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I. Introductory

How many years have elapsed since the idea of studying literature as the object of research works occurred in the mental activities of the human beings? It was probably less than a century and a half ago: that is, since the eighteenth century when scientific way of thinking had gradually permeated into the average person and popularized among the people owing to the rise and growth of natural science. So it is quite doubtful whether literature can be studied as science or academic study. Nevertheless, commentaries, annotations, critical biographies, literary histories, etc. exist, as fait accompli, before us and claim their being the results of research works of literature. So far under these circumstances we have accepted that that is the study of literature. The method of studying has gradually become positive in accordance with that of natural science or other cultural science. But has the study of literature that has been studied by these methods been able to be called academic study? Anyhow, that literature taken as the objective of study just mentioned—was it what is called literature today in its true sense? By means of these methods, have we ever been possible to grasp the entity of literature? It is true that lots of knowledge have been accumulated through these achievements, but analysis and examination have displayed the discomposed forms of literature, haven't they? Literature is metamorphosed into another being, the moment we consider we have grasped it. It is no longer literature, but a material for the study of human being, a part of the study of literature, or data for psychology or sociology, I presume. Evading afar, far beyond and above them, literature is beckoning us. So what have been given us are, in truth, studies of literary surroundings, though they themselves are quite important and worth while.

Studies of literary surroundings today having increased in precision, no inferiority is suspected in their fields, as compared with other fields of learning. Such being the case, they are regarded as the most proper form of literary studies. But however proper they may look, surroundings are surroundings. What is the core of literature, then? It is perhaps what is communicated tacitly from mind to mind. Therefore it is hardly possible to grasp the core of literature. Being concerned with our life in general just as religion is, it is quite improper that the entity of literature is taken as the objective of the modern learning, the harbinger of which has originally been found in the field of natural science. The immediate response of the literary field to the shock of the academic research may be literary
surroundings above mentioned. By the way, what is presumed the study of the entity of literature has not always been unpractised. But it is called appreciation rather than research work. Appreciation seems to have equalled research work, and research work appreciation. That is the vague idea of learning or study as far as literature is concerned. As other arts such as music, painting and sculpture have their own genres, so literature should possess and claim its own originality to be shown in its study, instead of data or material for other academic fields.

Any sort of literature, when it is given as literature, has a form. In other words, it is shown as an epic, a lyric, a narrative (or a novel), a drama, or an essay (or a thesis). In this case, matter and form are combined inevitably, not dualistically nor arbitrarily, as Pater already insisted. So the study of genres that serve as frames of literature in our sense: does it not pave a more direct way to approach the core of literature?

Did the genres of literature which I mentioned above exist side by side from the beginning, then? They did not exist side by side as shown today, but gradually did grow and develop in history as clarified in the fact that most ancient literatures began with epics, which were followed by lyrics, from lyrics narratives were generated and they were integrated into dramas. Literature, in fact, is an expression of human experiences through language, and one of various cultural expressions of mankind. Therefore, the centre of these genres is consciousness of mankind as an individual or a group. The consciousness of the moderners has extensively been complicated. But, as the twilled cloth can be reduced to its fundamental warp and woof, through laborious handling, the complicated course of development of every genre at the later stages can be traced systematically. And the study of each genre leads us to the fact that the source of inebitability with which human consciousness could not help taking a given genre of literature, can be revealed in history and society (or group) concretely.

It is still at a tentative stage to comprehend literature in the phase of this vital development. Negligence will be expected from some quarters, because this literary theory of ours appears abstract or it is apt to pave the way of schematism. Research work, in a sense, bears a predictive character, apart from a mere accumulation of knowledge, I presume. At any rate, Ernest Bovet, one of the founders of this view of literature, seems to have obtained a suggestion from Victor Hugo, and to have drawn his idea from Brunetiere and Croce. In this country, it is safe to mention Prof. Kochi Doi and Prof. Yoshimi Kudo as earlier believers in this literary theory.

