

The Reformulation of the Concept and Philosophy of History in Modern Japan

著者	SUZUKI Sadami
会議概要（会議名，開催地，会期，主催者等）	ハワイ州マウイ，2000年11月
page range	253-298
year	2007-06-01
シリーズ	International Symposium in North America 2000
URL	http://doi.org/10.15055/00001452

The Reformulation of the Concept and Philosophy of History in Modern Japan

SUZUKI Sadami

Translated by Jeffrey ANGLES

1. Historical Transformations in the Concept of Historiography and Views of History

In order to examine the historical transformations in the notion of historiography and the ways that that views of history have changed in Japan from ancient times to the modern era, one must first put the concept of “history” (*rekishi*) itself into some historical perspective. Why? If one does not, then there is a strong possibility that in examining the ways that people in the past wrote or thought about history, one will gloss over—or even worse, dispose of—any differences that might exist between older understandings of “history” and the way that the concept is currently used in historiographical studies.

Contemporary accounts of history take on several different forms, ranging from political and economic histories to histories that tend to focus on the lives and culture of the common people. It is clear, however, that these forms of telling the events of the past are fundamentally grounded in the modern Western science of history—in other words, the idea that history is the work of objectively reconstructing what happened in the past and recording it for contemporary audiences. In looking back over the various records of the past, contemporary historians place value on accounts which get at the truth behind true events; they downplay legend and seemingly non-factual accounts of the past, or at least, attempt to get at the kernel of “truth” deep within a particular legend. This scholarly attitude toward the recording of history entered Japan during the Meiji period. For this reason, many scholars who have dealt with the ways that the idea of history has been reformulated in modern Japan have focused their attention on the Meiji period; however, most of them have approached the subject with a strong bias that is itself a result of the introduction of the modern Western concept of history.

One major exception to this rule is Satō Masayuki’s study *Rekishi ninshiki no jikū* (The Space and Time of Historical Understanding), published in 2004.¹ Satō calls the comparative study of the ways that people have understood the past “historiology” (*hisutorioroji*), and in the introduction, he writes the following about past studies of the meaning of history.

Historical accounts of things that happened before the present moment have been the primary objects of research; however, they do not necessarily presuppose the existence of a field of scholarship dedicated to the study of history. Even when professional historians did not exist, history came down to us through words and writings, and the past formed for us. Even when there were no university professors who worked in historical studies, history itself was continually interpreted so that the past has continued to cast its strong spell over the present.²

In his first chapter, “Historical Perceptions and Consciousness within the Word ‘History,’” Satō examines the way that the concept of history has been formulated in modern historiography. There he writes, “[I]f traditional fields of study had not been receptive to new modes of scholarship and served as the foundation upon which they were reorganized and reformulated, then the translation of concepts would be absolutely impossible.”³ In the fourth chapter, “Models and Perceptions within Historiography,” he comments that elucidating “the position and role of historiography within an entire culture as a whole” is the subject of historiology, and in order to do that, one should clarify the “special characteristics of the subsets” of different kinds of historical records and “determine the ways in which these elements connect with one together.”⁴

This perspective is desirable not just when one examines transformations in the idea of “history” but whenever one attempts to examine the changes that any idea has undergone over the course of time. My own work, which deals with the ways that various cultural concepts from the west were translated and incorporated into Japanese thought in the late Tokugawa period, the Meiji era and onward, I have used this perspective as my guiding principle.⁵ Without a doubt, Satō Masayuki’s *Rekishī ninshiki no jikū* is a work valuable for anyone interested in historiography or related subjects; however, Satō has failed to place “history,” as this term is used in modern historical studies, into sufficient cultural perspective. Why is that?

In the fourth chapter, “Models and Perceptions within Historiography,” Satō correctly argues that in China, history is a mode of scholarship designed to derive lessons from the past. In this regard it differs from the Western model of history, and therefore, it has not given birth to the same set of problematics regarding the way that one perceives the historical past. From the countless historiographic pieces of writing that describe the past, Satō only chooses histories that conform to the modern standards of historical study—histories that attempt to reconstruct the truth underlying true events, then he conducts his comparative study of historiography east and west based on this selection. His standards become especially clear when he writes about the “literary forms of historiography” in Japan. There he writes, “fundamentally, history (*rekishi*) was written in *kanbun* (classical Chinese), whereas literature (*bungaku*) was written in Japanese, and this tradition continued until the nineteenth century.” The histories that he is talking about were those written by specialists; all other things fall into the category of “literature” and are excluded from the framework of historiography.

When Satō uses the word “literature” (*bungaku*) here, he means the idea of writing as a form of linguistic art—an idea that only caught on among specialists at the beginning of the twentieth century. Within the history of the concept of “literature,” however, are certain considerations that undercut his argument. Until the mid-nineteenth century, the word *bungaku* was used in Japan to refer to the study of books and materials written in *kanbun*. This tradition remained so firmly in place that even until the Meiji period, no one considered *waka* poetry or tales (*monogatari*)—two genres always written in Japanese—to fall within the boundaries of what was called *bungaku*. There are no known exceptions to this rule. Throughout the Meiji period, the word *bungaku* was used in a general sense to refer to something akin to the modern idea of “the humanities,” a broad field that included history. Although modern scholars and translators usually render the word *bungaku* as “literature” in English, one might more precisely render the word *bungaku* as it was used through the Meiji period as “the study of letters.” One sees this in the title of the administrative units of universities, where the word

bungakubu (department of *bungaku*), referred to an academic unit that taught history. It was around 1910 that the word *bungaku* began, among specialists, to take on a sense closer to that of the English word “literature” as its principal meaning. In other words, it was at this time that the word *bungaku* came to refer to literary arts, as well as criticism and research having to do with the literary arts. In the period after World War II, one finds the original meaning of *bungaku* only relatively limited, specialized places, such as the title of university departments where it still means something broader than just the study of novels, literary criticism, and so on.⁶ In other words, Satō Masayuki is making the mistake of classifying past instances of historiography using concepts that circulate today.

In China, it was during the 1930s that the word *wenxue* (written with the same characters as *bungaku*), started taking on the meaning of the literary arts. Until then, it had meant the “study” (*xue*) of “letters” or “writing” (*bun*), and was used to refer to scholarship in general. It seems to have been a rough synonym for the words *wenyi* and *yiwen*, but sometimes, it was used to place a greater value on the study of writing in particular. (*Wenyi* and *yiwen* are two combinations of the characters that mean “letters” or “writing” and “arts,” and therefore, they represent broader fields of endeavor than just writing.) In the bibliographic treatise in the official history of the Sui dynasty (*Sui shu*), the word *wenxue* (in other words, “the study of letters”) came to take on the following subcategories: *jing* (teachings, especially those of Confucius), *shi* (history), *zi* (ideology), and *ji* (anthologies). The more value one placed on history, the closer the fields of *jing* and *shi* came into alignment; however, histories were always edited with the spirit of the “teachings” in mind. Although there is not enough space here to give much more than a cursory summary of these concepts and their value within Chinese scholarship, sufficed to say that it was during the Song Dynasty that many Chinese began to look down upon fabrications within these records.⁷

“Models and Perceptions within Historiography,” chapter four of Satō’s *Rekishī ninshiki no jikū*, provides a comparison with modern western histories that place Christian theological teachings in a prominent position. In doing so, Satō states that in the Chinese and Japanese cultural traditions, historical records compiled in order to show patterns and models were each centered around their own axis of analysis. Satō places great value on experienced events and interprets the spirit of Confucianism, which attempted to avoid fabrications, from a perspective that stands in contrast to history. In doing so, he ends up inverting the order of teaching and history in Confucianism. Moreover, Satō fails to investigate the differences between the characteristics of Chinese histories and historiography written by Japanese in *kanbun*.

Previously, this article quoted Satō in saying that “fundamentally, history (*rekishi*) was written in *kanbun*, whereas literature was written in Japanese, and this tradition continued until the nineteenth century.” Satō continues to say the following.

Among novels that have to do with historical events, there have arisen many different kinds of historical tales, such as accounts of war (*senki-mono*) and stories of battle (*gunki-mono*). What one has to notice, however, is that although these works like magnificent examples of historiography to the modern eye, at the time they were written, they did not fall within the category of history as understood by historians. This is because traditionally, history was understood as only those works that recorded various events that took place within the nation that were worth recording.

When Satō speaks of “historical tales” (*rekishi monogatari*) here, he is employing a term established among scholars of “national literature” (*kokubungakusha*) in the early part of the twentieth century in order to refer that type of historiographic records that take the form of a tale incorporating recollection. As this article will later show, the earliest of these is *Eiga monogatari* (*A Tale of Flowering Fortunes*), but this was followed by other histories written by the Fujiwara clan, including *Ōkagami* (*Great Mirror*) and other works.

