen note, I'll bet.'

But it was only a scrap of paper after all, a burnt fragment of sheet music. It must have come from somebody's home—or the teachers' room, perhaps, at some primary school—and been carried up into the sky, alight, by the blast from the previous day's raid,

then roamed the void for a whole day and night before coming to earth again. Beneath the notes were printed the words: 'Cherry blossom, cherry blossom, in the spring sky. . . .'¹³⁰

Since many people regard the cherry blossom as the national flower of Japan, the falling sheet music symbolically suggests the victimization of Japan. In the second, the women who wait in the river until their clothes dry tell Shigeko and Yasuko:

In the playground of the First Prefectural Middle School in the city . . . there was a reservoir of water for firefighting purposes. Around it, hundreds of middle school students and voluntary war workers lay dead. They were piled up at the edge of the reservoir, half-naked since their shirts had been burned away. Seen from a distance, they looked like beds of tulips planted round the water. Seen closer, they were more like the layers of petals on a chrysanthemum.¹³¹

Ibuse's comparison of the dead bodies to the petals of the chrysanthemum, the imperial and national seal of Japan, hammers home the idea of Japanese victimization.

The historical Shigematsu's purpose in keeping a diary about the atomic bombing is twofold: he sought to provide an authentic description of his experience of the atomic bomb tragedy and to express his wish for peace. Ibuse's augmentation of Shigematsu's diary achieves Shigematsu's purpose more effectively. Ibuse's addition of diverse accounts of the atomic bombing not only provides a more comprehensive portrayal of that historical event but also transforms Shigematsu's personal desire for peace into a collective wish. In the novel, the language that Ibuse used to express the protagonist Shigematsu's desire for peace is similar to his source.¹³² In addition, Ibuse added several other characters' anti-war remarks to generalize the peace wish. For instance, Yasuko notes in her diary entry on 7 August 1945, "Hiroshima is a burnt-out city, a city of ashes, a city of death, a city of destruction, the heaps of corpses a mute protest against the inhumanity of war."¹³³ Dr. Iwatake similarly notes, "[The ringing, caused by radiation sickness,] persists in my ear day and night, like the tolling of a distant temple bell, warning man of the folly of the bomb."¹³⁴

After the examination of hypertextuality in *Black Rain*, an exploration of its "paratextuality," another kind of transtextuality in Gérard Genette's theory, helps to illustrate Ibuse's strategy of augmentation and his expectation of readers' responses. Genette divided the paratext into two categories: the peritext and the epitext. The former includes the elements that frame the text (such as book titles, chapter titles, prefaces, and notes); the latter refers to the elements outside the text (such as interviews, publicity

announcements, reviews, private letters, and other authorial and editorial discussions). As Genette put it, all the paratextual elements, which stand on the threshold of a text, constitute “a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of *transaction*: a privileged place of a pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that—whether well or poorly understood and achieved—is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it[.]”¹³⁵ In other words, an important function of paratextuality is to direct readers’ reception of a text.

Among the paratexts of *Black Rain*, Ibuse’s authorial discussions and his memorandum (*oboegaki*), which performs a similar function as a note, are especially relevant to our inquiry. In his preface to the book *Hachigatsu muika o egaku: sakuhinshū* 八月六日を描く：作品集 (Describing 6 August: a collection of works), Ibuse explained his strategy of augmentation. He pointed out that, since the atomic bombing was an unprecedented event that happened suddenly and ended in an instant, even hibakushas themselves were unable to capture a complete picture of it; however, the juxtaposition of various accounts of the atomic bombing redressed the deficiency of a single hibakusha’s limited view. As he observed, “if you relate only a single person’s experience of a big event, it would present a very limited view. It would be like a blind person’s account of touching an elephant.”¹³⁶

Ibuse’s extensive use of documents made him modestly state that he was like the editor of *Black Rain* in his oral presentation of the remarks he made upon receiving the Noma Literary Prize. Nevertheless, the memorandum (*oboegaki*) of the 1986 edition of *Black Rain* shows that Ibuse still expected his creative efforts to be recognized and readers to remember him as a *novelist*. The memorandum goes:

この作品は小説でなくてドキュメントである。閑間重松の被爆日記、閑間夫人の戦時中の食糧雑記、並びに岩竹博医師の被爆日記、岩竹夫人の看護日記、複数被爆者の体験談、家屋疎開勤労奉仕隊数人の体験談、及び各人の解説によつて書いた。熊手をもつて掻き集めるやうにして書いた。空前の出来事であり二度と繰返してはならないことだから [。]¹³⁷

This work is not fictional but documentational. I wrote it based on Shizuma Shigematsu’s diary about his experience of being bombed, Shizuma’s wife’s notes about the diet during the war, Dr. Iwatake Hiroshi’s diary about his experience of being bombed, Iwatake’s wife’s diary about how she took care of Iwatake, several hibakushas’ experiences, the experiences of members of the Service Corps who dismantled houses, and these people’s explanations regarding their accounts. I wrote this book as if I were raking all the information out there together, for [Hiroshima] was an unprece-

dented event, which must never be allowed to happen again[.]

The first sentence この作品は小説でなくてドキュメントである may be interpreted as meaning “this work is not a novel but a document,” as Toyota did;¹³⁸ nonetheless, it is more appropriate to interpret the sentence as meaning “this work is not fictional but documentary” for the following two reasons. First, Ibuse used character names in this memorandum, such as 閑間重松 (Shizuma Shigematsu) and 閑間夫人 (Shizuma Fujin). Because Ibuse publicized his model Shigematsu Shizuma’s name at the initial publication of *Black Rain* in the 1960s, the use of character names in this memorandum should not be seen as Ibuse’s intention to hide his sources, but rather as his expectation that, despite his documentary approach, readers perceive *Black Rain* as a *novel*. To interpret この作品は小説でなく as meaning “this work is not a novel” would deny the novelistic nature that Ibuse sought to emphasize that his work had. Second, the word “*kumade*” 熊手 (rake) is a metaphor that suggests a process of deliberate arrangement to make things in order and understandable. Hence, to interpret the word ドキュメント as standing for the noun “document” would mistakenly ignore Ibuse’s expectation that readers pay attention to *how* and *why* he arranged the documents in certain ways in order to portray the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

CONCLUSION

This essay has shown that Toyota’s accusation of *Black Rain* as a work of plagiarism, which mainly stemmed from his personal grudge against Ibuse, is misleading and problematic. Ibuse not only acknowledged his use of Shigematsu’s diary in the 1960s but also has transformed the diary through the strategy of augmentation. His use of diverse accounts of Hiroshima shows his efforts to describe that unprecedented event faithfully and responsibly. In literary terms, Ibuse’s augmentation of Shigematsu’s diary not merely has generated new meanings in making Hiroshima a symbol of Japan’s victimization that evokes the nation’s pacifist stance but also has aestheticized the suffering of the Japanese. His elaboration on the female protagonist’s marriage problems is a gentle touch that underlines the devastating effects of the atomic bombing.¹³⁹ Furthermore, his addition of episodes that refer to the cherry blossom and the chrysanthemum may be read as a tribute to the Japanese sense of beauty and a reminder of the culture’s victimization.

