

**YOSHIRO ISHIHARA'S DETENTION IN SIBERIA WRITTEN IN
"BOKYO TO UMI" (『望郷と海』)**

Diyora Abdurakhimova*

*Teacher,

Department of Translation Studies and International Journalism,

Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies,

Tashkent, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: diyora.9208@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00586.9

ABSTRACT

In this article, we will consider the Siberian detention depicted in the essay "Bokyo to Umi" by Yoshiro Ishihara, who was known as a poet. Yoshiro Ishihara talked about his Siberian experience in poetry immediately after his return to Japan. Ishihara often stated that he did not write prose, but fifteen years after returning, he published several essays on his experience of detaining Siberia. Later, it will be published under the title of "Bokyo to Umi". Why did he have to write his experience as an essay after fifteen years had passed? In "About "Bokyo and the Sea"", there is the following description about it.

KEYWORDS: *Siberian Detention, Life and Death, Humans, Humanity, Individual, Egoism*

INTRODUCTION

For me, poetry was the only form of expression that could be perceived as "confused". It was because of my poetry that I was able to escape from the aphasia that naturally accompanies the mental imbalance and confusion immediately after returning to Japan. After that, it can be said that the period of about 15 years until I wrote the prose was a repetition of trial and error in order to re-question the internal experience of the external experience and to establish what can be said to be the subject of the re-questioning.

He said that he had "strong anxiety and resistance" to talk about his experience in prose. I have poetry, he wrote, and was saved by poetry. However, as a result, he is forced to talk about his experience in prose. It was because "I needed to re-question how I now perceive myself, who lost words and expressions at the end of devastation and debilitation". In prose, Ishihara re-experiences his own experience by internally re-questioning it, and in "About "Bokyo to Umi"", he describes it as "an experience that truly deserves the name of the experience". In addition, "The absolute premise for starting to write these memorandums is the attitude of accusation" and the withdrawal from "victim awareness", and his position in writing "Bokyo to Umi". Is clarified. "Accusation" is an important point when reading Ishihara, and it is a feature of essays as well as poetry.

In addition, Fumiyo Hatatani states that Ishihara's essay is characterized by touching the perpetrator, and summarizes the content of the essay most accurately.

The series of essays logically analyzes the actions of Japanese detainees, especially Ishihara himself, in the Siberian Concentration Lager, and delves into the inside. What is depicted is the essence of human beings, where life and death are revealed in the extreme situation of a single piece of paper. Its violent and powerful appearance becomes a question that is common to the present and shakes its feet. How would you live if you were in this situation? (Note 3)

“A series of essays” refers to “Bokyo to the Sea” and “The River Where the Sea Flows” published in 1974. The author thinks that the point of “the essence of human beings that is revealed in the situation” that Hatatani mentioned when dealing with “Bokyo to Umi” is an important point of this work. Focusing on that in this chapter, we will explain in detail under what circumstances and how Ishihara’s “re-questioning his experience” was done by analyzing the daily life in the camp. I will consider it.

In this article, we first analyze Yoshiro Ishihara’s perception of “life” and “death” which are fateful problems in extreme situations. After that, we will consider how “survival” was realized and what was lost as a human being.

About “life” and “death”. The “I” in “Bokyo to Umi” contains an essay on the theme of direct Siberian detention. Although each essay describes the harsh situation of detention, if one topic is considered as a whole, there is no doubt that the relationship between “life” and “death” and the surviving side’s “self-responsibility”. And there is a sense of “sin”. In other words, Yoshiro Ishihara’s self-criticism as a survivor is thought to be there. The rationale for this is that Ishihara should not forget the fact that in “About “Bokyo to Umi””, “What has returned is somehow already destroyed as a human being. One hero is also from there. Did not come back”.

A similar word can be found in Viktor Frankl’s “Night and Fog”¹, which had a great influence on Ishihara.

All of us who have returned to life by all the happy coincidences, or-if we want to call it-by the miracle of God, know that and reassure us: It is possible. That is, the best people did not come back. (Underline by author)

Ishihara and Frankl may well express their “remorse” as “the ones who have returned”. With that in mind, the attitudes towards the dead in the works of both authors can be well understood.