Do these historical accounts, compiled by the Fujiwara authorities, really fall outside the boundaries of those writings that described national events “worth recording”? This does not appear to be the case. In fact, these works, although written in the form of tales, are important historiographic records created under government auspices. To complicate matters, the writing of the *Taiheiki* (*Account of the Great Peace*), which Satō Masayuki would probably classify as one of the several “different kinds of historical tales, such as accounts of war and stories of battle,” was supervised by the Ashikaga shogunate and for many years served as an “official history” of the warrior-run government. As these examples show, Satō’s observations fall short of the goal that he himself has set forth: the elucidation of “the position and role of historiography within an entire culture as a whole.” The reason is that, in the end, he has not grasped the relationships between “history” and other concepts and has failed to explore sufficiently the formulation of these ideas.

The purpose of this essay is to trace the ways in which Japanese historiography was reformulated in the Meiji period, but in order to do so, it is first necessary to examine the position that history held in premodern Japan. (Satō Masayuki too recognized the necessity of examining this conceptual framework.) However, in doing so, one should recognize that, at that time, history (written with the single character *shi*) was a subfield of the larger field of “the study of letters” (*bungaku*)—that broad field of scholarship that dealt with imported Chinese texts and that existed well before the word *bungaku* evolved into a narrower concept more akin to the modern western idea of the language arts. Moreover, one should re-examine historiographical sources written in Japanese in order to determine their characteristics and determine where they fall in the conceptual schematic of various forms of writing. For these reasons, the following section of this essay will briefly examine the differences in the Chinese and premodern Japanese concepts of history (*shi*), even though the principal purpose of this essay is to examine the Meiji reformulation of history. The third portion of this essay sketches out the shifts in the conceptual framework of history when the Japanese of the Meiji period encountered Western historiography and views of history. My intention in doing so is to gain a wide perspective and thus to open the discussion of historiography to wider possibilities, and so in the interests of space, regrettably, most of my discussions of individual historiographic works will be limited to the level of what might find in an encyclopedia or historical dictionary. The fourth section of this essay re-examines the work of Kume Kunitake (1839–1931), a scholar in national history at the Imperial University who attempted to apply bibliographic positivism to his work. In doing so, this will clarify the differences in the concept of history in the Meiji period and in the treatment of the history of the “imperial nation” that arose later, especially in the years around 1935.

2. Historiography in China and Pre-Restoration Japan

2.1. *Shi* and *lishi*

Traditionally, Chinese characters each have their own individual meaning. The compound word *lishi*, which is generally used today in China to mean “history,” is a combination of two individual characters. The first, *li*, means happenings in the past and corresponds roughly to the modern notion of history, and the second, *shi*, means history that has been recorded in written texts and thus corresponds to the term historiography. The two characters sometimes appeared as separate lexical items next to one another in ancient texts; for instance, they appear in the commentaries of Pei Songzhi (372–451) to the *Sanguo zhi* (Chronicle of the Three Kingdoms) as well as in the biographies compiled by Xiao Zixuan of the Liang dynasty (487–537) to form *Nanqi shu* (History of the Southern Qi).⁸ This word gained special currency in the nineteenth century. It is clear that Pi Xirui (1849–1908) wrote works such as *Jingxue lishi* (History of Confucian [Classical] Studies), but it is unclear exactly when this combination of characters began to function together as a compound word that meant something like “history” or “historical studies.” According to one contemporary Chinese dictionary, the word was first used as a translation for the title of the *Historiai* (479 B.C.E.) of Herodotus (494–30 B.C.E.).⁹ This seems to imply that the modern Chinese compound *lishi* was established as a two-character compound in response to the need to translate the Western concept of history—a process similar to what happened when the Chinese translated many other concepts as well.

In a nutshell, the Chinese understood history as the movements of the world in accordance with the will of Heaven or, more concretely, records of those events. One characteristic of Chinese historiography is that it was written, preserved, and compiled at the hands of government officials, who handled public records in ancient China. Historiography held a high place in the classics. Confucius (ca. 551–479 B.C.E.) used historical examples to establish a sense of correct conduct and thus helped establish a custom of recording examples of happenings within society that had didactic and moral value. In 213 B.C.E., the first emperor of the Qin Dynasty, after uniting the country into one kingdom, put into effect a policy of “Burning the books and burying the scholars” (*fenshu kengru*); however, later in 206 B.C.E. after the beginning of the Han Dynasty, Emperor Wu (r. 140–87 B.C.E.) made Confucianism state orthodoxy and strove to restore the lost classics. By this point then, scholars regarded the classics with reverence and placed a high value placed upon history, though they were careful to take critical stances vis-à-vis textual sources.

Sima Qian (ca. 145–87 B.C.E.), a contemporary of Emperor Wu, wrote *Shiji* (Records of the Grand Historian) in the form known as *jizhuanti*, comprised of several components including *benji* (imperial biographies), chronological tables, *liezhuan* (arrayed biographies of princes, heroes, great men, and scholars), *zhi* (treatises on various subjects), and the like. In particular, the Han-period way of writing was to collate and compare various kinds of records (not only official documents) against each other, and then to write. As a result, there were not a few passages that were mutually contradictory. As long as the bibliographic source was seen as having authoritative provenance, then it was given respect, and inconsistencies in content were left intact.

Respect for history continued to grow. The institution of the *shiguan*, the official historians who preserved and managed historical documents, was established in the Tang Dynasty,

and history became an important subject in the examinations for public office. Bureaucrats recorded the emperor's speech and conduct (*qijuzhu*) and summaries of the emperor's reigns and deaths in inclusive "veritable records" (*shilu*). When one dynasty replaced another that had grown weak or been overthrown, a new era would begin, and at the beginning of each new era, the new dynasty would write an official history (*zhengshi*) of the dynasty that preceded it. Through this process, historiographic material accumulated as a series of histories, each describing the events of an individual dynasty. Later, the Emperor Qianlong of the Qing Dynasty had these combined to produce the *Ershisi shi* (Twenty-Four Histories), consisting of 324 fascicles. Pursuant to a presidential order early in the Chinese republican era, the official histories were supplemented at the time Ke Shaomin's (1850–1933) *Xin yuan shi* (New History of the Yuan Dynasty) was published. This resulted in the creation of the so-called *Ershiwu shi* (Twenty-Five Histories). These are now known as the "official histories" (*zhengshi*) of China.

One finds that in these histories, the authors rigorously question the factuality of the historical materials, but they do not explain the backgrounds of events or interpret their meanings. Two essential elements of the official histories are the imperial biographies that recount the chronology of an emperor's reign and the biographies that describe the achievements of various important individuals. As mentioned above, another characteristic is that the official histories consist of an accumulation of historical accounts of each of the various dynasties, and for this reason, they are known in Chinese as "separate dynastic histories" (*duandaishi*). No other country in the world has written accounts of its history over so many years in such a systematic way.

Among the various official histories, Sima Qian's *Shiji* was what is called a *tongshi*, a more comprehensive history that covered the events of more than just a single dynasty of history. (Moreover, this work is interesting in that it records myths and legends passed down among the common people.) Another of the most famous comprehensive histories from a later point in history is the 294-fascicle *Zizhi tongjian* (Comprehensive Mirror for Aid in Government) (1065–84). Commissioned by the imperial order of Yingzong (Song emperor who ruled 1063–67) of the Northern Song Dynasty, Sima Guang (1019–86) compiled 1326 years worth of history, spanning the centuries from the Warring States Period to the Five Dynasties. There are other books as well that cover the history of multiple eras, such as *Lishi dafang gangjian bu* (Addenda to the Mirror for All History) (1606), which Yuan Huang of the Ming Dynasty compiled for use as a textbook in preparation for the examinations for public office. In this case, it is clear that the word *lishi* in the title means "history of successive generations" (*lidai zhi shi*), or in other words, a collection of separate dynastic histories.¹⁰ From this alone, it is difficult to tell if the two characters in *lishi* are acting as a single compound phrase or not.

Histories that were recorded by individuals and not through unofficial channels were called "outside histories" (*waishi*) or "outside transmissions" (*waizhuan*), but even these unofficial histories tended to parallel what was in government records. Later, especially in the Song dynasty, scholars adopted an increasingly strict, negative attitude toward writings that appeared to be fabrications. As a result, they assigned writings such as so-called "anecdotal histories" (*baishi*), "mysterious tales" (*zhiguai*), and "transmissions of the strange" (*zhuanqi*) of questionable veracity to categories that served as the wastebaskets for sources of dubious origins, namely "fiction" (*xiaoshuo*).