Plagiarism cases abound in modern Japanese literature. Let us name only a few of them: Tayama Katai’s 田山花袋 (1871-1930) *Inaka kyōshi* 田舎教師 (Country teacher, 1909); Mori Ōgai’s 森鷗外 (1862-1922) “Hatori Chihiro”

羽鳥千尋 (Hatori Chihiro, 1912), *Abe ichizoku* 阿部一族 (The Abe family, 1913), and *Shibue Chūsai* 渋江抽齋 (Shibue Chūsai, 1916); Tokutomi Roka's 徳富蘆花 (1868-1927) *Takezaki Junko* 竹崎順子 (Takezaki Junko, 1923); Ibuse Masuji's "Aogashima daigaiki" 青ヶ島大概記 (A general account of Aogashima, 1934) and *Jon Manjirō hyōryūki* ジョン万次郎漂流記 (The cast-away account of John Manjirō, 1937); Dazai Osamu's 太宰治 (1909-48) "Kyokō no haru" 虚構の春 (A fictional spring, 1936), "Joseito" 女生徒 (The schoolgirl, 1939), and *Shayō* 斜陽 (The setting sun, 1947); Shōji Kaoru's 庄司薫 (1937-) *Akazukin-chan ki o tsukete* 赤頭巾ちゃん気をつけて (Take care, Little Red Riding Hood, 1969); Miyahara Akio's 宮原昭夫 (1932-) *Dareka ga sawatta* 誰かが触った (Someone touched it, 1972); Ariyoshi Sawako's 有吉佐和子 (1931-84) *Fukugō osen* 複合汚染 (Compound pollution, 1975); Usui Yoshimi's 臼井吉見 (1905-87) *Jiko no tenmatsu* 事故のてんまつ (A complete account of the accident, 1977); Yamazaki Toyoko's *Daichi no ko* 大地の子 (Son of the earth, 1991); and Hirano Keiichirō's 平野啓一郎 (1975-) *Nisshoku* 日蝕 (Solar eclipse, 1998).¹⁴⁰ The intertextual characteristics of these works differ. Some are based on diaries; some, letters; some, historical accounts; some, scientific documents; some, a prior Japanese writer's work; some, a Western writer's work. Although there may or may not be political, moral, and aesthetic subtexts involved in these cases, they lead one to the following questions: What is a literary creation in Japanese literature? Can intertextuality be regarded as emblematic of the creative process in modern Japanese literature? Do the ideas of originality, literary borrowing, and imitation differ between Japanese and other literary traditions?

The topic of plagiarism and literary creation in Japanese literature cries out for extended treatment. The present essay can only be considered a first step toward understanding the complexities of the topic. Ibuse's case helps us to rethink the place of intertextuality (and therefore the question of "plagiarism"—"tōsaku," "hyōsetsu," "tōyō," "mudan in'yō," and "pakuri") in twentieth-century Japanese prose.

Appendix

The following is a juxtaposition of the same diary passages from (1) Shigematsu's diary, (2) Toyota's 1993 book, (3) Toyota's 1995 article, (4) Toyota's 1996 book, and (5) Ibuse's novel.¹⁴¹ The parts distorted by Toyota, whether through revision of the sentences themselves or through his own additions, are underlined, as are the parts in Ibuse's novel that Toyota imitated.

(1) Shigematsu, *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 47-48.

ようやく山本駅にたどりついた。電車は満員だったが、どうにか押して車内

に入った。荷物だと思って、肩でじわりじわり押した婦人の荷物は、どうも荷物らしくない。そうとさわってみると、子供さんらしい。しまった、体がじいんと縮んだ。「子供さんですか」と尋ねると、
「そうです。死んでいるのです」
.....

眼をそらすと、電線の上を鳶がゆうゆうと舞っている。北の山では油蟬が、耳に立つ様に鳴いている。向うの国道を風か吹き、ほこりを押しまくってゆく。まばらに北へ避難して行く負傷者が、ほこりに包まれて見えなくなる。自分が火煙の中を潜っている時の心になってしまう。頭がぐらつく。国道から目をそらすと、蓮根の葉が大きくゆれている間から、つぶららしい水鳥が、二メートルばかりたち上ったが、又葉の間へおりていった。

発車すると云う声が聞える。車外の人が乗ろうと右往左往するが、もう乗れそうにもない。油蟬の鳴き声が、やたらに心をせきたて、いらいらさせる。電車ががくと、動いては止る。又動くが止る。三四回動いて、ようやくごろりごろりと走りだした。プラットホームに取り残された人が、ぼんやり立って見送って居てくれる。線路続きの民家の屋根から、数羽の雀が一斉に飛び立った。此のあたりの雀は、焼けて居ないらしい。元気そうだ。

[Ibuse will change all the underlined material, as he adapts the diary to his novel.]

(2) Toyota, "Kuroi ame" to Shigematsu nikki, pp. 156-57.

ようやく山本駅へたどり着いた。

電車は満員だったが、どうにか押して車内にはいった。

荷物だと思って、肩でじわりじわり押した。

婦人の荷物はどうも荷物らしくない。そうとさわってみると、子供さんらしい。

しまった。体がじいんと縮んだ。

「お子さんでしょうか」

とたずねると、

「そうです。死んでいるのです」
.....

眼をそらすと、電線の上を鳶がゆうゆうと舞っている。北の山では油蟬が耳に立つように鳴いている。

向うの国道を突風が吹き、ほこりを押しまくってゆく。まばらに北へ避難して行く負傷者がほこりに包まれて、見えなくなる。自分が火煙の中を潜っている時の心になってしまう。頭がぐらつく。国道から目をそらすと蓮根の葉が大きく揺れている。その間からつぶららしい水鳥が二メートルばかりたち上ったが、また葉の間へおりて行った。発車するという声が聞こえる。車外の人が乗ろうと右往左往するが、もう乗れそうにもない。油蟬の声はやたらに心をせきたてて、気をいらいらさせる。

電車ががくと動いては止まる。また動くが止まる。三、四回動いてようやくごろりごろりと走りだした。

プラットホームに取り残された人が、ぼんやり立って見送っていてくれる。

線路つづきの民家の屋根から、数羽の雀が一斉に飛びたつた。このあたりの松 [sic] は焼けていないらしい。元気そうだ。

[Toyota does not yet change the diary, for his intention here is primarily to show the similarity between the diary and Ibuse's novel, not to accuse him of plagiarism.]

(3) Toyota, "Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame wa tōsaku datta noka*," p. 14.

ようやく山本駅へたどり着いた。 [Here the beginning remains unchanged.]

電車は満員だったが、どうにか押して車内にはいった。

荷物だと思って、肩でじわりじわり押した。

婦人の荷物はどうも荷物らしくない。そうとさわってみると、子供さんらしい。

しまった。体がじいんと縮んだ。

「お子さんでしょうか」

とたずねると、

「そうです。死んでいるのです」

僕はぎくりとした。

[This line is Toyota's addition to the diary. He takes it from Ibuse's novel.]

.....

……眼をそらすと、電線の上を鳶がゆうゆうと舞い、油蟬が耳に立つように鳴いている。

発車だという声が聞こえると、車輻に乗れない人たちが、しきりに騒ぎだした。電車はがくと動いては止まり、またがくと動いて止まった。

[He also changes these sentences from the diary in order to make them more similar to Ibuse's sentences in his novel.]

(4) Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 76-78.

やっと山本駅へたどり着いた。

[Toyota takes this phrase from Ibuse and inserts it into the diary as Shigematsu's own.]