The dominant form of expression of literature in a wider sense (or what is written in letters) was verse. History or even philosophy was written in verse. It is without saying that drama and poetry were expressed in verse. Poetry was always reminded of by verse, and verse by poetry. So long verse dominating ages continued that we are surprised with the habitual force of history. History tells us that prose, after this long period of verse, made rapid progress as a means of expression of the bourgeois. People in general found their expression, not in verse, but in prose, which, being quite free from the expression of the ruling class, or from the expression of those who rendered service to the governing,
made growth as the expression of the masses themselves. In the age of Pope when books were generally understood difficult things, it was Defoe who scribbled freely in plain English. Modern narrative literature, the originator of which was supposed Defoe, has made rapid progress through this elastic form of expression, prose, and established the genre of modern fiction. Fiction is in reality the flourish of prose literature, as poetry used to be the typical form of verse.

We can trace the first stage of development of literature from epic, lyric, narrative down to drama, but the second and the third ones can hardly be traced quite perfectly. This might be the inevitable fact due to the complications of human consciousness with the advance of the times. And in accordance with this complication, fiction or narrative literature in general seems to have made its own development through modern ages. In other words, literature appears to have made a modulating development in fiction with the growth of prose style as a momentum. So if we examine the history of the novel, we may probably find another fresh development of literature in the form of fiction. This is one of the reasons why I will advocate that fiction should be studied in the phase of genre. This is, to be sure, a fresh approach to the study of fiction in order to comprehend fiction as fiction.

As is the case with literature in general, most cases of studying fiction so far tend to end in the study of view of life, psychology, etc. found in the novel, instead of studying novels as they are. Most scholars forget novels in studying them. So I suggest that one of the ways to study fiction for fiction's sake can be found in the study of its genre. Another way, then, can be sought for in the study of technique. As to genre, I have already revealed some possible reasons. Now I am going to give a few reasons why technique will be taken up as the means of studying fiction for its own sake.

The artist usually would not talk about his technique as if it were a trifle. In fact it is technique, by means of which he can perform his art of work to be appreciated by others. Misconception prevailing in the world of art is that technique is mattered only by an artisan, not by an artist. But in truth, he endeavours for many years to achieve his own unique technique to produce masterpieces. On the other hand, the appreciator fails to perceive the technique and when he discusses the value of the art of work, he takes the technique for granted. The consequence is that the abstract idea of the artist is mistaken for what decides his respective art. People in general have their own ideas, more or less, but not all of them can be artists. Those who have been bestowed with special talent can produce art. And talent means, I think, the ability to acquire a certain kind of technique with which a given work of art is created.

So far I have expounded the importance of technique in the world of art in general. Now I want to define the scope of my statement to fiction. In the field of fiction, as already known, our daily experiences are the theme of it. How are they expressed in the form of novel? The process of it will be discussed in detail later, but one thing here I want to say is that there must be the ways in which the experiences may be composed. In other words, there cannot be any novel without technique. And the sort of technique
concerns with the variety of novel. Or in some cases, the difference of romance, biography, autobiography, satire, allegory, and other forms of literature depends upon the sort of technique. In this respect Dr. Mendilow of Hebrew University of Jerusalem explains in his *Time and Novel*.

"The time has long passed when technique could be taken simply to mean the ways in which a given body of experience may be organized and manipulated to the best advantage. It is also the way in which unformulated experience sort itself out and realises itself. The content of the novel could not become itself without technique, and it becomes what it is because it has been caught in a particular way; the artistic worth of a novel resides largely in its being caught in the only way inevitable to it. Another technique would make it something else, another a different body of experience." (p. 234)

In this thesis, I want to give a fresh light upon the study of fiction through handling the two phases, genre and technique, in order to approach fiction in itself.