As in China, Japanese scholars of Confucianism also used the word *shi*, but the two-character compound *rekishi* was hardly used at all. (*Rekishi* is the Japanese reading for the same characters read *lishi* in Chinese.) Hayashi Gahō (1618–80), one of the sons of the Confucian scholar Hayashi Razan (1618–80), took over his father's work while serving the Tokugawa shogunate and completed the colossal 310-fascicle work *Honchō tsugan* (Comprehensive History of Our Kingdom, 1670). In the letters he exchanged with his younger brother in 1660 while working on the compilation, he uses the word *rekishi*. It is likely that he was influenced by the Chinese volume *Lishi dafang gangjian bu* mentioned above.¹¹ Satō Masayuki has located about twenty more books from the Genroku period onward that use the word. Among them is one called *Honchō rekishi* (History of Our Kingdom). This suggests that whereas the word had meant a collection that linked separate dynastic histories in China, the meaning had started to broaden out in Japan, as it came to be used to describe a group of historical documents that comprised a continuous history (*tsūshi*) of the nation. Moreover, the word appears to have been used in essays.¹²

In the Tokugawa period, one finds many cases where even if the content of a book was written in Japanese, it would have a *kanbun* title.¹³ Although such situations are rare, one might perhaps view those cases when the word *rekishi* was used in of a book written in Japanese as representing some of the earliest instances of the word as a naturalized Japanese compound word. However, it is important to note that since Japanese histories were continuous and since Japan has not had multiple dynastic changes in its past, it was relatively easy for Japanese to make the transition from the original Chinese use of the word, namely the historiographic records of various different dynasties, to a slightly different meaning, namely the historiographic records of various emperors. When writing of the *Kojiki* (Records of Ancient Matters) in *Endō tsugan* (A Comprehensive History of Sexual Love, 1716), the Shinto scholar Masuho Zankō (1655–1742) stated, “[that particular] history (*rekishi*) is exceedingly complicated.”¹⁴ It is possible to imagine that a Shinto scholar might have seen the *Kojiki* as an official history, but to suggest the *Kojiki* alone represents a *rekishi* (if we understand him like his Japanese contemporaries to mean a comprehensive history), seems an extremely broad use, perhaps even mistaken use of the term. Masuho Zankō also used the word *rekishi* in his *Jugyō hen* (Lectures), but it would be premature to say that these instances represent the emergence of this word as a general term.

2.2.1. Official and Unofficial Histories in Ancient Japan

In China, government authorities established the practice of creating official histories as authoritative historical records. Influenced by China, the ancient Japanese court also started compiling historical records as part of its work; however, the nature of these records was quite different than in China. This section will briefly describe the historical records compiled and administered by the authorities.

The *Rikkoku shi* (The Six National Histories of Japan), which were compiled by the government between the Nara and Heian periods, were put together at the hands of bureaucrats. It is well known that these were written in *kanbun* in a chronological style known as *hennentai*. Because the Yamato court, headed by the emperor, was never overthrown but simply continued in a line of emperors and empresses, these histories might be seen as parts of a continuous, long history. The six national histories consist of the following works: (1) *Nihon shoki* (Chronicles of Japan, 30 volumes, 720 c.e., covering the age of the gods until Emperor

Jitō), (2) *Shoku Nihongi* (Continued Chronicles of Japan, 40 volumes, 793, treating the years 697–791), (3) *Nihon kōki* (Later Chronicles of Japan, 40 volumes, 840, covering 792–833), (4) *Shoku Nihon kōki* (Continued Later Chronicles of Japan, 869, covering 833–850), (5) *Nihon Montoku tennō jitsuroku* (Annals of Emperor Montoku of Japan, 10 volumes, 879, covering 850–858), and (6) *Nihon sandai jitsuroku* (Annals of Three Reigns in Japan, 50 volumes, 901, covering 858–887, the reigns of Emperors Seiwa, Yōzei, and Kōkō).

The part of *Nihon shoki* that deals with the age of the gods consists of an edited collection of numerous surviving documents. As pointed out by Kate Wildman Nakai in her essay in this volume, an important feature of this work is that variant accounts are presented; the signal of these is the beginning phrase “according to a certain document” (*issho ni iwaku*). Because the ancient Japanese emperorship emerged in what was a federation of local political entities, writers at that time collected documents from a number of various areas and clans in order to write the early history of the nation. The patchwork quality of *Nihon shoki* is a result of this political and textual situation. In contrast, when the *Kojiki* presents the age of the gods, the ancient writers systematized the stories about the imperial household, using inference to sort out the numerous legends that had accumulated over the centuries.

One of the most frequently noted characteristics of the *Nihon shoki* is that it presents mythology and history as continuous and integrally connected; however, the intertwining of mythology and history is something that one often discovers in the oral tradition of preliterate societies. It is clear that the compilers of the early histories have simply preserved that connection. For instance, the heroic stories in the *Nihon shoki* and *Kojiki* were clearly inspired by various stories that were then kneaded into tales of heroism in people’s imaginations over long periods of time. Right in the middle of this process, however, the stories were written down. The result is perhaps not unlike a pot of rice gruel where the shapes of the original grains of rice have not completely dissolved. In other words, the legends in the *Nihon shoki* were collected and recorded in a half-finished state just before the various oral traditions that circulated in different parts of the country were completely molded together in order to form one grand mythological narrative.

Unlike the official histories of China, *Nihon shoki* contains writing about Buddhism. In the eras after the six national histories, there were attempts to compile works about subsequent eras, and these produced works such as the *Shin koku shi* (New National History) and *Honchō seiki* (Eras of Our Kingdom), but the *Annals of Three Reigns in Japan* was the last of the imperially sponsored official histories. From the Nara period to the mid-Heian period, a number of people wrote documents called “Personal Notes on *Nihon shoki*” (*Nihongi shiki*); these appear to be the notes of lecturers and the students who listened to them. In the Heian period, scholars produced a condensed summary of the Six National Histories known as *Nihongi ryaku* (Abridged Chronicles of Japan, 34 vols.). Also about that time, Sugawara no Michizane (845–903) classified and arranged the various types of accounts within the Six National Histories in his *Ruijū kokushi* (Classified National History). Much later, toward the end of the thirteenth century, Urabe Kanekata (late thirteenth century) compiled the *Shaku Nihongi* (Annotations of *Nihon shoki*), which is, as its name suggests, a commentary on *Nihon shoki*. As these examples show, the *Nihon shoki* was a work that remained an important reference for the scholarly class.

One more pre-Heian work of historiography worthy of note is Inbe Hironari’s (fl. 808) *Kogo shūi* (Gleanings from Ancient Stories, 807), which gives an account of the lineage of the

Inbe clan. The Inbe clan was officially in charge of Shinto ritual (*saishi*), but they had come into competition with the Nakatomi clan, whose participation in the same profession had grown increasingly prominent. The Inbe clan complained to the court about receiving unfair treatment, and they wrote *Kogo shūi* in order to record the stories about their clan which they claimed had fallen through the cracks when the national histories were compiled. In writing official documents, these Shinto scholars wrote in *kanbun*. *Kogo shūi* was, strictly speaking, an unofficial history, but it was a historical document that was born when submitted in conjunction with a plea to the court.

Toward the beginning of *Kogo shūi*, one finds the critical assertion that many details of history have slipped through the cracks when the official histories were written. This criticism had been leveled at the histories because one function of the official histories was to guarantee the lineages of the various clans involved in the imperial government. Here we see a statement of discontent toward the recording of history that, most likely, would have been unthinkable in China because of the difference in the functions of official histories and the importance that they played for the authorities in each country. Indeed, *Kogo shūi* is quite different in character from the unofficial histories written in China, and for many years, it continued to garner the respect of Shinto scholars. For more than a century after the completion of the *Nihon sandai jitsuroku*, people wrote histories of Japan in the form of “tales” (*monogatari*), which were written in *wabun*—a combination of Japanese words written in *kana*, Chinese words, and even a few kanji compounds words invented in Japan. These historical “tales” were one product of the so-called cultural golden age that took place under the Heian aristocracy. *Eiga monogatari* (A Tale of Flowering Fortunes, 40 volumes or 30 volumes in variant versions) picks up the brush with the reign of Emperor Uda (r. 887–97), and continues to recount the events of the subsequent two centuries, ending with the reign of Emperor Horikawa (r. 1089–1107). It is clear that this work was picking up where the last of the six national histories, the *Nihon sandai jitsuroku*, had left off with the reign of Kōkō (r. 884–87) in its fiftieth volume. Certainly, the Fujiwara who held the reigns of authority were aware that the work of compiling national histories had ceased, and so it seems fair to think that for them, *Eiga monogatari*, which was written in the same chronological order as the earlier works, held the same significance as an “official history.”

Each volume of *Eiga monogatari*, however, had its own form and theme; for instance, one might take the form of an old man’s narration whereas another might be told by an omniscient narrator that allows us to see into character’s thoughts and feelings, thus following the lines of what one would now see as fiction. A significant part of the work describes the public and private lives of Fujiwara no Michinaga (966–1027), sometimes even delving into Michinaga’s personal psychology. The scene of his death apparently draws part of its inspiration from the scene in *Genji monogatari* (*Tale of Genji*) where the Shining Prince passes away. In China, where scholars paid great heed to concrete, experiential facts in writing their histories, the idea of borrowing from a fictional story while writing a historical document would be unthinkable. In the “Hotaru” (“Firefly”) chapter of *Genji monogatari*, there is a passage where the Shining Prince solicits the affections of a young woman. There, one finds the statement that a tale can sometimes recount the details of events and the subtleties of the human heart better than historical records. It appears that in writing their history in the form of a tale, the authors of *Eiga monogatari* adopted this same opinion. The later sections of the *Eiga monogatari* describe incidents that transpired, court events, and customs after Michinaga’s death. The

decision to use *wabun* and the form of a tale instead of the *kanbun* and chronological style of *hennentai* used to write the six national histories seems to suggest that the authors were attempting to avoid placing themselves alongside the imperial authorities of the six national histories. One might even sense a note of cultural nationalism in these decisions.