電車は満員だったが、どうにか押して車内にはいった。

荷物だと思って、肩でじわりじわり押した。

婦人の荷物はどうも荷物らしくない。そうとさわってみると、子供さんらしい。

しまった。体がじいんと縮んだ。

「お子さんでしょうか」

とたずねると、

「そうです。死んでいるのです」

僕はぎくりとした。 [Again, as in (3), this is Toyota's addition to the diary.]

.....

……眼をそらすと、電線の上を鳶がゆうゆうと舞い、油蟬が耳に立つように鳴いている。

発車だという声が聞こえると、車輻に乗れない人たちが、しきりに騒ぎだした。電車はがくと動いては止まり、またがくと動いて止まった。

[He continues to make the same changes here, as in (3).]

(5) Ibuse, *Black Rain*, pp. 142-43.

やつと [Toyota inserted this phrase into Shigematsu's diary as Shigematsu's own.] 山本駅に辿りついた。ここから先は電車が動いてゐる。車輻は満員になってゐたが、どうにか割込んで行つて我々もデッキに立つことが出来た。僕は身動きも出来なくて、すぐ鼻の先にある荷物を肩でじわりじわりと押した。その荷物は、三十前後の綺麗な顔つきの婦人が担いでゐる白い布包みだが、どうも荷物らしくは思はれない。そつと手で触つてみると、人間の耳を撫でる手応へを受けた。布包みのなかは子供らしいが、こんな負んぶの仕方はない。この人混みのなかで

は窒息するにきまつてゐる。言語道断である。

「失礼ですが、奥さん」と僕は婦人に、ひそひそ声で云つた。「お子供さんですか」

「そうです」と婦人も、あるか無しかの声で云つた。「死んでゐるのです」

僕はざくりとした。 [This is the sentence from Ibuse that Toyota inserted into the diary.]

.....

電線の上を鳶が舞ひ、油蟬の音が聞え、国道のわきの蓮池にカイツブリか忙しうに泳いでゐた。ごく普通であるこの風景が珍しいものに見えた。

発車だといふ声が聞えると、車に乗れない人たちが一としきりざわつた。電車は、がくんと動いて止まり、またがくんと動いて止まつた。

[Here, too, are sentences from Ibuse that Toyota claimed were Shigematsu's.]

We can see that, in the beginning, Toyota was a careful editor of Shigematsu's diary. However, as he became obsessed with accusing Ibuse of plagiarism, he changed the diary in order to support his accusation.¹⁴²

Notes

1. "Shōwa yonjūichi nendo dai jūkyū kai Noma bungeishō Ibuse Masuji-shi *Kuroi ame ni kettei*" 昭和四十一年度第十九回野間文芸賞井伏鱒二氏『黒い雨』に決定, *Gunzō* 群像 22.1 (1967): 294.

2. Tada Michitarō 多田道太郎, "Sengo besutoserā monogatari 71: Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame*" 戦後ベストセラー物語71: 井伏鱒二『黒い雨』, *Asahi jōnanaru* 朝日ジャーナル 9.10 (1967): 36.

3. For Ibuse's writing process, see John Whittier Treat, *Pools of Water, Pillars of Fire: The Literature of Ibuse Masuji* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), pp. 202, 206-9; and Sōma Shōichi 相馬正一, "Kaisetsu" 解説, in *Shigematsu nikki* 重松日記, 3rd printing, ed. Sōma Shōichi (Chikuma shobō, 2001), pp. 280-91.

4. See Toyota Seishi, "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki* 『黒い雨』と重松日記 (Nagoya: Fūbaisha, 1993), p. 25. According to Terayoko Takeo 寺横武夫, Toyota later also published almost the same diary passage that he had published in the August 1959 issue of *Kagen* (pp. 17-18) in his book *Genbaku bunkenshi* 原爆文献誌 (Nagareyama: Ron shobō, 1971, pp. 80-82) and in the January 1981 issue of *Kagen* (pp. 23-25). See Terayoko Takeo, "*Kuroi ame chūkai*" 『黒い雨』注解, in *Ibuse Masuji kenkyū* 井伏鱒二研究, ed. Isogai Hideo 磯貝英夫 (Hiroshima: Keisuisha, 1984), pp. 375-77 n. 4. Toyota edited the diary passage he published in the three books, so it is not identical with Shigematsu's original text. See "Jijitsu kankei ni gimonten: Toyota-shi no '*Kuroi ame*' to . . ." 事実関係に疑問点: 豊田氏の『黒い雨』と..., *Chūgoku shinbun* 中国新聞, 20 September 1993, p. 9.

5. Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki*, p. 39.

6. See *Ibid.*, p. 49.

7. Toyota Seishi, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji* 知られざる井伏鱒二 (Sōyōsha, 1996), p. 16.

8. In this paper, references to the Japanese text of *Black Rain* are from this edition, published by Shichōsha.

9. Shimizu Bonpei 清水凡平, "Shigematsu nikki o meguru kyo to jitsu" 重松日記をめぐる虚と実, *Songyo* 尊魚 4 (1999): 84.

10. Toyota claimed that he came to know Ibuse through a personal visit after the war; see Toyota's "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 63-64. In his 15 March 1966 letter to Shigematsu, Ibuse mentioned Toyota's name, which suggests that Ibuse did know

Toyota; see Ibuse Masuji, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan" 重松静馬宛井伏鱒二書簡, in *Shigematsu nikki*, 3rd printing, p. 267. After Toyota stirred up the plagiarism controversy through the NHK television program, Ibuse treated the controversy with indifference. He did not want to talk about it and denied that he knew Toyota. For Ibuse, Toyota's approach of exploring factual elements in the novel was missing the point. See Shimizu, "Shigematsu nikki o meguru kyo to jitsu," pp. 72-75, 84; and Shimizu Bonpei, "Kuroi ame: Ibuse bungaku to kyōdo" 『黒い雨』: 井伏文学と郷土, *Aki bungaku* 安芸文学 70 (2002): 44. According to Sōma Shōichi, while *Black Rain* was in serialization, Shigematsu alerted Ibuse to Toyota's radical criticism of the novel. See Sōma Shōichi, "Kuroi ame to Shigematsu nikki," *Shinchō* 98.6 (2001): 230.

11. Toyota Seishi, "Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka: sakuhin to hibakusha no shiryō o kenshō suru" 井伏鱒二の『黒い雨』は盗作だったのか: 作品と被爆者の資料を検証する, *Shūkan kin'yōbi* 週刊金曜日 3.47 (1995): 10; Toyota Seishi, "Ibuse sakuhin *Kuroi ame* no kenshō" 井伏作品『黒い雨』の検証, *Kagen* 44.169 (2000): 6; Toyota Seishi, "Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* no shinjitsu: zenbun no kyūwari ijō ga in'yō datta" 井伏鱒二『黒い雨』の真実: 全文の九割以上が引用だった, *Shūkan kin'yōbi* 10.13 (2002): 58.

12. Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 15.

13. Toyota Seishi, "Tōyō Shigematsu nikki hoka no najitsu: Ibuse-shi ni sakka no ryōshin ga hoshikatta" 盗用重松日記ほかの内実: 井伏氏に作家の良心が欲しかった, *Kagen* 45. 172 (2001): 51.