Let’s take a look at the attitude of “I” toward the dying people in “Bokyo to Umi”. For example, Eichmann’s phrase “The death of a hundred is a tragedy / The death of a million is a statistic” quoted in the epigraph “In the Unidentified Death” is written in the work of the detainees. It accurately represents the current state of death and how “I” accepts it. As mentioned in Chapter 1, most people disappeared in the year when detention began. It is the result of starvation, typhus, and inexperience. However, among the dead, there is no human death as an individual. There are a number of dead, there are groups, there are only unknown soldiers. That is the most difficult thing for “I” who values the individual. It can be presumed that this is because there is a strong desire to remember the dead as an individual and as a person with a name. It is also undeniable that there is respect for the dead.

The same idea as the idea that there is no “individual” death in Ishihara’s “lager” can be seen in Frankl’s “Night and Fog”. In the section about teaching someone else’s number to remove a person from the list, he continues:

But it is clear that even if someone is saved from being killed, someone else must come in instead. Because in the case of transport, only the number of people, that is, the number of prisoners to fill the transport, matters. Each prisoner literally shows only the number, and the list of transports is, in fact, only the number. (Underline by author)

If you pay attention to the sidelines, you can see that only the “number” of human beings is emphasized, and the human name is changed to just a “number”. In other words, the characteristic of death in the internment camp is that it is not the death of an “individual”, and Ishihara regards it as “terrifying”. As an example, Ishihara first mentions death in genocide (genocide).

ジェノサイドのおそろしさは、一時に大量の人間が殺戮されることにあるのではない。そのなかに、ひとりひとりの死がないということが、私にはおそろしいのだ。人間が被害においてついに自立できず、ただ集団であるにすぎないときは、その死においても自立することなく、集団のままであるだろう。(中略)人は死において、ひとりひとりの名を呼ばれなければならないのだ。(「確認されない死のなかで」)

The horror of genocide is not that a large number of humans are killed at one time. It is terrifying to me that there is no death for each person in it. When humans are finally unable to become independent in damage and are merely a group, they will not become independent in their death and will remain in a group. (Omitted) In death, one must be called the name of each person. (“In unconfirmed death”)

Becoming a “group” first breaks the concept of “individual”. Just as the responsibility of an “individual” as an individual is not taken into account when acting in a “group”, the value of each individual as a human being is overlooked even when he or she dies. For Ishihara, it is “terrifying” that many people do not die at once, but that they cannot die as a single person with a name. It can be seen from here that he was so particular about “individuals”. At the same time, there is dissatisfaction with the statistics of human beings.

As mentioned in Frankl’s quote above, “the number of prisoners who should be transported is a problem”, both Ishihara and the survivors are a matter of number.

粗暴な囚人管理のもとでは、誰が生きのこるかということは、ただ数のうえでの問題であって、一人の個人の関心の枠をすでにこえていたのである。(同前)

Under rough prisoner management, who survived was just a matter of numbers, already beyond the bounds of an individual's interests. (Same as above)

The word “individual” is also used in this quote, but in the lager everything is counted and it doesn’t matter who survives.

However, it cannot be said that Ishihara himself was outside the “group”. Because human beings could not survive alone, they sometimes lived a life in which “symbiosis” was forced, and the person “us” was used as a narrative, and oneself was included in it. Is revealed.

In “In unconfirmed death” two deaths that were in opposition to genocide, but shocked Ishihara, are written. The first is a Japanese man who died softly while eating.

ある朝、私の傍らで食事をしていた男が、ふいに食器を手放して居眠りをはじめた。そのときの囚人の手から食器をひきはなすことはできない。したがって、食事をはじめた男が、食器を手放して眠り出すということは、私には到底考えられないことであつたので、驚いてゆさぶってみると彼はすでに死んでいた。そのときの手ごたえのなさは、すでに死に対する人間的な反応をうしなっているはずの私にとって、思いがけない衝撃であつた。すでに中身が流れ去って、皮膚だけになった林檎をつかんだような触感は、その後ながく私の記憶にのこつた。

One morning, a man who was eating beside me suddenly let go of the dishes and began to fall asleep. The tableware cannot be removed from the hands of the prisoner at that time. Therefore, it was unthinkable for me that the man who started eating would let go of the dishes and fall asleep, so I was surprised to find that he was already dead. The unresponsiveness at that time was an unexpected shock to me, who should have already had a human reaction to death. The tactile sensation of grabbing an apple, which had already flowed away and had only skin, remained in my memory for a long time.