Another important historical tale is the three-volume *Ōkagami* (The Great Mirror, in six- and eight-volume variants), which was written late in the eleventh century and covers the years between 850 and 1025. Along with *Eiga monogatari*, it is called a “tale of succession” (*yotsugi monogatari*), inasmuch as it describes several successive generations rather than focusing entirely on one central protagonist. Nonetheless, the work does contain sketches of the reigns of emperors, lives of high officials, tales of the Fujiwara clan, and so on. Clearly, the purpose of the work is to serve as an “official history” of Fujiwara rule. It also focuses on individual characters and works in numerous anecdotes, but it seems that it took the form of a tale as way to tell the story of the Fujiwara’s prosperity and give a sense of the inevitability of their rise to power. The late twelfth century saw the completion of the ten-volume *Imakagami* (The New Mirror, 1022–1170), written in a biographical style, and the three-volume *Mizukagami* (The Water Mirror, twelfth century). The latter work describes the emperor’s reigns from Emperor Jinmu (trad. r. 660–585 B.C.E.) to Emperor Ninmyō (r. 833–50) in chronological order, thus covering the 1510 years before *Ōkagami*. Even later in the second half of the fourteenth century came the three-volume *Masukagami* (*The Clear Mirror*), which continues in chronological order where *Imakagami* left off. Because it is filled with a yearning for the irretrievable prosperity of the past, there are a great many rhetorical flourishes in the work’s style. For instance, “The New Island Guard” (*Niijima mori*), which describes the life of Retired Emperor Go-Toba (1180–1239, r. 1183–98) after his defeat in the Jōkyū Disturbance of 1221 and his exile to Oki Island, was clearly modeled after the Suma chapters of *The Tale of Genji*. The similarities are too obvious to be overlooked.¹⁵

One late Heian-period history written by a non-official source is *Fusō ryakki* (Outline of Japan, 1094 onward). Written by Kōen (d. 1169), a monk at Mount Hiei, in *kanbun*, this chronological work focuses primarily on the history of Buddhism, although it also covers part of the period before Buddhism’s introduction, namely the period from the Emperor Jinmu to Emperor Horikawa. In China as well, one finds unofficial histories written by monks who wanted to trace the history of Buddhism, a subject that was not treated in the official histories. It seems likely that Kōen knew of these works, but like other writings by people involved with Japanese Buddhism, it shows a strong interest in how Buddhism was propagated among the Shinto population of Japan and the kinds of relationships that Buddhism forged with the imperial court. Interestingly, *Fusō ryakki* refer to the *Great Mirror*, *Water Mirror*, and other historical works that took the form of tales. *Fusō ryakki* influenced later histories such as *Gukanshō* (The Jottings of a Fool, also translated as *The Future and the Past*) written by Jien (1155–1225), a monk during the Kamakura period. Unlike *A Tale of Flowering Fortunes*, which describes the Fujiwara family’s rise in prosperity and fortune, *Gukanshō* argues that each new era was growing increasingly weak and debilitated due to the “principle of causation” (*dōri*) that guides all history. At the same time, this work explains that the principle of causation manifests itself within each individual matter, and that when people are led by the virtuous manifestations of this principle, their acts bring about beneficial good for everyone (*rishō*).

2.2.2. Official and Unofficial Histories in Medieval Japan

Azuma kagami (Mirror of the East) is a public history compiled under the Kamakura military authorities. This work records the happenings of six generations of shoguns from 1180 to 1266 in a diary style (*nikkитай*) written in a distinctive mixture of Chinese heavily inflected with Japanese. For historical sources, it turns to documents of the military government, nobles, and temples, as well as to diaries of courtiers and tales of the military. The work abounds in anecdotes about warriors, and daimyos of the Warring States era frequently read it for political and personal guidance. For the Kamakura shogunate, this represented something that could be called an “official history.” Interestingly however, the work was not recognized later during the Tokugawa period because the Nitta clan (the ancestors of the Tokugawas) was antagonistic toward the Kamakura shogunate. This shows that in Japan, shifts in the political situation could affect the authority of historical sources.

One characteristic of medieval Japanese historiography is that many accounts of the military were written and recited. Another is that Buddhist ideology had a strong influence on historiography, partly because the Zen sect came to Japan from China during this time, and various sects of Japanese Buddhism became increasingly popular among the common people. On the other hand, the medieval philosophy known as Ise Shinto shattered the belief that the ruling buddhas which had come from India had also appeared in Japan in the guise of *kami*—a belief that had arisen during the Heian period and gained currency as the “theory of original reality and manifested traces” (*honji suijaku setsu*). Instead, adherents asserted that Amaterasu Ōmikami, the principal goddess of the Shinto pantheon, was uniquely Japanese. This too gave rise to a new view of history. The remainder of this section will discuss each of these developments in turn.

In the tenth century, there emerged a number of annals-like tales in *hentai kanbun*, a form of Chinese modified to fit the Japanese language. These tales were based upon records from the provinces and public offices, as well as on orally narrated transmissions. One example is the *Shōmonki* (The Story of Masakado’s Rebellion), which describes the Taira-no-Masakado Disturbance (939–40) from the point of view of the loser, Masakado, who had rebelled against the court. Another example is the *Mutsu waki* (An Account of the Mutsu Rebellion), which narrates the history of the Earlier Nine Years’ War (1051–62) from the point of view of the subjugated army.

In the Kamakura period, there emerged from these works a group of tales of the military (*gunkimono* or *gunki monogatari*) focused on scenes of battle. These tended to be written in a “mixed style” of Japanese with some Chinese stylistic and lexical elements (*wakan konkōbun*). The most important tales of the military are the *Hōgen monogatari* (The Tale of the Hōgen War; 3 vols., ca. thirteenth century), *Heiji monogatari* (The Tale of the Heiji War; 3 vols., ca. thirteenth century), and the *Heike monogatari* (The Tale of the Heike). This group of tales, known as “songs of the Taira clan” (*heikyoku*), was performed by *biwa hōshi*, monks who recited and sang the works to *biwa* accompaniment. People apparently believed that the *biwa* was able to call forth the spirits of the dead, and so this instrument held a quasi-religious significance at the time. *Hōgen monogatari* begins with a divination from the deity Kumano Gongen that predicted the death of the tonsured emperor Toba (1103–56). *Heike monogatari* built upon the notion in other works that the Buddhist law was in its final stages, and it eulogized the souls of the Taira clan, whose decline was determined by divine will, while

at the same time celebrating the world of the Minamoto. *Heike monogatari* is structured chronologically. One characteristic of its style is that its stories are riddled with borrowings from records and legends, as well as temple and shrine histories. Throughout the work, one finds traces of the Buddhist theory of karma as well as the notion of yin and yang. Moreover, it uses diverse modes of narration, borrowing freely from all of the various literary styles of the period. After the fourteenth century, *Heike monogatari* begins to appear as a bibliographic source. At this time, the various books called *kataribon* (librettos for musical recitation) were under the charge of a group of *biwa hōshi*. These *kataribon* center on the story on the tales of the Taira clan, but the various texts called *yomihon* (readers), such as the twenty-volume *Nagatobon*, also include detailed accounts of the Minamoto clan. These texts later gave birth to the 48-volume *Genpei jōsuiki* (An Account of the Genpei War), which creates its own account through incorporating different accounts of events culled from various sources. Using all of these works as historical sources, later eras produced tales and performance pieces that feature the warriors of *Heike monogatari* as protagonists. *Gikeiki* (Yoshitsune) and *Soga monogatari* (The Tale of the Soga Brothers), for example, both patch together individual legends, as do other works that describe military affairs and war such as the *Meitoku ki* (Record of the Meitoku Period; late fourteenth century), which depicts local battles in the medieval era.

The 40-volume *Taiheiki* (Account of the Great Peace), set during the Wars of the Northern and Southern Courts (1331–92), is believed to have been modeled after the twelve-volume *Heike monogatari*. Scholars usually think of it in three sections: a first part that describes events through the fall of the Kamakura shogunate, a second section that describes events through the death of the Emperor Go-Daigo (1288–1339) at Yoshino, and a third part that describes events through the emergence of Ashikaga Yoshimitsu (1358–1408). This text was read out loud as a historical document about the beginning of the military government; in other words, it was a performed text that underwent numerous revisions at the hands of the Ashikaga shogunate. Although it takes the form of a tale written in Japanese, the Ashikaga shogunate no doubt saw the *Taiheiki* as having the same significance as an “official history.”