14. Shigematsu's diary—composed of the following three volumes: "*Kaen no hi*" 火焔の日 (Days of the flame), "*Hibaku no ki*" 被爆の記 (Diary of an a-bomb victim), and "*Zoku-hibaku no ki*" 続・被爆の記 (Diary of an a-bomb victim, the sequel)—was published in the book *Shigematsu nikki*. The book's umbrella title does not reflect its contents, which include not only Shigematsu's diary but also the notes of the hibakusha Dr. Iwatake Hiroshi 岩竹博 (1901-92) (another major source of *Black Rain*), Ibuse's letters to Shigematsu, and the editor Sōma Shōichi's commentary. In order to avoid confusion, in this essay I use the term "Shigematsu's diary," without italics, to refer to the diary itself. The first printing (*satsu* 刷) of the book *Shigematsu nikki* was published on 25 May 2001 by Chikuma shobō. The third printing I am using was published on 25 September 2001 by the same publisher. According to the editor of the book, the third printing corrected date mistakes in the correspondence between Ibuse and Shigematsu in the first printing and mistakes in the map of Shigematsu's route in Hiroshima on the day the bomb fell in the second printing. See Sōma Shōichi, "Kiroku bungaku *Kuroi ame* no hōhō" 記録文学『黒い雨』の方法, *Aki bungaku* 70 (2002): 37; and Sōma Shōichi, "Kenshō Shigematsu nikki to sono shūen: netsuzō shiryō ni yoru gensetsu hihan" 検証重松日記とその周縁: 捏造資料に拠る言説批判, *Songyo* 7 (2002): 95.

15. See Inose Naoki, "Shigematsu nikki shuppan o kangei suru: *Kuroi ame* to Ibuse Masuji no shinsō" 重松日記出版を歓迎する: 『黒い雨』と井伏鱒二の深層, *Bungakukai* 文学界 55.8 (2001): 194-212; and Tanizawa Eiichi and Inose Naoki, "Sakka no chinmoku bungaku no shūen: bundan ni tou *Kuroi ame* wa hontōni sengo bungaku no kessaku ka" 作家の沈黙文学の終焉: 文壇に問う『黒い雨』は本当に戦後文学の傑作か, *Boisu* ボイス=Voice 284 (2001): 180-89.

16. Alexander Lindey, *Plagiarism and Originality* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), p. 2.

17. I am using the second edition of *Nihon kokugo daijiten* (Shōgakukan, 2000-2002).

18. The usage of "tōyō" is broader than "tōsaku" and "hyōsetsu." Besides plagiarism, "tōyō" is also used to refer to misappropriation/embezzlement of public money and unauthorized use of seal.

19. Ibuse, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan," pp. 255-56. This letter was mistakenly dated 29 March 1964 in the first printing of *Shigematsu nikki*.

20. Shigematsu Fumihiko 重松文宏, "Ibuse Masuji no shōsetsu *Kuroi ame ga umareru katei de Shigematsu Shizuma wa sensō ni dō taiji shitaka*" 井伏鱒二の小説『黒い雨』が生まれる過程で重松静馬は戦争にどう対峙したか, *Songyo* 12 (2007): 97. Shigematsu Fumihiko is Shigematsu Shizuma's adopted son-in-law.

21. Cited in Shigematsu Fumihiko, "*Kuroi ame no seiritsu katei: ōfuku shokan o chushin ni shite*" 『黒い雨』の成立過程：往復書簡を中心にして, in *Ibuse bungaku no warai: Ibuse Masuji botsugo jūnen kinen* 井伏文学の笑い：井伏鱒二没後十年記念 (Fukuyama: Fukuyama bugakukan, 2003), p. 49.

22. This letter was dated 1963 in Ibuse, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan," p. 256; it was dated 1964 in Shigematsu Fumihiko, "Shōsetsu *Kuroi ame seisei katei ni oite Ibuse Masuji wa sensō ni ikani taiji shitaka: ōfuku shokan o chushin ni shite*" 小説『黒い雨』生成過程において井伏鱒二は戦争にいかに対峙したか：往復書簡を中心にして, *Songyo* 11 (2006): 99.

23. See Ibuse, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan," p. 257; and Sōma, "Kaisetsu," pp. 284-85.

24. Iwatake Hiroshi, "Kuroi ame kara no yonjū nen" 黒い雨からの四十年, *Fujin kōron* 婦人公論 70.11 (1985): 238.

25. In Japan, the idea of copyright (both as a commercial device and as a recognition of intellectual property rights) can be traced back to the Tokugawa 徳川 period (1600-1868). However, it was primarily during the Meiji 明治 period (1868-1912), under Western influence, that Japan's copyright system became well established and the rights of authors were fully embodied in legislation. Influential in this regard was the celebrity Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 (1835-1901), whose knowledge of Western learning and personal experience in the West made him an important figure in the Meiji Restoration. Bothered by the pirated editions of his works, such as *Seiyō jijō* 西洋事情 (Conditions in the West, 1866) and *Gakumon no susume* 学問のすすめ (An encouragement of learning, 1872), Fukuzawa campaigned for the imitation of Western countries to establish the legal institution of copyright. For the development of authorship and copyright in Japan, see Peter Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 223-51.

26. In his 5 October 1963 letter to Ibuse, Shigematsu expressed his hope that his and his wife's real names could be used in Ibuse's novel. He wrote, "I would be glad if you use my (and my wife's) real names when you write and furthermore, it would serve as an eternal memorial, so please do use our real names in your writing." Cited in Sōma, "Kaisetsu," p. 284. This letter was dated 1964 in Shigematsu F., "Shōsetsu *Kuroi ame seisei katei*," p. 100. In his talks with or letters to Ibuse, Shigematsu expressed his hope several times that real names for locations and other people could be used in the novel and Ibuse did his best to meet Shigematsu's expectation; see Shigematsu F., "Shōsetsu *Kuroi ame seisei katei*," pp. 108-10. For his characters, Ibuse changed the historical Shigematsu's name to Shizuma Shigematsu 閑間重松, but he did not change the given name (Shigeko シゲ子) of the historical Shigematsu's wife. Ibuse changed the family name of the historical Shigematsu's niece to Odaka 尾高, when his story was first in serialization in *Shinchō*; however, he changed it to Takamaru (the historical Yasuko's family name), when his story was later published in book form. Ibuse used the kanjis 矢須子 for the given name of his character Yasuko. For Ibuse's use of other character names, see Wakuta Yū 涌田祐, *Ibuse Masuji jiten* 井伏鱒二事典 (Meiji shoin, 2000), s. v. "Shigematsu Shizuma" and "Takahashi fujin" 高橋夫人.

27. Ibuse pointed out that he modified Shigematsu's diary but used Dr. Iwatake's notes verbatim: "I reworked Mr. Shigematsu's diary. However, I changed not one line, not one word of Mr. Iwatake's notes. His writing was good and the content was appropriate. In fact, I thought that using the notes as they were worked better to represent a

conscripted doctor." Cited in Ibuse Masuji, "Watakushi no michi 29: shiroi niji—Ninroku jiken zenjitsu ni miru" 私の道29：白いにじ—二・二六事件前日に見る, *Chūgoku shinbun*, 15 March 1989, p. 3. Despite Ibuse's words, a comparison of the historical Iwatake's notes (included in the book *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 219-52) with the character Iwatake's notes in *Black Rain* (ch. 17-19) shows that Ibuse in fact edited the historical Iwatake's notes subtly—he condensed the notes, changed punctuation and paragraphing, and reordered the sentences. See also Sōma Shōichi, "Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* to Iwatake Hiroshi no shuki: jitsuroku no kyokōka o megutte" 井伏鱒二『黒い雨』と岩竹博の手記：実録の虚構化をめぐる, *Kajinoha* 梶葉 8 (2000): 47-64.