What shocked Ishihara, who “should have already had a human reaction to death”, was the “feeling of grasping an apple that had only skin”. Losing a human response to “death” may be seen in two cases: the deadest or the distance from death. When a large number of people die in the life of the camp and they are desperate to live, it is thought that the reaction to death is not truly “human”. However, it may have been revived by feeling the human being malnourished and “eaten up” by “self-protein” with the touch of his hand. Such deaths were not uncommon, but it would have been great for Ishihara to experience them with the sensation of his hands. Not only that. The thought about the scene is written as follows.

彼にも一個の姓名があり、その姓名において営なまれた過去があつたということなど到底信じがたいような、不可解な物質であつたが、それにもかかわらず、それは、他者とはついにまぎれがたい一個の死体として確認されなければならず、埋葬にさいしては明確にその姓名を呼ばれなければならなかつたものである。

It was a mysterious substance that it was hard to believe that he also had a surname and had a past that was practiced in that surname, but it was finally confused with others. It had to be identified as a single corpse, and had to be explicitly called for its surname at the time of burial.

“In unconfirmed death” mainly talks about “life” and “death”. Among them, “name” is also a proof of human being as an individual, and Ishihara is trying to convey that his “history” that has lived up to that time is there. Frankl’s testimony that humans were “numbered” is solved by Ishihara in the form of “human beings” as one “individual”.

The second is the death of a Romanian who died under a felled tree at a logging site. Here, the scene where Ishihara saw the corpse is depicted.

私の目がその下半身をたどって、雪明りのなかで上半身にとどいたとき、思わず私は息をのんだ。上半身が仰向いていたからである。死体の胴がねじ切れていたことに気づくには、それほどの時間を必要としなかつた。私はまっしぐらにバラックへ逃げかえつた。その時の私のいつわりのない気持ちは、一刻でもはやく死体から遠ざかりたいという

ことであった。「あれがほんとうの死体だ」という悲鳴のようなものが、バラックの戸口まで、私の背なかにぴったりついて来た。

When my eyes followed the lower half of the body and reached the upper half of the body in the snow, I took a breath. This is because the upper body was facing up. It did not take long to notice that the corpse's torso was twisted. I fled straight to the barracks. At that time, my unrelenting feeling was that I wanted to move away from the corpse in an instant. Something like a scream, "That's a real corpse", came snugly in my back, up to the barracks doorway.

Ishihara's first thought in this regard was that "humans should never die like that". Yoshiro Ishihara must have seen various ways of dying. However, death like the Romanian would be the most tragic for humans. Not only Ishihara, but also everyone is miserable, and no one must want such a death. Moreover, it is believed that the death was not perceived as the death of a single human being. For that reason, Ishihara thinks, "human beings should never die like that". We can read the consciousness that these two deaths should be recorded and must be left as a human being who will never be forgotten.

On the other hand, the following thoughts can be seen regarding humans who died in the internment camp.

いわば人間でなくなることへのためらいから、さいごまで自由になることのできなかつた人たちから淘汰がはじまったのである。（「強制された日常から」）

So to speak, hesitation to become non-human, so the selection began from those who could not be free until the end. ("From forced daily life")

This statement can be read as if it implies the inhumane behavior of the surviving human beings. In other words, adapting to the situation was the key to survival. Therefore, when we talk about "life" in the camp, we must focus on "adapting". Ishihara states in "About "Bokyo to Umi" that "adaptation is to "survive" and, more than that, to surely fall as a human being". In other words, "surviving" in the camp, means "certainly falling as a human being". Furthermore, the following description can be found in the same essay.

私にとって重要なことは、私が適応したという事実、私が生きて帰って来たという事実の納得と承認である。生きて帰って来たという事実そのものが、のがれがたく墮落である地点まで一度は自分を追いつめなければならないのではないか。私に出発という行為があるとすれば、かろうじてそののちである。（「『望郷と海』について」）

What is important to me is the conviction and approval of the fact that I have adapted and that I have returned alive. Perhaps the fact that he came back alive must once pursue himself to the point where it is hard to escape and fall. If I had the act of departure, it was barely after that. ("About "Bokyo to Umi"")

This quote and Ishihara's words at the beginning of this section, "One hero did not come back from there," are connected, and the conclusion that the "life" of one's survival is by no means a pleasure.