The *Taiheiki* has numerous scenes that are modeled on *Heike monogatari* and that even contain elements of parody; in addition, there are passages that quote from famous Chinese stories. In places, the narrative voice interprets the meaning of characters’ actions on the basis of Confucian political thought. Constant throughout the work is the emphasis on the struggle between the Minamoto and Taira clans, both of which served at court, and the examination of the shift of political power between them. If we think of this work as an example of an “official history” describing the management of the military government, the multi-layered quality of the text—in other words, the quality that results when a new authorial voice reinterprets material in older histories—is all that much more complex. Even in the Tokugawa period, *Taiheiki* was performed in oral recitations. It was the subject of many lectures and annotations, evincing universal praise and providing the prototype for many stories (*kōdan*) told by raconteurs throughout subsequent eras.

In 1402, there appeared a book known as the *Nan-taiheiki* (The *Taiheiki* Rebuked), which took the *Taiheiki* and its contents to task. This was the work of Imagawa Ryōshun (also known as Sadayo, b. 1326), whom the southern branch of the imperial court had sent to take back and administer Kyūshū. Nonetheless, the shogun Ashikaga Yoshimitsu dissolved the post, and Imagawa Ryōshun lost his position. In the disappointment of his later years, he wrote this work in order to tell his descendants about how the Imagawa clan had for genera-

tions been loyal to the shoguns, how he personally had been set up by the shogunate and served them loyally. Drawing upon Confucian thought, he expounded the theory of rule “for the sake of all people under heaven.” Because he felt that he was correcting portions of the *Taiheiki*, he gave his work a name that showed his critical stance. In the medieval period, divisions of territories were closely related to whether or not one’s exploits on the battlefield were recognized; therefore, inaccurate historical accounts might result in protest. Certain warriors even made claims that picture scrolls showing scenes of battle were incorrect. In other words, no matter which form they might take, historical documents created under government supervision were still essentially records to guarantee the authority and legitimacy of those in power.

In the midst of the Period of Northern and Southern Courts, Kitabatake Chikafusa (1293–1354) wrote *Jinnō shōtō ki* (A Chronicle of Gods and Sovereigns, 1339) in order to argue that the southern court was the legitimate branch of the imperial family. Colored with the belief prevalent at the time that the Buddha’s law was dying out (*mappō*), his account explains the origins of the crisis and advances his own theory about why the southern branch should be the rightful heirs to the throne. He begins with a *kanbun* phrase stating, “The great land of Japan is the land of the gods” (*Dai Nihon [wa] shinkoku nari*); then he presents two “facts”: (1) the imperial household represents a single family line with an unbroken lineage, and (2) the household itself possesses virtue (*toku*). Taking these assertions as his starting point, he argues that Japan is superior to other countries such as China and India, which were not headed by such a divine, unbroken family of rulers. This view of history was grounded in Kitabatake Chikafusa’s own belief in Ise Shinto; however, his philosophy of “virtue” in *Jinnō shōtō ki* and his respect for factuality both derive from Confucianism. If we look a few years back to see the historical context for this work, we see that the troubles that Japan experienced as a nation during the attempted Mongol invasions of 1274 and 1281 had led to an increased sense of nationalism, of which one sees traces in Kitabatake’s work. The philosophy that informs *Jinnō shōtō ki* is without a doubt a product of the medieval era. Nonetheless, Kitabatake also argues that the future prospects of the country resided with people working for the good of society—men dedicating themselves to agriculture and women dedicating themselves to spinning. In this regard, his history shows a set of values relatively close to the modern work ethic.

In 1587, Ōta Gyūichi (1527–1610?) wrote a biography of Oda Nobunaga (1534–82) called *Shinchō-kō ki* (Chronicle of Lord Nobunaga), which Oze Hoan (1564–1640) later revised under the title *Shinchō ki*; Paul Varley comments perceptively on these works elsewhere in this volume. In the Tokugawa period, biographies of generals became common, one famous example being Oze Hoan’s *Taikōki* (Chronicle of Hideyoshi). Even though Hoan wrote this work against the strong wishes of the Tokugawa authorities, who had come to power only through defeating Toyotomi Hideyoshi’s (1536–98) forces, the work was nonetheless carried into the raconteur’s repertoire. It enjoyed great popularity and continued to influence views of history among the common people until well after the Meiji Restoration.

2.2.3 History in the Early Modern Period

When the Age of Warring States ended and the Tokugawa shogunate brought the entire country under its control, it recognized Neo-Confucianism as an official subject and once again started the process of compiling histories of the various families in power. The goal,

once again, was to legitimize the authority of the warrior families in power. The distinctly Japanese brand of Neo-Confucianism the government promoted emphasized loyalty and filial piety (*chūkō*) over ritual (*rei*), and devotion to one's lord (*chū*) over devotion to one's parents (*kō*). This philosophy informed the way the histories and criticisms of the various warrior clans were written. When dealing with the imperial family and nobility, the policy of the Tokugawa shogunate was to increase shogunal authority by suppressing the actual power of the court, even while still granting it as much official authority as possible. In the frontispiece of one of the earliest *ōraimono* (literally "writings about comings and goings" but in this case a dictionary), had for its frontispieces, a copy of Matteo Ricci's famous world map (*Kon'yo bankoku zenzu*, 1602) and images of all of the emperors throughout Japanese history.¹⁶ This was used by townsmen and well-off farmers, and it suggests a degree of knowledge about Japan's place in the world as well as an awareness that the long, historical succession of the imperial family had continued over centuries.¹⁷

In a different vein than the Neo-Confucian thought of the shogunate were Itō Jinsai's (1627–1705) School of the Study of Ancient Meaning (*Kogigaku*) and Ogyū Sorai's (1666–1728) School of Ancient Rhetoric (*Kobunjigaku*). Sorai's scholarship was particularly important in spreading an attitude of respect toward the classics. As Qing-dynasty historical investigations became available in Japan, comparable historical investigations grew in number, and within the various genres of writing, people began putting together studies of the histories of Confucianism, poetry in Chinese (*kanshi*), and other subjects.

Meanwhile, the monk Keichū (1640–1701) revised methods of doing textual critique and was thus able to provide new insights in *Man'yōshū* studies. It was this advance that gave birth to the National Learning (*kokugaku*) of Kamo Mabuchi (1697–1769), Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801), and their contemporaries. In other words, this advance allowed scholars to write genre-based histories of Japanese poetry and *wabun*. In terms of the consciousness of history, these developments cleared the path for the development of an ideology of "Japaneseness" (*Nihonshugi*), which idealized the semi-mythical age of the gods and described the origin and culture of Japan as fundamentally distinct from that of China. Hirata Atsutane's (1776–1843) National Learning is a late Edo-period variation on this same theme, and in contrast to the Mito School which spread an image of Japan as the land of the gods among warriors loyal to the throne, Hirata Atsutane's work helped spread an image of Japan as the land of the gods among the general populace. These ideologies had an important effect upon views of history after the Meiji Restoration.

Another development was the establishment of a genre known as "period pieces" (*ji-daimono*), which put the historical past on stage for the common people in the form of kabuki, puppet plays, and other forms of popular entertainment. Although based on historical fact, these works employed various techniques to make the story come alive and give a sense of presence to the audience. Between the various developments in Neo-Confucianism, National Learning, and the arts of the common people, writing about history developed in several different directions during the Tokugawa period. The paragraphs below will provide an overview of each of these three areas.

The Tokugawa shogunate established Neo-Confucianism as an official area of scholarship. Under orders from the shogunate, the Hayashi family compiled the *Honchō tsugan*, in which they endeavored to write historical fact as directly as possible. The final word of

the title is written with the same characters as the Chinese record *Zizhi tongjian* mentioned above, and it is written in the same style overall. As one might guess, this work was written in *kanbun* and represented a “continuous history” (*tsūshi*) that spanned several hundred years. The first part of this expansive work covered the vast period from the semi-mythical first ruler of Japan, Emperor Jinmu, to the Emperor Uda, and consisted of forty volumes, whereas the continuation, which was 230 volumes, covered the period from Emperor Go-Daigo to the Emperor Goyōzei. When one finally factored in other portions, the total reached a staggering 330 volumes. The project was completed in 1670, and shows signs of being written to legitimize the lineages of the warrior families involved with the government.

In the Mito domain, Tokugawa Mitsukuni (1628–1700) undertook the compilation of *Dai Nihon shi* (History of Great Japan), a full-scale work of the historian’s art, comprising chronicles, biographies, annotated commentaries, tables and charts, and the like. This work is grounded in Confucian studies, but also expresses reverence for Shinto and the imperial household. A Bureau of History was established in 1657, and work on the project continued for generations. Covering the period from the reign of Emperor Jinmu to the coronation of Emperor Go-Komatsu (1377–1433) in 1392, which reunited the Northern and Southern Courts, *Dai Nihon shi* consists of seventy-three volumes of *honki* (descriptions of imperial reigns, equivalent to the Chinese category *benji* mentioned above), 170 volumes of *retsuden* (biographies of princes, heroes, great men, and scholars, equivalent to Chinese *liezhuan*), 126 volumes of *shi* (writings on individual fields of inquiry, equivalent to Chinese *zhi*), and twenty-eight volumes of charts. Due to the massive scale of the project, *Dai Nihon shi* was not finally completed until 1906. It exhibited a late Tokugawa period feeling of loyalty to the imperial family, and it exerted a strong influence on later views of history. For instance, in the biographies of the imperial family, it includes the Empress Jingū (trad. 169–269), who it thought to be the same person as Himiko who had appeared in *Nihon shoki*. In the descriptions of imperial reigns, it includes Prince Ōtomo (Emperor Kōbun, 648–72), defeated by Prince Ōama (later Emperor Tenmu, 622–86) in the Jinshin Disturbance (672), and in discussing the wars during the period of the Northern and Southern Courts (1336–93), it follows the theory advanced by the *Taiheiki* and identifies the Southern Court of Emperor Go-Daigo at Yoshino as the legitimate heir to the throne.