28. Ibuse Masuji, "Sakka no sugao," interview by Kawamori Yoshizō 河盛好蔵, *Shōsetsu gendai* 小説現代 3.9 (1 September 1965): 27-28

29. Ibuse Masuji, "Ibuse bungaku ni tsuite," interview by Kawamori Yoshizō, 11 July 1966, in *Taidan Nihon no bungaku* 対談日本の文学, 4th ed. (Chūō kōronsha, 1979), pp. 382-89, esp. 388-89.

30. According to the bibliography (p. 54) of Terayoko Takeo's article "*Kuroi ame kanken*" 『黒い雨』管見 (in *Kindai bungaku shiron* 近代文学試論 10, 1972, pp. 46-55) there was an article "*Kuroi ame no moderu: Shigematsu-san Hiroshima hōmon*" 『黒い雨』のモデル：重松さん広島訪問 in *Yomiuri shinbun* 読売新聞 Hiroshima edition in July 1966. The title of this article by an unnamed reporter suggests that Ibuse publicized his use of Shigematsu as the model while *Black Rain* was still in serialization. I have consulted librarians at the National Diet Library and conducted two extensive search of the library's *Yomiuri shinbun* microfilm, but I was unable to find the article by using Terayoko's citation.

31. Ibuse Masuji, "Watakushi no kotoba," *Shūkan shinchō* 週刊新潮 33 (20 August 1966): 13.

32. "Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* to Ibuse Masuji," *Sandē mainichi* 45 (25 September 1966): 18-21.

33. See "Shōwa yonjūichi nendo dai jūkyū kai Noma bungeishō," p. 294. Ibuse stated that he used Iwatake's notes as they were in his oral presentation of the remarks; see Tada, "Sengo besutoserā monogatari 71," p. 36.

34. See Ibuse Masuji, "*Kuroi ame sonota*" 『黒い雨』その他, interview by Jinbō Kōtarō 神保光太郎, 1969, in *Ibuse Masuji zentaidan* 井伏鱒二全対談, ed. Maeda Sadaaki 前田貞昭, vol. 1 (Chikuma shobō, 2001), pp. 142-45; *Mainichi shinbunsha* 毎日新聞社, ed., *Kono honoo wa kiezu: Hiroshima bungaku nōto* この炎は消えず：広島文学ノート (Mainichi shinbunsha, 1971), pp. 58-61; Ibuse Masuji, "*Kuroi ame shippitsu zengo: hibaku 25 shūnen ni atatte*" 『黒い雨』執筆前後：被爆25周年にあたって, *Akahata* 赤旗, 2 August 1970, Sunday ed., p. 13; Ibuse Masuji, "Ibuse Masuji-shi ni kiku: *Kuroi ame* no koto" 井伏鱒二氏に聞く：『黒い雨』のこと, interview by Ozawa Toshiro 小沢俊郎, *Kokugo tsūshin* 国語通信 144 (1972): 2-7; Ban Toshihiko 伴俊彦, "Ibuse-san kara kiita koto, sono jūichi" 井伏さんから聞いたこと、その十一, in *Ibuse Masuji zenshū dai 13 kan geppō* 井伏鱒二全集第13巻月報 (Chikuma shobō, 1975), pp. 1-3; Ibuse Masuji, "Watakushi no michi 28: Shigematsu-san—nikki sankō ni *Kuroi ame*" 私の道28：重松さん一日記参考『黒い雨』, *Chūgoku shinbun*, 14 March 1989, p. 3; Ibuse, "Watakushi no michi 29," p. 3; and Hagiwara Tokushi 萩原得司, *Ibuse Masuji kikigaki* 井伏鱒二聞き書き (Seikyūsha, 1994), pp. 70-79.

35. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 157; Toyota Seishi, *Hiroshima no isho* 広島の遺書 (Sōyōsha, 1984), p. 265.

36. Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 114.

37. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 83.

38. Toyota, "Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka," p. 17; Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 10, 12, 15-16; Toyota, "Tōyō Shigematsu nikki hoka no najit-

su," p. 53.

39. See "In'yō hyōji meyasu kimeru—Bungeika kyōkai" 引用表示目安決める—文芸家協会, *Asahi shinbun* 朝日新聞, 3 February 1978, evening ed., p. 5. *Asahi shinbun* articles cited in this paper are available in Kikuzo (*Kikuzō* 聞蔵) database.

40. Daphne A. Jameson, "The Ethics of Plagiarism: How Genre Affects Writers' Use of Source Materials," *The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication* 56.2 (1993): 20-23.

41. See, for example, "*Gaisenmon* kara tōyō no katachi: Yamazaki-shi no shōsetsu 'Kaen' shiryō atsume ni techigai" 『凱旋門』から盗用の形：山崎氏の小説「花宴」資料集めに手違い, *Asahi shinbun*, 19 February 1968, evening ed., p. 9; "*Pari fujin* kara no tōyō de owabi no kotoba, Yamazaki Toyoko-san ga happyō e" 『巴里夫人』からの盗用でおわびの言葉、山崎豊子さんが発表へ, *Asahi shinbun*, 14 March 1968, p. 14; "Bungeika kyōkai o taikai: tōyō mondai de, Yamazaki Toyoko-shi" 文芸家協会を退会：盗用問題で山崎豊子氏, *Asahi shinbun*, 28 March 1968, evening ed., p. 10; "Bungeika kyōkai e fukki: tōyō mondai no Yamazaki Toyoko-shi" 文芸家協会へ復帰：盗用問題の山崎豊子氏, *Asahi shinbun*, 30 September 1969, p. 14; "Niwa-shi no mudan in'yō de ronsō" 丹羽氏の無断引用で論争, *Asahi shinbun*, 20 June 1972, evening ed., p. 9; Niwa Fumio, "Bungeisakuhin to chosakuken: shōsetsu e no rekishisho kara no in'yō, datō na kanyōhō tsukuritai" 文芸作品と著作権：小説への歴史書からの引用、妥当な慣用法つくりたい, *Asahi shinbun*, 26 June 1972, evening ed., p. 7; "Bungeikakyō yakushoku o jitai: Niwa Fumio-shi mudan in'yō de inseki" 文芸家協役職を辞退：丹羽文雄氏無断引用で引責, *Asahi shinbun*, 10 October 1972, p. 3; "Niwa-shi, Shigematsu-shi to wakai: 'Rennyō' no mudan in'yō, shussho meikishi sairensai" 丹羽氏、重松氏と和解：「蓮如」の無断引用、出所明記し再連載, *Asahi shinbun*, 27 October 1972, p. 22; "Yamazaki Toyoko-san, mata tōyō: shūkan rensaichū no 'Fumō chitai'" 山崎豊子さん、また盗用：週刊連載中の「不毛地帯」, *Asahi shinbun*, 21 October 1973, p. 3; and "Niwa Fumio-shi ga Bungeika kyōkai riji ni fukki: mudan in'yō go sannentan buri" 丹羽文雄氏が文芸家協会理事に復帰：無断引用後三年半ぶり, *Asahi shinbun*, 1 May 1976, p. 18.