II. Genre

As I have already stated, the genres of literature have evolved in history, so various types of the novel, I think, have also appeared one by one in the course of modern history. In this case I mean from the simple to the complicated. Therefore, first I try to trace the evolutorial history of the novel, which will lead us, in turn, to the exhibition of various types, or what we call genres, of the novel. After the perusal of these genres, we will naturally discern some principles of structure in the novel.

The most simple form of fiction in prose is the story which records a succession of events. This kind of story merely serves to inspire our curiosity. It is easily noticed that the typical type of the reader of this kind of story is a child or boy or uneducated person. And it can only keep the young reader going by "and then, and then." In the history of the novel this type of story first appeared. What we usually call romance belongs to this kind of story. The feature of romance, as you know, is fantastical, and the events which happen unexpectedly in succession proceed to be complicated and entangled one another, and finally end happily. Our delight lies in this happy ending. So the hero or the character is depicted roughly from the outside, not being individualized yet. It serves only to make the action complicated and to keep the plot going. So it is not called a character in a true sense, but a type. Here the action is the dominant factor and the character, the setoff. Therefore, this kind of story may be called the novel of action. The plot goes on in any direction in accordance with our wishes. It does not keep the inevitable course of destination with our knowledge. It is a fantasy of desire rather than a picture of life. But as is seen in Scott and Stevenson while the plot is being accelerated, types (or figures on the scene) are vivified and crystallized into characters. There looms out a new type of novel with character wriggling. It is also in some measure, a novel of character.

Now next comes a novel of character. It has no definite plot for the most part. Nor has it any definite action. The character does not a part of the plot, but it is independent. Or rather the plot is subordinate. The situation is general, not particular, so that it may enable more characters to be introduced into the area. The character, from the beginning,
is constant. For only one side of the character is shown. And plot does not proceed nor
develop. Instead, the character is located in different situations and made to act typically.
Strictly speaking, the character does not act, but move. So the plot is loose and easy-going.
The purest example of it in English literature is perhaps *Vanity Fair*. If we examine the
figures there, we find that these figures do not change throughout the story, and they are
complete from the beginning. This is one of the features in the novel of character. We find
In actual life, our characters are not one-sided. We involve contradictory elements in
ourselves. So we are not flat, but we are distinguished from others in a certain salient
point of our own. This characteristic feature intensified in each person is individuality. Flat
corresponds to this individuality magnified. Although we cannot expect a deep insight into
the inner world of flat character, a crowd of people are depicted swarming and different
types of individuals are exhibited before us through the dexterity of the author of the novel
of character. The devices used are to locate them always in new situations, and to change
their relations to one another. The author gives us the amplification of characters inspite of
each being flat.

So far we have observed that there are roughly two kinds of novel: one in which the
plot must be strictly developed and the character is a setoff, while one in which the plot
may be loosely constructed, and the character is introduced typically. But it is difficult to
draw a definite line between them. Its boundaries shade too easily into those of the adjacent
area. Now it is safe to say that the novel of action and the novel of character are relative.
Most of the prose fiction in the eighteenth century are the transitional production from the
former to the latter. A phenomenon quite similar to this is found in the following fact that
at the beginning of the century, Defoe produced the transitional production from the
picaresque novel, the novel of action, to the novel of character. Though various situations
and objects to be criticised are presented, the story is concentrated upon a single person.
Here appeared what is called travelling hero. By making this central personage travel from
place to place, the author tried to depict as many scenes and characters as possible. And
next the plot came to be a frame in which the picture of life was shown rather than the
action. It turned not only to show the character, but to suggest the picture of society.
Here the object of the novel of character can be said to take a central figure through a
succession of scenes, introduce a great number of characters and thus build up a picture of
society. And the modern version of this is a rise in life, namely, a climbing hero.

In the relation of the plot to the action and the character, we discerned less unnatural-
lessness, as we came from Smollett, Fielding, through Scott and Dickens, down to
Thackeray. Delineation develops of its own accord. Thus *Vanity Fair* is an unprece-
dented novel of character in English literature.