If one adds the *Honchō tsugan* and *Dai Nihon shi* to the six national histories written by *kanbun* by the ancient court and to the series of “mirrors” (*kagami-mono*) written in *wabun* in the form of tales by the Fujiwara authorities, one gets a total of four kinds of “official histories” that narrate the Japanese past as an continuous history, from ancient times onward. As for official histories, this would be it until the modern period; however, individuals in the pre-modern period did write their own historiographic materials. The mid-Edo-period scholar and poet Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725) wrote *Tokushi yoron* (Lessons from History) in 1712. His work examines the processes through which warriors established their authority in Japan and the various dynamics involved when power changed hands, comparing the Japanese situation to that in China when one dynasty took over from another. About the same time, one finds many other works of historical analysis and criticism that draw upon these works to put together comprehensive histories that focus on the warrior families. *Nihon gaishi* (Unofficial History of Japan, 1827, 22 vols.) by Rai San’yō (1780–1832), about which Thomas Keirstead writes in his chapter above, is one such work. Though it praises Tokugawa society, it also

emphasizes warrior subjectivity and a spirit of loyalty to the emperor; for this reason, it later became a favorite among the members of the anti-shogunal movement.

In its late years the Mito School gave rise to the ideology of Fujita Yūkoku (1774–1826) and his son Fujita Tōko (1806–55), who at the end of the Tokugawa period espoused the ideology of “revering the emperor and expelling the barbarians” (*sonnō jōi*). Hand in hand with this ideology was the notion that Japan was the “land of the gods” (*shinshū*) and that the nation of Japan had been created under the absolute authority of the emperor and imperial household. This idea held a great deal of sway among warriors in the twilight years of the Tokugawa period, and it would have a profound impact on views of history after the Meiji Restoration.

Next, one should consider developments in historiography among Shinto scholars. In the Tokugawa period, Yoshida Shinto, a brand of Shinto that had emerged from Ise Shinto, had a significant effect on shrines throughout the country. Built upon the theory of “three teachings together” (*sankyō itchi ron*), which stated that Shinto, Confucianism, and Buddhism were all linked at the roots, it freely wove elements of the latter two philosophies into Shinto, creating a syncretic ideology. However, Matsuoka Yūen’s mid-Tokugawa-period work on Shinto, *Shintō gakusoku Nihon-damashii* (Shinto Regulations, or the Spirit of Japan, 1733) draws upon Kitabatake Chikafusa’s *Jinnō shōtōki*, to place Shinto in a special position, accounting for the nature of the Japanese national polity (*kokutai*) by turning to the Japanese emperorship, which he argued consisted of a long, unbroken line of rulers. Like Chikafusa, Yūen insists on the fundamental superiority of Japan over China, which had changed dynasties numerous times. Nonetheless, Yūen draws upon the Confucian idea of the “Middle Way” (or Golden Mean, *zhongyong*), when he argues that the imperial lineage managed to survive by never leaning too far in one direction of the other. Even as Yūen advocates the superiority of Japan, his own thought is not completely free of Chinese Confucianism.

Meanwhile, Shintoist lectures (or sermons, *dangi*), too, were given at meetings where discussing textual interpretation. *Endō tsugan* (A Comprehensive History of Sexual Love, 1716) written by Masuho Zankō (1655–1742), the pioneer of *dangibon* (books of sermons), criticized the flourishing of Confucianism, arguing that Confucianism emphasized ritual while forgetting harmony. It located one of the basic principles of Japan, which it also calls “the land of harmony,” in precisely this notion of harmony, especially as manifested in friendly relations between the sexes and marital happiness. *Endō tsugan* locates the origins of this principle in the relationship of the mythical deity Izanagi to Izanami no Mitonomaguwai, and it theorizes about various aspects of sexual love, old and new, in amusing ways, sometimes even interpreting it as an expression of the flourishing of Shinto principles. The analogy using Izanagi and Izanami, forced as it was, supplied the foundations of the harmony that he saw as distinguishing Japan from China. One sees this strain of thought earlier in a variant version of the *Kokin waka shū shō* (Selections from the Collection of Waka Old and New). There, we read, “In Japanese poetry (*yamato-uta*), there is a strong sense of harmony. . . . This harmony extends to the union of the yin-yang of the two gods [Izanami and Izanagi]. This harmony extends to all things in creation, all things even opposites without exception. This is *waka* poetry.”¹⁸ He appears to be suggesting that *waka* have the power to bring together all elements of the universe. In the middle ages, all sorts of far-fetched additions were made to the *kana* preface of the *Kokin waka shū* (Collection of Waka Poetry New and Old) by Sōgi

(1421–1502), the leading *renga* poet of the medieval era, and this appears to be one of them. These ideas may look like a joke, but one should not overlook them in analyzing Japanese views of history.

Masuhō Zankō's *A Comprehensive History of Sexual Love* discusses historical manifestations of love and therefore holds a significant place in the history of Japanese love and sexuality, but this is only one manifestation of the trend during the Tokugawa period to establish histories of various types of things, including literary genres. For instance, Emura Hokkai (1713–88) wrote *Nihon shishi* (A History of Japanese Verse, 1771, 5 vols.) before editing *Nihon shisen* (A Collection of Japanese Verse, 1774, 10 vols.) and a companion volume (1779, 8 vols.). *Nihon shishi* provides a comprehensive commentary on the history of *kanshi* poetry from ancient times through the time of writing and includes commentary on individual poets. This work of history is at the same time also a product of Japanese Confucianism, but it is believed that this work was the first in the genre of literary critical history, without rival even in China. In the prevailing conceptual scheme of the time, the study of letters (*bungaku*) in Japan held a central place in the field of history.

At the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, one saw the flourishing of a world of historical essays that examined lifestyles, customs, and even rumors as historical phenomena. This movement was driven not only by the flow of classical studies and National Learning but also by an influx of Qing-dynasty historiographic studies that reexamined the Chinese classics. This trend toward studies of the history of individual things, which was entirely separate from the order of Neo-Confucian studies, grew significantly. As we see in *Kottōshū* (Collection of Antiques) by Santō Kyōden (1761–1816), these histories sometimes made detailed observations regarding the origins of certain things and provided explanations of how they changed over time. These works sometimes helped form categories that influenced the way that people classified certain things. For instance, *Kinsei mono no hon Edo sakusha bunrui* (Classification of Edo Authors of the Early Modern Period) by Takizawa Bakin (1776–1848) helped give form to certain categories, such as “tales” (*monogatari*) and “fiction” (*shōsetsu*), by dividing the works into these genres.

In the midst of the Tokugawa-period movement to restore the classics, Arakida Reijo (1732–1806) wrote *Tsuki no yukue* (Whereabouts of the Moon, 2 vols., 1771) and *Ike no mokuzu* (Seaweed on a Lake, 14 vols., 1771), which describe the fall of the Taira clan. In general, these works have a stronger feel of dramatization than the historical tales of the late Heian period. In surveying the ways that people at this time thought about history, we would be remiss if we overlooked the “period pieces” (*jidaimono*) of jōruri and kabuki. The term “period piece” stands in opposition to the term “domestic drama” (*sewamono*), which refers to works set in the same era in which they were performed. When domestic dramas were not up to the task of satirizing bakufu policy, performers put on period pieces that took their plots from events in the historical past.¹⁹ The famous jōruri *Kanadehon Chūshingura* (The Treasury of Loyal Retainers, 1748) by Takeda Izumo (1691–1756) is a dramatization that shifts the story of the forty-seven loyal Akō retainers to the era of the *Taiheiki*. While recording individual sentiment and subjective actions, one finds in such works an increasingly strong sense that the protagonists of these works are powerless, transient beings merely caught in the grand sweep of history. Through the actions of historical characters that appear in the *Taiheiki*, the audience was able to make out the historical circumstances of the forty-seven retainers who

took revenge for their lord. In this way, the Japanese public cultivated their ability to read the truth hidden beneath fictional fabrications. Meanwhile, because there were so many debates about the truthfulness and fictionality of things that were written as historical fact during the Tokugawa period, we can sense that the Japanese public was developing the ability to pick up on the authorities' attempts to justify themselves using historical materials.²⁰

To summarize, by the time that the modern Western notion of history reached Japan, the Japanese already had in place an interrelated complex of several ways of writing about the historical past. Each of these helped serve as “receptors” that allowed the Japanese to incorporate the new ideas as they were introduced from abroad.