42. See Shigematsu Fumihiko, "*Kuroi ame* ni kakawaru Toyota mondai no ikisatsu: Shigematsu nikki shuppan no kuwadate" 『黒い雨』に関わる豊田問題の経緯：重松日記出版の企て, *Songyo* 9 (2004): 106-18.

43. See Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to Shigematsu nikki, pp. 176-77; and Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 16, 106, 137. The aphorism in the Japanese edition is in Ibuse, *Ibuse Masuji jisen zenshū dai 6 kan*, p. 204; its English translation is in Ibuse Masuji, *Black Rain*, trans. John Bester (Kodansha, 1969), p. 162. In this paper, references the English text of *Black Rain* are from Bester's translation.

44. It was the Ibuse scholar Sōma Shōichi who detected Toyota's false attribution; see Sōma Shōichi, "Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* no tōsaku mondai: shiryō no kaizan kiji o megutte" 原爆小説『黒い雨』の盗作問題：資料の改竄記事をめぐって, *Songyo* 3 (1998): 35-40.

45. See the appendix for an example.

46. See Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to Shigematsu nikki, pp. 26-27; and Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 54.

47. For Sōma's and Toyota's articles to each other, see Sōma, "*Kuroi ame* tōsakusetsu e no hanron, jō" 『黒い雨』盗作説への反論 (上), *Tōkyō shinbun*, 6 August 1997, evening ed., p. 9; Sōma, "*Kuroi ame* tōsakusetsu e no hanron, ge" 『黒い雨』盗作説への反論 (下), *Tōkyō shinbun*, 7 August 1997, evening ed., p. 7; Toyota, "Sōma Shōichi-shi e no hanron: *Kuroi ame* o megutte" 相馬正一氏への反論：『黒い雨』をめぐって, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 2 September 1997, evening ed., p. 7; Sōma, "Futatabi *Kuroi ame* o megutte: Shigematsu nikki jōshokō e no gimon" 再び『黒い雨』をめぐって：重松日記浄書稿への疑問, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 9 October 1997, evening ed., p. 9; Toyota, "*Kuroi ame* o megutte: Shigematsu

nikki Sōma Shōichi-shi ni kotaeru" 『黒い雨』をめぐって：重松日記相馬正一氏に答える, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 6 November 1997, evening ed., p. 7; Sōma, "Santabi Toyota-shi ni tou: Shigematsu nikki seisho wa kyokō" 三たび豊田氏に問う：重松日記清書は虚構, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 3 March 1998, evening ed., p. 7; Toyota, "Kuroi ame to Shigematsu nikki mondai: Sōma-shi ni kotaeru" 『黒い雨』と重松日記問題：相馬氏に答える, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 15 April 1998, evening ed., p. 11. The timelines of Toyota's stories about his possession of the xeroxed and transcribed copies of the diary are inconsistent, see Songyo henshūbu 尊魚編集部, "Kuroi ame tōsaku kenshō" 『黒い雨』盗作検証, *Songyo* 8 (2003): 112-23, 115-16.

48. See "Genbaku egaita Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* ni zokuhen: 8.15 byōsha nimo tanebon" 原爆描いた井伏鱒二『黒い雨』に続編：8.15描写にも種本, *Yomiuri shinbun*, 3 August 1999, p. 26, available in Yomidasu rekishikan (ヨミダス歴史館) database.

49. See "Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* tanjō hiwa, shokan de ukibori: tēma ni shippitsu tamera" 井伏鱒二『黒い雨』誕生秘話、書簡で浮き彫り：テーマに執筆ためらい, *Yomiuri shinbun*, 2 February 2001, Hiroshima ed., p. 31 (available in Yomidasu rekishikan database); and "Ibuse Masuji no shokan 30 tsū hakken" 井伏鱒二の書簡30通発見, *Chūgoku shinbun*, 20 January 2001, p. 1.

50. Each of the four volumes of Shigematsu's diary has a title. Both the first and third volumes are entitled "*Kaen no hi*"; both the second and fourth volumes, "*Hibaku no ki*." See Sōma, "Kaisetsu," pp. 276-77; and Sōma Shōichi, "Shigematsu nikki no zen'yō hanmei: hibaku nisshi no zokuhen ga mitsukaru" 重松日記の全容判明：被爆日誌の続篇が見つかる, *Songyo* 4 (1999): 60, 66.

51. See Sōma, "Kaisetsu," pp. 281-82.

52. See Ibuse, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan," p. 255.

53. See Shigematsu F., "Ibuse Masuji no shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* ga amareru katei de," p. 96; and Sōma Shōichi, "Ibuse Masuji to Shigematsu Shizuma: *Kuroi ame* seiritsu no ikisatsu" 井伏鱒二と重松静馬：『黒い雨』成立の経緯, *Shiryō to kenkyū* 資料と研究 7 (2002): 14.

54. See Ibuse, "Shigematsu Shizuma ate Ibuse Masuji shokan," p. 255.

55. Shigematsu wrote, "I kept a diary about my experience of being bombed for future generations, which covered the period from the day when the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima to the noon of the 15th [of August] when the war ended. . . . I would like you to have a look at it"; cited in Sōma, "Kaisetsu," p. 281-82.

56. Japanese ed., p. 29; English trans., p. 28.

57. Japanese ed., pp. 370-71; English trans., pp. 294-95.

58. Japanese ed., pp. 370-71; English trans., p. 294.

59. Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki*, p. 17; Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 63.

60. See Shigematsu F., "*Kuroi ame* no seiritsu katei," pp. 54-57; and Shigematsu F., "*Kuroi ame* ni kakawaru Toyota mondai no ikisatsu," pp. 106-18. For a detailed discussion that problematizes Toyota's story about his possession of a xeroxed copy of Shigematsu's diary, see Sōma, "Kenshō Shigematsu nikki to sono shūen," pp. 75-79.

61. For Shigematsu's writing process, see Shigematsu F., "Ibuse Masuji no shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* ga amareru katei de," pp. 91-96; and Sōma, "Kaisetsu," pp. 277-78, 280-83. For Toyota's initial contact with Shigematsu's diary, see Shimizu, "Shigematsu nikki o meguru kyo to jitsu," p. 67; Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 79; Toyota Seishi, *Hiroshima zuisō* 広島随想 (Hiroshima: Kagensha, 1987), p. 58; Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki*, p. 78; and Toyota, "Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka," p. 11. On p. 27 of his book *Hankaku shūka hyakuzetsu* 反核秀歌百絶 (Hiroshima: Tanka kōronsha, 1985), Toyota Seishi noted that he received Shigematsu's diary in about 1962, which is a wrong date, for Toyota had published part of the diary in *Kagen* in 1959. For the relationship between Shigematsu's diary notes and his full-fledged diary, see Sōma Shōichi,

“Hibaku taiken kiroku no kyojitsu: sōkō nōto to Shigematsu nikki” 被爆体験記録の虚実：草稿ノートと重松日記, *Songyo* 8 (2003): 22-51.

62. See “Meisaku *Kuroi ame* no hibakunikki akarumi” 名作『黒い雨』の被爆日記明るみ, *Asahi shinbun*, 12 October 1988, evening ed., p. 3.