Next we must consider another form of novel which, like the novel of action, demands
a strictly developed plot. This is called the dramatic novel. The plot of the novel of
character is expansive, while that of the dramatic novel is intensive. In the novel of
character the action begins with a single figure and expands towards the circumference,
which sometimes reveals the picture of society. In the dramatic novel the action begins with more than two persons and it takes place from several points on its circumference and comes together towards the center. In the novel of character, the character does not change, but the scene changes. In the dramatic novel, the scene does not change, but the characters transform gradually through their mutual contact. The novel of character is a picture of modes of existence, and the dramatic novel is an image of experience. In English literature, Jane Austen and Thomas Hardy belong to the category of the dramatic novel.

Now from the different point of view, we can presume that the imaginary world of the dramatic novel is found in time, while that of the novel of character, in space. Of course, in the former, space is also given more or less, but it is in time that the action is performed in succession. And in the latter, time is also given, but the action, diffusing into space, ceases to move. In other words, time and space may be two different kinds of view of life. The dramatic novel is a way to observe life personally in time. On the other hand the novel of character is a way to view life socially in space. The former is dominated by the law of causation, while in the latter there is a loose construction. In the dramatic novel the expression of space is vague and arbitrary. But the scene concerned is illuminated more intensely than in the novel of character, which looks quite contradictory. That is because the scene is the image of the condensed environment of vicissitude of life. But in the novel of character, the scene abounds in infinite changes, which excite our curiosity. There time loiters about. Here it flies away. Presentiment that something, though uncertain, will happen at any moment; now the presentiment takes on an actual form, the incident marches every moment, and finally the end comes. Such a sense of tension in time is one of the most important features of the dramatic novel. For instance, Dostoevski is a great master in this respect. But in the novel of character, time is inexhaustible, which is fit for characters to be evoked. It is here that a sense of humour and stability is generated.

Thus far, as the novel of character shows us life or manners, so the dramatic novel develops and represents the organic movement of life. As there is crowded time in the dramatic novel, so there is intensely filled space in the novel of character. This effect of the crowded people can be obtained from the unchangeability. Thus in the novel of character, various types of character are swarming and jostling. In the dramatic novel, figures retire one by one, and the main characters remain.

A work of art has two elements: that is, universal and particular. It is only what is particular that the artist can express. And what is universal is grasped with the particular. The novel can be art because it possesses universality. How can the novel possess universality, then? The universality of the novel can be obtained through the negation either of time or space. The negation can be achieved only by the artist's concentrating himself upon the particular unconditionally. Therefore, an excellent work of art is at once particular and universal. So both the limitation of time in the novel of character and that of space in the dramatic novel are not defects respectively, but conditions to provide with universality. So far stress is put upon time or space concerning the aforesaid two forms of novel. The reason
of it is to comprehend life more sufficiently from the psychological point of view.

As we have already observed, the dramatic novel is subjected to restriction in space, and the novel of character in time, but we can suppose another form of novel which is not subjected to the restriction of time and space, a novel which gives us a wider picture of life in both time and space, and besides fails to lose universality. In this kind of novel, however, action occurs in time. And space changes as the character does. In the dramatic novel, the background does not seem to change because of its single action, but in this form of fiction, the background cannot help changing by reason of its constant succession of actions following one after another. Universality in the dramatic novel is a stage, while in this new sort of novel, it is "vicissitudes of life". Here life does not mean fate nor society, but human life always changing. Let us call this form of novel the chronicle. The action there is almost accidental, but all the events happen within a perfectly rigid frame. The strict construction and the arbitrary progression are the indispensable conditions of the chronicle as an artistic form. In the dramatic novel, time is materialized in the character psychologically, but in the chronicle time is divided into two kinds. They are time as absolute progress and time as accidental manifestation, or astronomical time and psychological one. The former continues to make steady progress, and, not being controlled by the character, keeps rigid regularity outside the character. It is the passage of time, the perpetual repetition of birth, growth, death, and birth again. The latter passes rapidly with the events, and gives us a sense of urgency quite often. It is, as it were, calculated within the events. And now the relation of these two kinds of time is stated as follows. The progress of astronomical time gives a particular event a different value—turns a tragedy into a mere sorrow, and necessity into accident, and absoluteness into relativity. Therefore, the events are turned into episodes. In this sense, the world of the chronicle is rather broad and loose.