So why can't we say that "surviving" is happy? Why did the detainees who returned alive felt "remorse" and "guilt" toward the dead when they reconsidered the time? The reason is that detainees have to sacrifice what is important to humans in order to survive in harsh conditions.

The price to survive. In order for detainees to survive in the situation of internment camps, which is not suitable for humans to live in, there was a great price to pay for losing something. The first price was trust in humans, which turned into distrust. One of the causes of distrust was that the detainees were forced to “coexist”. It is the meal scene that depicts distrust in “Bokyo to Umi”. Since there is a shortage of tableware, two people can be put in one tableware, and two people will form a “food can group”. It is written as follows about how the “food can group” is formed.

食罐組をつくるばあい、多少とも親しい者と組むのが人情であるが、結局、親しい者と組んでも嫌なものと組んでも、おなじことだということが、やがてわかった。というのは、食糧の絶対的な不足のもとでは、食罐組の存在は、おそかれはやかれ相互間の不信を拡大させる結果にしかならなかったからである。（「ある〈共生〉の経験から」）
（傍線・引用者）

When creating a canned food group, it is human nature to team up with someone who is a little closer, but in the end, it turned out that it was the same whether it was teamed up with someone close to you or something you didn't like. For, under the absolute shortage of food, the existence of the eclipse group would probably only result in widening distrust between each other. (“From the experience of a certain < symbiosis >”) (Underline by author)

It is pointed out here that it has nothing to do with feeling distrust, whether the person is close or disgusting. The reason is the lack of food. The problem is how to distribute the small amount of food evenly, and the scene where the distribution method is changed many times is also depicted in the work. In addition, the attitude of suspicion toward the other party at the time of distribution can be seen from the following sentence.

分配が行われているあいだ、相手は一言も発せず分配者の手許をにらみつけているのはた目には、この二人が互いに憎みあっているとしか思えないほどである。（同前）

While the distribution is taking place, the other person is glaring at the distributor's hand without saying a word, so it seems that the two are hating each other. (Same as above)

Here, the distrust of the other party is clearly seen. If diet is the energy that gives humans as living things the energy to live, it would be life itself for malnourished detainees. Therefore, it is natural to be serious about one's diet, and so is the person who distributes it. Therefore, it can be said that two or three meals in a day are obtained by using the nerves of the detainee.

In addition, there is the issue of food distribution by quota, which is mentioned in “From the Forced Everyday Life”. From the fixed amount per person, those who seem to have fulfilled the quota and those who do not are divided. By increasing the food of one detainee, the food of another detainee is reduced. These rules of the camp also create an opportunity for increased distrust among detainees.

The problem with this distribution method is to see the other person as a person who directly endangers his or her life. However, because of this distrust, “symbiosis” cannot be stopped. The “symbiosis” between “food cans” will naturally continue during work and sleep. Because it is a means to survive.

いま私に、骨ばった背を押しつけているこの男は、たぶん明日、私の生命のなにがしかをくいちぎろうとするだろう。だが、すくなくともいまは、暗黙の了解のなかで、お互いの生命をあたためあわなければならない。それが約束なのだから。そして同じ瞬間に、相手も、まさにおなじことを考えているにちがいないのである。(同前)

This guy, who is now pushing me with a stubborn back, will probably try to break something in my life tomorrow. But at least now, with the unspoken understanding, we must warm each other's lives. Because that is a promise. And at the same moment, the other person must be thinking about exactly the same thing. (Same as above)

The lives of others are needed because one cannot survive alone. It is a daily life that continues to “coexist” while having a feeling of distrust toward the person who endangers one’s life. The distrust described in “From the experience of a certain “symbiosis” appears mainly in the meal scene, but even in the case of a secret notice, the other person is treated as a person who may harm himself. You can think of it as always maintaining distrust because you were watching it.