63. See Hagiwara, *Ibuse Masuji kikigaki*, p. 75.

64. Toyota, “Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* no shinjitsu,” p. 59.

65. See “Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* to Ibuse Masuji,” pp. 20, 21.

66. See “Meisaku *Kuroi ame* no hibakunikki akarumi,” p. 3.

67. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 85; Toyota, *Hiroshima no isho*, p. 265.

68. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 89.

69. Toyota, *Hiroshima no isho*, p. 263.

70. Toyota Seishi, *Kanashimi no senbazuru: dokyumento* 悲しみの千羽鶴：ドキュメント (Sōjusha, 1991), p. 88.

71. Toyota declared that he was a hibakusha, but his inconsistency about the location where he was bombed undermines the credibility of his accounts. See Iwasaki Seiichirō 岩崎清一郎, “Are wa ‘sōsaku nikki’ datta: ‘hibaku taikenki’ o nokoshita kajin” あれは「創作日記」だった：「被爆体験記」を残した歌人, *Songyo* 7 (2002): 96-108; and Toyota Seishi, *Bakuzen bakugo: Hiroshima o ikieta ichikyōshi no dokyumento* 爆前・爆後：広島を生き得た一教師のドキュメント (Sōjusha, 1994), pp. 223-25.

72. See Robert Jay Lifton, *Death in Life: Survivors of Hiroshima* (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 553-55; Matsumoto Hiroshi 松元寛, “Genten toshite no Hiroshima” 原点としてのヒロシマ, 1979, in *Nihon no genbaku bungaku* 日本の原爆文学, vol. 15 (Horupu shuppan, 1983), pp. 401-2; and Toyota, “*Kuroi ame*” to *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 233-34.

73. Lifton, *Death in Life*, p. 269.

74. John Whittier Treat, *Writing Ground Zero: Japanese Literature and the Atomic Bomb* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), p. 278.

75. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 85; Toyota, *Hiroshima no isho*, p. 265.

76. Toyota, “*Kuroi ame*” to *Shigematsu nikki*, p. 233.

77. *Ibid.*, p. 114.

78. Treat, *Writing Ground Zero*, p. 278.

79. Ibuse, “*Kuroi ame* sonota,” p. 142; Ban, “Ibuse-san kara kiita koto,” p. 3.

80. Ishida kisha 石田記者, “Doyō hōmon: genbaku shōsetsu o kaita Ibuse Masuji-shi” 土曜訪問：原爆小説を書いた井伏鱒二氏, *Tōkyō shinbun*, 10 September 1966, evening ed., p. 8. See also Ibuse, “*Kuroi ame* shippitsu zengo,” p. 13.

81. Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 12-13; Toyota, “Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* no shinjitsu,” p. 61.

82. See “Bungakusha 287 nin ga hankaku apīru: heiwa no tame sugu kōdō o” 文学者287人が反核アピール：平和のためすぐ行動を, *Asahi shinbun*, 21 January 1982, p. 1.

83. See Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, pp. 163-94; and Toyota, *Bakuzen bakugo*, pp. 216-19. See also Kuroko Kazuo 黒古一夫 and Ishimura Takeshi 石村健, *Genbaku bunken daijiten: 1945 (Shōwa 20) nen ~ 2002 (Heisei 14) nen* 原爆文献大事典：1945（昭和20）年～2002（平成14）年 (Nihon tosho sentā, 2004), s. v. “Toyota Seishi.”

84. See Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 89.

85. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 29; Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 94.

86. Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 79; Toyota, *Hiroshima no isho*, p. 263; Toyota, “*Kuroi ame*” to *Shigematsu nikki*, 25; Toyota, “Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka,” p. 11.

87. Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, p. 52; Toyota, “Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* no shinjitsu,” p. 58.

88. Toyota’s story about his part in the change of the title is inconsistent. In one version, he made a phone call to Ibuse *after* Ibuse had changed the title and he asked

whether Ibuse knew that the term “*kuroi ame*” was also used in haiku. See Toyota, *Genbaku bunkenshi*, p. 29. In another version, Toyota made a phone call to Ibuse before Ibuse changed the title and he suggested Ibuse to change the title to *Kuroi ame*. See Toyota, *Hiroshima no isho*, pp. 263-64; Toyota, “*Kuroi ame*” to *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 72-74; Toyota, “Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka,” pp. 16-17; and Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 93-97. In his talks and interviews, Ibuse pointed out that Saitō Jōichi 斎藤十一, the editor of *Shinchō*, suggested the change of the title. See Ban, “Ibuse-san kara kiita koto,” p. 3; and Hagiwara, *Ibuse Masuji kikigaki*, p. 74. Despite Toyota’s attempt to take credit for the poetic title “*Kuroi ame*,” the change of the title is actually only tangentially related to the issue of plagiarism, for “*kuroi ame*” is not an original but a common term. As Toyota himself was aware, the term “*kuroi ame*” was used by haiku poets. For discussions that problematize Toyota’s story about his role in Ibuse’s change of the story title, see Hagiwara Tokushi, “*Kuroi ame* sono sokumen: Ibuse Masuji no sakuhin ni tsuite” 『黒い雨』その側面：井伏鱒二の作品について, *Songyo* 7 (2002): 30-31; Sōma, “Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* no tōsaku mondai,” pp. 40-46; Sōma Shōichi, “Zōho kaitei genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* no kōzō” 増補改訂原爆小説『黒い雨』の構造, *Songyo* 9 (2004): 33-36; and Shimizu, “*Kuroi ame*: Ibuse bungaku to kyōdo,” pp. 44-45.

89. Toyota, “*Kuroi ame*” to *Shigematsu nikki*, p. 74; Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 96-97.

90. See Yamaori Tetsuo, “*Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku dewanai: ‘hakkotsu no gobunshō’ no senritsu koso Ibuse ni yoru chinkon no inori da” 『黒い雨』は盗作ではない：「白骨の御文章」の旋律こそ井伏による鎮魂の祈りだ, *Boisu=Voice* 287 (2001): 192-99.

91. See Masumura Teruko, “Ibuse bungaku ni okeru *Kuroi ame* no kōsatsu: *Kuroi ame* to *Shigematsu nikki* no hikaku o chūshin ni” 井伏文学における『黒い雨』の考察：『黒い雨』と重松日記の比較を中心に, *Dōto daigaku kiyō, bijutsu gakubu* 道都大学紀要、美術学部 *Bulletin of Dohto University, Faculty of Fine Arts* 29 (2003): 1-27.

92. See Maeda Sadaaki, “Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka? *Shigematsu nikki* to no kanren kara” 井伏鱒二『黒い雨』は盗作だったのか？重松日記との関連から, *Ehime kokubun kenkyū* 愛媛国文研究 54 (2004): 85-97.

93. Julia Kristeva, “The Bounded Text,” 1969, in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez, ed. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), p. 36.

94. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 1. Genette used the term “intertextuality” to refer to “a relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts”; that is, when there is “the actual presence of one text within another.” See his *Palimpsests*, pp. 1-2.