In the dramatic novel, we see fate unfolding in the world, and wield power over the human affairs. In the chronicle, on the contrary, the human world is clear and immediate, but fate remains a mystery. Therefore something religious now and then reigns over the world of the chronicle. So the author's conception of fate, for better or worse, has a shadow of resignation. Now we see everything in the phases of time, space and casualty. Even if it is God who witnesses the whole universe from beginning to end, our imagination also aspires to do so. This being, the aforesaid three limitations determine the principle of structure in the novel of character, the dramatic novel, and the chronicle.

In English literature, the chronicle is said to be the reigning tradition of modern fiction. For example, *Sons and Lovers*, and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* belong to this category. In faith, it is suggested that the English novel has developed from the novel of action to the novel of character, the dramatic novel and the chronicle in history. These four types of novel have respectively been derived from the particular stage of history one by one, not sprang up simultaneously.

There is one thing to be warned. A certain kind of novel is quite similar to the chronicle at first sight. But here society is given as taken for granted from the beginning,
and the events are needed only to explain the actual. So there is no intrinsic connection
between this ideal society and the events. *Forsyte Saga* is a great example of this kind.
This may be called the period novel, as distinguished from the chronicle. The author of
the latter is always looking forward at least, while that of the former looks backward upon
the past. It is natural that the period novel should stand outside the legitimate course of
traditional development.

Here is another case of Joyce's *Ulysses*. It is quite similar to the chronicle from the
outside. But the main point of it lies on its psychology, and the imaginary world of it is a
sort of space-time. This novel is aspiring to be a new type of novel. It is true that there
are found some technical renovations there, but it does not show anything of new develop-
ment from the structural point of view. Some declare that it is a variation of the novel of
character. It is an attempt to return to the pure tradition of art, as a reaction against the
period novels of Wells, Galsworthy, etc. It has unexpectedly followed the conventional
form on the way of development.

In fiction nothing is so important a moment as character, I think. So it is not useless
to reconsider the character here. The character which is found in the novel of character is
flat character as we have already seen. It was called humour in the seventeenth century,
and sometimes type or caricature. It is static and it always shown only one side of the
character typically. But the character in the dramatic develops. So it may be called round.
Flat character, when it was first created, showed freshness, but while the creation was
being reiterated, it has become mediocre. Round character shows reality, but flat character
symbol. Symbol here means that it is not real but it is the symbol of reality. Therefore
both round and flat reflect reality. Each of them only belongs to the different kind.

Edwin Muir says in his *The Structure of the Novel*, "In separating prose fiction into
three main divisions, the character novel, the dramatic novel, and the chronicle, it is
obvious that we have been employing categories which apply to other forms of imaginative
literature as well." (p. 146) According to him, the dramatic novel corresponds to comedy,
tragedy and epic. He is at a loss how to do with the novel of character and has a narrow
escape, saying that it seems to be a purely prose form. And no mention is the response to
the chronicle. Muir is right in comprehending fiction in accordance with the phase of
literary development, but it appears that his lack of the consciousness of the development
of literary genres has caused such confusion and obscurity. This will prove quite clear when
we think as follows. When individuality, that has been unconscious of itself in lyrical
literature, is awakened and emotion in floating is combined into one character, fiction or
narrative literature in general is born. Therefore, the center of fiction is the novel of
character, and the dramatic novel corresponds to drama, the chronicle, to epic. Thus, as
is seen in literature in general, its genres have grown and developed historically, though
in a different order.