3. The Reformulation of the Concept of History in the Meiji Period

The Meiji Restoration appeared, at least on the surface, to be a revolution that returned to older ways; but it also was a reaction to the nationalism of various countries of the West. In the end, the changes brought about after the Restoration involved systematizing the people and nation by fashioning a culture appropriate for a new, integrated nation of Japanese citizens. In looking back at their history, the Japanese found origins that were older than those of Europe, and this provided a point of pride. Within the framework of their new nationalism, organizing the old classics and editing histories of Japan became a task befitting the whole nation. Members of the intelligentsia who were working with “enlightenment” thought incorporated several elements of Western historiography: the idea of history as a forward march of progress, the idea of positivism, and a respect for bibliographic sources. Before long, the Meiji state adopted a new educational system for the elite. Toward the middle of the long process of educational changes, the Imperial University broke up Chinese studies (*kangaku*) into philosophy, historical studies, and literary studies (that is, “literature” in the modern, more restrictive sense of the word); and with this, the government created “Departments of Letters” (*bungakubu*) which contained courses in western history, eastern history, and Japanese history. Not long afterward, modern Western philosophy helped give rise to the view of Japan's history as that of an imperial nation—an idea that caused friction with positivist studies of Japanese history. (It seems likely that this emphasis on the imperial nation is one of the biggest reasons that Japanese historians disposed of the histories of Japan that had been created by officials intent on shoring up their own lineages.) This section will examine the changes in the way that the Japanese during the Meiji period thought about history. In paying attention to the ways that Japanese historical records and views of history served as receptors when Western historical records were brought into the country, it will outline the reformulations in Japanese views of history.

3.1. The Early Meiji Period

3.1.1. The Invention of History

In the late Tokugawa period and early years of the Restoration, a theory of the nation that argued that Japan was the land of “land of the gods” (*shinshū*) swelled to a high tide, and in 1871, the young Meiji government decided that the Ise Shrine, dedicated to the deity Amaterasu from whom the imperial family had allegedly descended, should be at the top of a hierarchy of all of the nation's shrines. In 1872, the government switched from the lunar calendar to the solar calendar so that the third day of the twelfth month of the first year of

Meiji became January 1 of the sixth year of Meiji. With that, the Japanese calendar fell in synch with the European calendar. The government had, in other words, westernized the way in which it measured time. At the same time however, it was decided that the Japanese would start counting time from the year when the emperor Jinmu, the legendary first emperor of Japan, had assumed his position. As the new year began, the year was named “Year 2533 of the current era” (*kigen 2533-nen*). This was 660 years more than if one were to count the year using the Western *anno domini* system. Japan was showing its citizens and the world that Japan had a past that was older than Europe. Indeed, Japan was engaging in what we might call the “invention of history.” The government determined that January 29 should be a national day of celebration, and so the next year, the day was named “*kigensetsu*” (occasion of [the founding of] the epoch), but in 1873, the day of the celebration was switched to February 11. There were many reasons for this, but one of the fundamental reasons that this occurred was because that it was difficult, if not impossible, for the country to ground its measurement of time in mythology.²¹

In 1882, the government determined that the practice known as “national worship” (*kokka saishi*) meant the worship of the ancestors of the imperial family, and it was not a religion per se. This was written into the new imperial constitution, and freedom of religion, which Western powers had wanted so much from Japan, was instituted for the first time since the opening of the country. That is, freedom of religion was allowed as long as it did not interfere with the practice of State Shinto, which was a religion that superceded all others. These practices had significant meaning for the study and philosophy of history.

3.1.2. The Modern Reformulation of Views of History

From the late Tokugawa period into the Meiji period, Japanese scholars involved with Western learning encountered the late nineteenth century European “era of historical studies,” in which the study of history had swelled to a high tide. It was an era of nationalism. The positivism of Auguste Comte (1798–1857) had started gaining currency, and in the search for the best policies to govern society and help move society forward, a positivist approach to economic and social history took on special importance. Influenced by the biological theory of evolution, the ideas of social Darwinism and the organic conception of society developed new force, and in Germany, there was a trend to use the study of official documents (using an ideology of bibliographic substantiation) to portray history as a unified whole (the theory of the nation as an organic whole).

Needless to say, “history” is one field of the humanities. The humanities were received in Japan as one form of the “study of letters” (one sense of the English word “literature”), and for this reason, the Japanese began to use the word *bungaku* as a translation of “humanities.” (This is where one gets the title *bungakubu* or “Department of Letters” that one still finds within Japanese universities.) Perhaps it is worth briefly examining the history of the English word “literature” as a translation of the compound *bungaku*. The English word “literature” has a significant number of meanings. Then, as well as today, one can think of it as having three principal meanings: (1) a broad meaning that refers to writing in general, (2) a secondary, more restrictive meaning that refers to the belles-lettres or humanities, and (3) a even narrower, meaning that refers to high quality, artistic products created using language. Of these three uses, it is the second which corresponds most closely to that of the Japanese word *bungaku*, which at the time consisted of a field of study concentrating on historical docu-

ments written in *kanbun* as well as classical Chinese poetry and other literary studies. It is for this reason that the English word “literature” and the Japanese word *bungaku* came to be used as translations for one another. In China, however, Confucianism tended to look down upon fabrications and so there was resistance to adopting the secondary, more restrictive meaning of “humanities,” much less the narrower meaning that referred principally to poetry, fiction, and plays. In Japan, the value placed upon fictional fabrications was somewhat higher, and because the Japanese were increasingly thinking of poetry, fiction, plays, and the like as each belonging to their own genres, regardless of whether they came from plebian or more aristocratic origins, the second and third meanings of *bungaku* had an easier time catching on in Japan than in China. As one important wing of *bungaku* (understood in the second sense of “humanities”), “history” (*rekishi*) easily adopted a position where it stood in contrast to more imaginative or artistic literary creations.

Because the Japanese tended to see history as continuous and connected, it was relatively easy for the Japanese to adopt the view of history as a teleological process of development, and there was little conflict on this point.²² Moreover, it appears that the Confucian universalism that had originated with Ogyū Sorai helped to pave the way for Japan to accept the broad universalism of the Western rubric “humanities.” Within this school of thought, the study of human life and ethics were far more important than the worship of some transcendental being. Finally, the seriousness with which Sorai regarded history must have proved useful to intellectuals when importing the western “era of historical studies.”

Hyakugaku renkan (System of the Sciences), a collection of lectures compiled by students of Nishi Amane (1829–1897), who had studied at Leiden University in Holland in 1862 and later returned to Japan to teach, reveals traces of European notions about history.²³ In *System of the Sciences*, Nishi mentions the following methods of recording history in Europe: biography, chronologies of events, chronologies comparing the development of various nations, romances, fables, and mythology. To a contemporary Western reader, this system of classification would not have appeared particularly strange. The French word *histoire* and the German *Geschichte* both have multiple meanings, and among them are fictional fabrications. Nishi also notes that in Sima Qian’s *Records of the Grand Historian*, all of these elements are present. This suggests the Japanese had already adopted the structure of European academics, but Nishi, who had been influenced by Comte’s positivism, suggested that one should limit “history” to only those facts that have a degree of certainty about them. It seems clear that the historical studies of the Qing dynasty and the historical essays of the late Tokugawa period served as receptors for the strict emphasis upon bibliographies and historical fact advocated by positivism.

3.1.3 Compilations of the Classics

A Japanese government project to compile a history of the humanities had started when David Murray (1830–1905), an advisor hired by the Japanese Ministry of Education, recommended that the ministry put together the work that eventually became the *Nihon kyōiku shiryaku* (Outline History of Japanese Education). Murray had recommended that this project be completed for the 1876 Philadelphia World’s Fair, but it was not finished until the following year. The goal of this work was to bring together a history of calligraphy, reading, and composition—all the elements of reading and writing pertaining to “the study of Japanese and Chinese letters” (*Nihon oyobi Shina bungaku*). In this case, “the study of letters” was

understood as consisting of history, philosophy, poetry, and fiction. The traditional notion of *bungaku*, which had consisted of the world of *kanbun*, had expanded to include the domain of items written in *wabun*. The domain of *bungaku* also included the visual arts, medicine, the study of medicinal substances, and history. The compilers' notes indicate that they understood the conventional notion of *bungaku* as no more than "useless poetry collections," but they were interpreting the term far more widely to include an extensive range of studies, perhaps due to Murray's urging that Japan make science the country's first priority.