95. Genette, *Palimpsests*, p. 5.

96. Ibid.

97. I use the general term “augmentation” rather than Genette’s specific term “amplification” to designate Ibuse’s enlargement of Shigematsu’s diary. According to Genette, amplification comprises two, rarely mutually exclusive, types of augmentation—“expansion” (augmentation through “stylistic dilation”) and “extension” (augmentation by adding “episodes that are extraneous to the initial theme but whose incorporation makes it possible to extend it”). See his *Palimpsests*, p. 260 and pp. 264-65 respectively. Although Ibuse expanded and extended Shigematsu’s diary (Ibuse’s addition of the episode in ch. 7 that dramatizes a female hibakusha’s embarrassment at her nakedness is an instance of expansion and his addition of Yasuko’s marriage problems an example of extension), amplification is not a suitable term to characterize Ibuse’s transformation of Shigematsu’s diary. For Genette, “the hypotext of an amplification may easily stand . . . as the equivalent of a summary.” See his *Palimpsests*, p. 262. As the hypotext of *Black*

Rain, Shigematsu's diary (which consists of about 150 pages) is half the length of its hypertext and therefore is too long to be called a summary of *Black Rain*. Hence, I use the general term "augmentation" to refer to the synthesis and convergence of expansion and extension in *Black Rain*.

98. See Saeki Shōichi, "Shōsetsuka to kirokusha" 小説家と記録者, *Asahi shinbun*, 8 December 1966, evening ed., p. 7; and Treat, *Writing Ground Zero*, p. 271.

99. Japanese ed., p. 91; English trans., p. 74.

100. Japanese ed., pp. 27-28, 34-37, 106-7, 277-78, 340-42, 378; English trans., pp. 26-27, 31-33, 85-86, 220-22, 270-72, 300.

101. Japanese ed., p. 47; English trans., p. 42.

102. Japanese ed., p. 22; English trans., p. 21.

103. Japanese ed., pp. 88-93; English trans., pp. 72-75.

104. Japanese ed., p. 276; English trans., p. 219.

105. Japanese ed., pp. 277-99, 336; English trans., pp. 220-37, 267-68.

106. Japanese ed., pp. 378-79; English trans., p. 300.

107. Japanese ed., pp. 38-40; English trans., pp. 34-35.

108. Japanese ed., pp. 127-28; English trans., pp. 102-3.

109. Japanese ed., pp. 276-97; English trans., pp. 219-36.

110. David Der-wei Wang, *The Monster That Is History: History, Violence, and Fictional Writing in Twentieth-Century China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), p. 48.

111. Japanese ed., pp. 60-61; English trans., pp. 50-51.

112. Japanese ed., pp. 77-88; English trans., pp. 63-71.

113. Japanese ed., pp. 132-34; English trans., pp. 106-7.

114. Japanese ed., pp. 145-56; English trans., pp. 116-24.

115. Japanese ed., pp. 175-79; English trans., pp. 140-43.

116. Japanese ed., pp. 194-95; English trans., p. 155.

117. Japanese ed., pp. 195-96; English trans., pp. 155-56.

118. Japanese ed., pp. 197-98; English trans., pp. 157-58.

119. Japanese ed., p. 209; English trans., p. 166.

120. Japanese ed., p. 210; English trans., p. 167.

121. Japanese ed., p. 210; English trans., p. 167.

122. Japanese ed., p. 218; English trans., p. 172.

123. Japanese ed., pp. 225-26; English trans., pp. 179-80.

124. Japanese ed., pp. 243-44; English trans., p. 193.

125. Japanese ed., pp. 244-58, 269-75; English trans., pp. 194-204, 213-19.

126. Japanese ed., pp. 258-64; English trans., pp. 205-10.

127. Japanese ed., pp. 266-69; English trans., pp. 211-13.

128. Japanese ed., pp. 298-320, 336-39; English trans., pp. 237-55, 268-70.

129. Japanese ed., pp. 320-35; English trans., pp. 255-66.

130. Japanese ed., p. 161; English trans., pp. 128-29.

131. Japanese ed., p. 193; English trans., p. 154.

132. The historical Shigematsu wrote in his diary, "I would rather have unjust peace than the most just war" (p. 121); "Ah! I hate war. The disastrous feeling has frozen my whole body. I don't care which side will win or lose in this war. I only hope it will end as soon as possible" (p. 171). In the novel, the character Shigematsu notes, "I hated war. Who cared, after all, which side won? The only important thing was to end it all soon as possible: rather an unjust peace, than a 'just' war!" (Japanese ed., pp. 202-3; English trans., p. 161).

133. Japanese ed., pp. 17-18; English trans., p. 18.

134. Japanese ed., p. 339; English trans., p. 270.

135. Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin

(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 2.

136. Ibuse Masuji, "Hashigaki," in *Hachigatsu muika o egaku: sakuhinshū* (Hiroshima: Bunka hyōron shuppan, 1970), p. 2.

137. Ibuse, *Ibuse Masuji jisen zenshū dai 6 kan*, p. 448. The character Yasuko's diary was Ibuse's invention; see Ibuse, "Ibuse Masuji-shi ni kiku," p. 4.

138. Toyota, "*Kuroi ame*" to *Shigematsu nikki*, pp. 7, 22, 24; Toyota, "Ibuse Masuji no *Kuroi ame* wa tōsaku datta noka," p. 17; Toyota, *Shirarezaru Ibuse Masuji*, pp. 54-55; Toyota, "Ibuse sakuhin *Kuroi ame* no kenshō," p. 10; Toyota, "Ibuse Masuji *Kuroi ame* no shinjitsu," p. 61.

139. See Ōe Kenzaburō, "Genbakugo no hakubutsushi" 原爆後の博物誌 in *Ibuse Masuji jisen zenshū dai 6 kan geppō* 井伏鱒二自選全集第6巻月報 (Shichōsha, 1986), pp. 2-3.

140. This list of works is based on the following three books. Nagata Mari 永田真理, *Daisakka wa tōsakka(?): hyōsetsu to sōzō no tanima o kangaeru* 大作家は盗作家 (?): 剽窃と創造の谷間を考える (Kōshobō, 1981); Takeyama Tetsu 竹山哲, *Gendai Nihon bungaku "tōsaku giwaku" no kenkyū: "kindan no konomi" o tabeta bungōtachi* 現代日本文学「盗作疑惑」の研究: 「禁断の木の実」を食べた文豪たち (PHP kenkyūjo, 2002); and Kurihara Yūichirō 栗原裕一郎, "*Tōsaku*" no bungakushi: shijō, media, chosakuken <盗作> の文学史: 市場・メディア・著作権 (Shin'yōsha, 2008).

141. Kuroko Kazuo has compared (2) and (4) to demonstrate Toyota's inconsistency. See Kuroko Kazuo, "*Kuroi ame tōsaku ronsō no fumō: hibaku shijō shugisha no kuroi ishi*" 『黒い雨』盗作論争の不毛: 被爆至上主義者の黒い意志, *Kajinoha* 6 (1998): 56. Nevertheless, an extended juxtaposition of all five diary passages is useful in presenting a clearer picture of how Toyota distorted the diary in order to make it look more similar to Ibuse's novel.

142. For more about Toyota's distortion of Shigematsu's diary, see Sōma, "Genbaku shōsetsu *Kuroi ame* no tōsaku mondai," pp. 29-35; and Sōma, "*Kuroi ame* to Shigematsu nikki," pp. 227-29.

* Yi-ling Lin is a graduate student in comparative literature at the University of Illinois. She would like to thank Professor Michael Palencia-Roth, Professor Norio Tachiki, Professor Dorothy Figueira, and anonymous reviewers of another two journals for their constructive feedback on various versions of this essay; Yuriko Oono and Shoko Oono for translation help; and Setsuko Noguchi and Makiko Ishizawa for research assistance.