In order to study fiction as fiction, so far we have begun with the study of its form or
what we call genre, and the consequence is that the novel has been comprehended in the
phase of development. Form is not merely form, but what is animated with life.
III. Technique

In the last chapter I have surveyed fiction vertically or historically and chiefly from the outside, but here in this chapter I try to observe it from the inside. In so doing, I intend to talk about the way how it is to be fiction or the technique of it. What I mean technique here is how the novel is created and what makes fiction distinguish from other genres of literature. For this purpose, I want to begin with the analysis of fiction and proceed to the matter of technique.

There are various kinds of view of art, for one's view of art is just like one's belief. So it is personal. So with the view of fiction. It is supposed that each person has his own view of fiction. In this respect the study of fiction differs from that of natural science. Those who discuss fiction, however, are apt to insist upon his opinion with the manner of omniscience. So far especially the worse the attitude has been, when appreciation has been mistaken for study. In studying fiction, one of the methods as objective as possible, is the study of technique, I suppose. In a sense, fiction is a mysterious presence. In order to ascertain the entity of it, we should distinguish fiction from wider presence behind fiction; and at the same time, from the adjacent territories. The difference is made between fiction or a novel and fiction in general. The former corresponds to every work of fiction, and the latter to the generalization of all works. When we analyze a presence, we generally do it from both the abstract phase of universality and the concrete phase of particularity. The abstract phase of fiction is imaginative narration, which is fiction as art in general, and concretely it is the sum of all example of the art of fiction, which is a separate novel distinguished from others. In the case of fiction, these are not enough. Process is needed which combines abstract art with a concrete work: to put it concretely, it means the reading or the writing of a story. These two are the experiences of fiction. Unlike scientific experiments, these are experiences which cannot be repeated again.

It is the unique experience that connects the concrete phase of fiction as an art with the abstract one. Now there are many ways of reading fiction. And even one person reads differently at the different stage of life. These different experiences can not be objective and universal knowledge unless they are exchanged among different persons through conversation, criticism and study.

This is the case with the author. The only difference is that conceiving, composing, writing and revising add to the reader's experience. The three factors of fiction, abstraction, universality, concrete particularity and process (experience) are inevitably connected.

The main point of the art of fiction is the creation of novelty. (The original meaning of "novel" is "something new" or "a novelty".) Therefore, as we have surveyed already in the last chapter, novels in the past and at present can be made systematic, but as to those in the future, it is desirable to draw back the systematization. For it is impossible to expect the appearance of any new style of fiction.

It is called that men are social beings, but when they are viewed from the spiritual side, they are originally as isolated existences as their bodies are. Therefore, fiction seems to be a communication by language among them. In other words, fiction is a society to be
experienced by a solitary person, and it is an art in which men trying to establish a
solitary society, though it sounds contradictory. Both the author and the reader retire from
the world and visit the printed story. They have the same experience as the life of a
certain person at the bottom of their mind as soon as they fall upon the printed words, go
out of the scope of the worldly sense, time and space, and enter the common humanity.
In these experiences, imagination is not a means but an object. So when we are fully
experiencing the fiction (when writing or reading), the event which occurs in fiction,
whether it is imaginary or not, in the actual world, is forgotten by us.

In the experience, we are not conscious of the meaning revealed on the page and the
printed words separately. Indeed, we are conscious of the printed words at first, but in
due course of time we began to be absorbed into the meaning represented by them. Non-
fictional prose and fiction look similar on the face of the page, but they are quite different
in the phase of experience. The experience which appears to the imagination of the reader
in reading fiction, is likewise experienced by the author. As the supposition that the event
is fictitious disappears from the reader's consciousness, the story gives us an illusion that it
is told about an event in the actual world. Supposing that the event is an actual one, the
imaginary experience shown there, is history, biography or true story, but if it is fictitious,
it is fiction. It is by technique that the distinction is made actually. And this is again one
of the reasons why technique is an important matter. Excellent technique means a power
to put style, the greatest contribution of the literary phase working upon the narrative
phase of fiction, out of our sight. Style disappearing and the experience, being told as if
it were an actual existence without us, becomes the story. And the relation between the
events shown in the pattern of fiction is carried on by one principle of conflict.