The notification would be a big problem for humans living in the camp. The essence of “human beings” appears there. In “Justice of the Weak”, it is written about the experience of being informed by “one needle”. Ishihara divides the notification into two types. The first is a sneak peek “mainly done in prisoner-of-war camps”, which is related to the “hanging up” and “the democratic movement and the so-called” hidden war criminals “of the Soviet authorities who used it skillfully”. It is supposed to be done. In other words, it is a secret notice disguised as a “democratic movement”, and it is stated that “it cannot be called “a secret notice””. The second is Ishihara’s experience of a sneak peek, stating that “it is a completely lonely act, and its motives are often mysterious”. The notification is given by the victim, who is also the perpetrator at the same time. The notified side will also have a victim consciousness. Isn't it natural that misanthropy grows stronger in a state where you don't know who will be informed, and even if you know it, you can't say anything?

It can be said that the distrust came from the fear that one's life would be taken by the other party. Moreover, such distrust will eventually deprive humans of the second price.

Ishihara cites detainees as the target of this hatred, and points out that he is a close person among them.

強制収容所内での人間的憎悪のほとんどは、抑留者をこのような非人間的な状態へ拘禁しつづける収容所管理者へ直接向けられることなく（それはある期間、完全に潜伏し、潜在化する）、おなじ抑留者、それも身近にいる者に対しあらわに向けられるのが特徴である。それは、いわば一種の近親憎悪であり、無限に進行してとどまることを知らない自己嫌悪の裏がえしであり、さらに当然向けられるべき相手への、潜在化した憎悪の代償行為だとあってよいであろう。（「ある〈共生〉の経験から」）（傍線・引用者）

Most of the human hatred within the internment camp is not directed directly at the camp manager who continues to detain the detainees in such an inhumane state (it is completely hidden and latent for a period of time). The same detainees, which are also characterized by being exposed to those who are close to them. It's a kind of narcissism of relatives, the proof of self-hatred that never goes on and on, and the price of latent hatred for those who should be

directed. Would be good. (“From the experience of a certain “symbiosis””) (Underline by author)

Why was the hatred not directed at the camp manager? The possible reason is that the camp managers created a harsh environment to deprive all of their “humanity”, but it was the detainees themselves who abandoned their “humanity”. That is. It is undeniable that it is also the camp’s manager who threatens his own life, but he must have felt a direct threat from other detainees around him before that. Therefore, I feel hatred for the people around me, but from the time I began to understand that it was myself who abandoned “humanity”, as Ishihara mentioned, the object of that hatred includes myself. Will be. It may be because he is in the same position as others and he keeps in mind that he is also a life-threatening being. He hates others, but he also hates himself.

The distrust, hostility, and vigilance of the other party may have expanded into hatred. Furthermore, I think that many anguish that is not mentioned in this work is hidden in the sentence “Everyone was deeply hurt mentally and clearly remembered each other’s actions in the most difficult state”. Be done. But there was certainly a thought behind everything about how to survive.

When trust, the first price to survive in the camp, and the hatred of the other party as a result of the second price are gone, the third price is the loss of interest in everything. Isn’t the worst situation when humans fall into a state of indifference?

Ishihara cites Yasenskii’s “Collusion of Indifferent People” in “From the Notes from 1965 to 1985”.

敵を恐れるな——やつらは君を殺すのが関の山だ。

友を恐れるな——やつらは君を裏切るのが関の山だ。

無関心なひとびとを恐れよ——やつらは殺しも裏切りもしない。だが、やつらの沈黙という承認があればこそ、この世には虐殺と裏切りが横行するのだ。

Do not be afraid of your enemies-they kill you in Sekiyama.

Do not be afraid of your friends-it’s Sekiyama that they betray you.

Fear indifferent people-they neither kill nor betray. But with the approval of their silence, slaughter and betrayal are rampant in the world.

By quoting such words in his notebook, it is clear that Ishihara had long been aware of his indifference. The indifference featured in “Bokyo to Umi” is similar to this. In short, it is indifference to the lives of others. However, if you take a closer look, one is the indifference to others who are “lonely” and have nothing to do with you, and it is your “egoism” that supports it. This <egoism> is originally possessed by everyone, but it appears strongly only in extreme conditions. The other is indifference to the surrounding events as a lesson learned from what I have experienced so far, and it can be said that there is something like “give up” in the background.

First, let’s confirm from the indifference to others. Indifference is often seen to flow from the “experienced” to the “inexperienced” in the camp. For example, “inexperienced people” learn

how to deal with poisonous insects, Mashika, through their own experiences. For anything else, the “experienced” is on the sidelines in silence. On the other hand, the “inexperienced person” had to “every time he encountered an unexpected situation, he had to judge, understand, and deal with it by himself”.

“Experienced people” do not teach others what they have experienced. There is a kind of “egoism” here. However, “inexperienced people” also become “experienced people” and acquire the “egoism”. This “egoism” appears to survive, and because I have experienced pain, I do not give others the opportunity to survive without any pain. Isn’t that the essence of “human beings”?

Ishihara states that such indifference “may have been a kind of instinct to defend oneself from useless interest”. That’s true. The silence around Ishihara’s “careless” experience in “Ogida” stems from his indifference to life, his fear of life, and his will to “defend himself”. It is supported by.

Next, what about indifference to surrounding events as a lesson learned from what we have experienced so far? This indifference is done recognizing that it is powerless to the events around it. It doesn’t matter to the detainees whether someone is shot dead or a new guard arrives. Because it can’t be helped, it seems that there is some kind of “give up”. Therefore, it is inevitable to keep “silence” to the surrounding events at all times.

The indifference that came from <egoism> and the indifference that came from getting used to the situation were the feelings that the detainees at that time naturally reached and were the weapons for survival. However, falling indifferent in any situation involves questioning the value of human beings. Being indifferent means being a bystander, shutting yourself in a world of just one person and excluding others.

However, even though he is a “lonely person” who is confined to a single world, he is always in a “group”. In such a state, the fourth price is the existence as an “individual”. It is largely due to the fact that it has already been treated as a “group” of detainees from the time of detention and has been “averaged” in everything. In “Silence and Aphasia”, “Even a toilet is a place that is completely open to the public. In an environment where fate cannot escape, there is no room for privacy anymore. We are, in short”, clear “to each other. Yes, no matter when I changed the position, there was no chance of confusion”. As shown, the cause is largely due to the influence of the environment.

The detainees also blend in with the “group”, and everything from doing to thinking becomes the same. It was also a means for this “group” to survive. Being the same as the people around you will not attract the attention of others and will prevent you from being particularly involved in the incident. However, the need for words diminishes as the prisoners become “clear” beings.

Gradually, words become the fifth price. Ishihara describes it as “aphasia”. There is no point in expressing the situation in words, just the words themselves have no meaning.

あるときかたわらの日本人が、思わず「あさましい」と口走るのを聞いたとき、あやうく私は、「あたりまえのことをいうなよ」とどなるところであった。あさましい状態を「あさましい」という言葉がもはや追いきれなくなる時、言葉は私たちを「見放した」。（「沈黙と失語」）

At one point, when I heard a Japanese person involuntarily say “I’m sorry”, I was about to say, “Don’t say the obvious”. When the word “dumb” can no longer keep up with the terrible state, the word “forsook” us. (“Silence and aphasia”)

We cannot express the state in which we are placed in words. The gap between reality and the meaning of words can be seen here. Therefore, the prisoner fell into a state of “aphasia” and further confessed that Ishihara himself had been in that state for a long time. Due to the “aphasia” situation, prisoners had to face the situation where they could not speak when needed.

As mentioned above, “surviving” in inhuman and harsh situations was achieved by continuing to be mentally debilitated. The detainees repeatedly overcome the ruin that pays for each element of “humanity”. The price will never be forgotten and will leave a mark on each person's heart. At least that's what Ishihara recognized in his essays and notes. The pain of what I had experienced in Siberia did not go away after my return.

The clear proof is “Bokyo to Umi” written 15 years after detention.

“Bokyo to Umi” is not a novel, but an essay, it is thought that what was written in it was not a fictional one, but rather a problem that bothered and made the author think. When considering why this essay was written, the first thing that came to my mind was that I wanted to revisit my detention experience and put it into words so that others could understand it. As can be read from the “Letter to Relatives”, Siberian detention was not well understood by others and was even suspected.

REFERENCES

1. 石原吉郎『石原吉郎全集Ⅱ』化新社、1980
2. 石原吉郎「『望郷と海』について」『石原吉郎全集Ⅱ』化新社、1980
3. ヴィクトール・フランクル『夜と霧』（ドイツ強制収容所の体験記録）霜山徳爾訳、みすず書房、1956
4. 細見和之「石原吉郎——シベリア抑留詩人の生と詩」中央公論新社、2015
5. 鹿野登美『石原吉郎と鹿野武一のこと』『詩学』1978