The experience of fiction is literary and narrative. And it is not the experience of
things now and here. Thus our speculation travels beyond the scope of perception, which
makes it possible to discover, what does not exist physically. And through imagination we
can experience in art that which does not exist physically. Concerning this respect THEO-
DORE GOODMAN remarks in his book as follows: “The artist is the man who searches for the
image he must have, whether it is there or not.” (p.21) Then what is the relation between
the actual world and the world of fiction? For the author this world is the mere starting
point of his illusion. Through what procedure, then, is his illusion that has started from
the actual world made into a work of art? First, the words, are put into shape as private
monologues within him. Then they are issued out of him as audible words, writings,
gestures and physical movements. The entity of the author's illusion is the experience, in
memory as well as perception, of daily life. And such a experience is always made afresh.
For, experience, in itself, is always made inevitably, just as our life, our living, is an
indispensable experience, whether we hope or not, while we are alive. Such experience as
is made in this way in the author is what is called imagination.

The feigned presence in which the author's imagination attracts our attention in a
work of fiction is complicated. Fiction as the imagined is not only all that appears in the
conscious attention, but seems to be all that will perhaps appear there. So at the moment
when we are in the midst of the imaginative experience, it is impossible to ask whether
the imaginative presence has a real existence or not. If we should ask such a question we
are not engaged in a task of imaginative experience. Then what is the meaning of the
following statement: "Fiction is a mirror of reality." In my opinion it means that the
illusionary experience picked up out of the complicated actual world through attention
proceeds into the manifestation of meaning, represents an actual, and finally makes the
experience of a copy of the actual.

We can conceive fiction in general as imaginary experience, at any moment and in
any form we desire to. As I have already stated, it does not matter what its value may
be or whether it may be checked with the fact. Therefore the contents of fiction include
such complicated and contradictory presence as at once private and public, or individual
and social at the same time. The whole thing that is absorbed by the author or reader
who considers one thing in his mind and concerns another in his body, is fiction.

Heretofore I have pursued the general idea of making of fiction and understood that it
does not bob up out of the earth nor it is evoked from above. In the most essential core of
fiction lies the way of making. And the way of making naturally demands technique.
Without technique nothing is made so far as fiction is concerned. And in this respect the
indispensable elements of fiction in general are the word, character, emotion, conflict,
imagination, pattern and idea. All of these seven elements are technique which distinguishes
fiction from the epic, lyric and drama on the one hand, and from the essay, biography
and history on the other. From this point of view, in conclusion, we meet the matter of
technique as another approach to the study of fiction as fiction, which, I think, will urge
the study of fiction to claim its raison d'etre as the science of art.

IV. Conclusion

In this essay I have advocated that one way of studying fiction as fiction is that of
genre, and another is that of technique. The former shows that fiction does not exist
casually, but has grown and developed in a sort of evolution. The latter shows the process
of writing and reading fiction, the driving force of which is technique that distinguishes
fiction from other divisions of literature. The former is, in a sense, an abstracted history
of fiction, and the latter concerns with the entity of fiction, around which swarm prefi-
cessional studies in the name of fictional studies.

Of course, I never forget that genre and technique stand on humanity. But fiction
does not the sole establishment upon humanity. Humanity concerns with every human
activity. So it will never decide definitely what fiction is.

This essay, indeed, is a sort of adventure and an immature one, I am afraid, but I
think its purport is a matter of course. So it has many things to be inquired into more
deePLY. And especially I acknowledge that a detailed explanation of each element of
technique is required. In that sense, my present essay is an introductory introduction to
the study of fiction. The idea of this essay has long been cherished in my mind, but I
acknowledge that without those reference books that are put down below, I hardly manage
to formulate it. (Dec. 20, 1957)
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