Sakakibara Yoshino (1832–81), who was in charge of the third section of the *Nihon kyōiku shiryaku*, titled "Bungei gairyaku" (An Outline of Scholarship), also compiled *Bungei ruisan* (A Classified Collection of Scholarship) in 1879. (Like the term *geibun*, the term *bungei* had been used in Chinese from ancient times to refer to scholarship in general.) This collection was divided into four sections, namely *Ji* (Letters), *Bun* (Writings), *Gaku* (Studies), and *Bungu* (Items used for Writing), and it contained a balance of scholarship in both Chinese and Japanese.²⁴ Nishimura Shigeki (1828–1902), who was the Secretary General of the Ministry of Education at the time, wrote the preface to *Bungei ruisan*, and it seems likely that Nishimura was the driving force behind the compilation of such works.

Even more ambitious a project than *Bungei ruisan* was the compilation of *Koji ruien*, which sought to classify the entire canon of classic texts. The project began in 1879 with a proposal from Nishimura Shigeki and was completed in 1914. The preface explains that without bibliographic sources it is impossible to "observe the basis of the vicissitudes" of Japanese history or to "see the changes in systems and products of civilization." "Desiring to know the individual causes of a wide spectrum of things and phenomena from across society," the editors felt it necessary to compile the collection. The preface also notes that China had various collections called *ruijū* (Ch. *leiju*), just as the West had encyclopedias. Japan too had various collections, but since each tended to lean toward a specific field, there was no one collection that covered all fields. It was to compensate for this lack that the editors undertook the project of compiling the *Koji ruien*. At the very root of the project is an apparent concern for history and the goal of sorting out bibliographic sources for all fields. To put it differently, the editors were interested in the "sciences" and "history" as interpreted in the Western sense of the terms. The classification scheme originally consisted of forty items, but by 1900, the editors had condensed these to thirty items. At this time, the editors also began adding items, including a category on Christianity.²⁵

3.1.4. The Spread of the Idea of Historical Development

Among the books most frequently read by scholars of Western learning at that time were François Guizot's *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (1828–30), Hippolyte Taine's *Les origines de la France contemporaine* (1876), and Henry Thomas Buckle's *History of Civilization in England* (1857). (Buckle's work was particularly strongly influenced by the work of Auguste Comte.) Taguchi Ukichi's (1855–1905) six-fascicle *Nihon kaika shōshi* (1877–82) followed in the footsteps of these works, describing the historical development of Japan from ancient times onward in both material and spiritual terms. Taguchi is also known as the translator of Adam Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776) and Herbert Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* (1876–96), which carried him into the fields of economics and Social Darwinism.

Because Christianity had little presence in Japan, the writings of Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) on social evolution and Charles Darwin (1809–82) on biological evolution met almost no resistance, and were widely read in their English originals.²⁶ Throughout the Meiji period, the theory of evolution spread widely in various different forms throughout Japanese society. At the forefront of the dissemination of the Spencerian theory of Social Darwinism was Katō Hiroyuki (1836–1916). In his *Kokutai shinron* (A New Theory of the National Polity, 1856), he argued against the theory of the nation as a divine entity, instead advocating the idea of innate human rights. Katō, however, changed his mind, and in *Jinken shin setsu* (A New Theory of Human Rights, 1882), he attempted to go beyond the theory of the natural rights of man, which he thought owed too much to Christianity and was therefore an outdated ideology. In its place, he attempted to develop a new theory of human rights that shows indebtedness to the theory of evolution. In his 1915 autobiography, he noted one reason he did this was because he believed society had entered a new era of natural science. In reality, his ideas were more indebted to the Spencerian ideas of Social Darwinism than to biological evolution. Moreover, Kato's idea that a common set of laws were shared by both the natural world and the social realm derives from the Neo-Confucian idea of *tenri* (the principle of heaven). Katō did not interpret this in Spencerian terms, such as individual competition and survival of the fittest, but as a process by which the original power of the state shifted downward to lower ranks of society over time. He argues that the ancient system of emperorship, in which the emperor served as a clan leader and the focus of ancestor worship, served to help the weak. Stating that Japan had a superior tradition that most of Europe in this regard, he compared Japan to Britain and, in the process, advanced his endorsement of constitutional monarchy.

After referring to several European constitutions, such as those of Prussia and Bavaria, which preserved clauses attesting to the divine right of the monarch, the Japanese adopted a constitution that contained a clause about the inviolable position of the Japanese emperor. In 1890, the government promulgated the Imperial Rescript on Education, which in urging the population to respect the allegedly unbroken line of imperial family, reflected a trend in Japanese Confucian ethics to bring the filial duty (*kō*) on equal footing to the loyalty that one might show one's superiors (*chū*). In the Tokugawa period, the warrior class were expected to show loyalty to the ruler of the province (*hanshu*) because the province (*han*) was meant something roughly equivalent to the modern notion of a "country." Over time, however, the object of loyalty had become the imperial person himself, largely because the Japanese had adopted the Confucian idea that the nation's population represent the "children" of the emperor. This sort of loyalty was not only something to be practiced by the warrior or ruling class; it was to be practiced equally by all members of the citizenry.

Likewise, Katō Hiroyuki saw the system of imperial rule as a continuation and natural development of a system of tribal leadership he believed Japan to have had in the past: "the people and ruler of our country truly have the familial relationship between parent and child."²⁷ In other words, he was espousing the theory of the national polity as a family (*kazoku kokka ron*). He makes little distinction between *chū* and *kō*, which in China had meant loyalty for the parents and ruler, and advances the idea that the two are one and the same (*chūkō ippon*)—in other words, a universal theory of national polity.²⁸ His thinking suggests an amalgamation of the ideas in the Imperial Rescript and the German-style theory of the na-

tion as an organic whole, and its represents a deviation from the Spencerian theory of Social Darwinism.²⁹ In many ways, Katō was “inventing tradition.”³⁰

In sum, his thought went through three stages: a belief in the theory of natural rights, an attempt to apply the theory of evolution to statecraft, and a more convenient, syncretic theory of the national polity as family. In this final stage, worship of the Japanese imperial family meant worship of the ancestors of the Japanese people, and in this way, his thinking fell in line with the government’s professed principle that worship of the Japanese imperial family did not involve “religion” per se. Regardless of what one thinks about Katō and his ideological successors, if there had been no modern reinterpretation of the theory of the national polity, the ideology that led to the promulgation of the Meiji constitution would probably never have taken root among Meiji intellectuals.

3.2. The Mid-Meiji Period

3.2.1. The Reformulation of the Idea of *Bungaku*

As ideas about history were undergoing the changes described above, Japan was busily adopting modern ways of thinking from Europe; as a result, many traditional ideas underwent significant changes, and in fact, even the entire method of systematizing various fields of academic study underwent monumental transformation. Meanwhile, traditional ways of thinking helped to shape the ideas about the philosophy of history that the Japanese were borrowing from the West. The result was that Japan ultimately produced ways of thinking about history that were quite different from those of Europe.

In the state nationalism that developed in Europe, once finds a respect for the early, primitive culture of one’s own nation and a pride in one’s traditional language. In the case of Japan, these sentiments had historically been expressed as rivalry *vis-à-vis* Chinese culture; one sees such feelings among the aristocracy of the mid-Heian period and in the Edo-period school of “National Learning.” During the Meiji period, however, Japan was taking a stand against the powers of the western world and so its sense of rivalry with Chinese was replaced with a rivalry with the West. As a result, Japanese nationalism was reframed within the dichotomy of East versus West, which led Japan to embrace an ideology of Asianism.

Not only was the study of English deemed necessary, but Meiji elites emphasized the study of *kanbun* as well. In the educational system established in 1872, the study of *kanbun* was included within the subject of “national language” (*kokugo*) in middle schools (*chūgakkō*), which educated and inculcated cultivation within teenage males of the elite class. The reason for the inclusion of *kanbun* is that since ancient times, the intellectual strata of society had used *kanbun* to read and write documents—not just simple regulations and accounts, but documents that had both cultural significance and depth. As the early Meiji period progressed, the study of English was seen as increasingly important, and so the study of *kanbun* grew significantly weaker among young people, but in 1880, the study of the Chinese classics was revived along with the study of the Japanese classics.³¹

The Tokugawa-period School of National Learning had taken great pride in the fact that Japan had long, unbroken traditions that were older than those of Europe, but in their view, these belonged primarily to the world of *wabun* and so they dealt primarily only with issues of sentiment and aesthetics. The reason has to do with the fact that many products of the intellectual class were written in *kanbun*. Fukuchi Ōchi (Gen’ichirō, 1841–1906), who

traveled to Europe three times as a translator beginning in the late Tokugawa period, wrote in his 1875 essay “Nihon bungaku no fushin o tanzu” (Lamenting the Stagnation of Japanese Letters), “There is no history written in language that the ordinary Japanese can read.”³² In other words, no comprehensive history of Japan had yet been written in the vernacular of the Japanese masses. Nonetheless, Fukuchi Ōchi was unshakable in his faith that the cultivation of the Japanese people had come about thanks to texts written in Chinese. Clearly, he believed, the study of *kanbun* texts was as important to Japan as the study of Greek and Latin texts was to Europe.

It was thanks to this idea that when editors set out to compile histories of Japanese “literature” (*Nihon bungaku shi*)—or to be more exact, histories of the Japanese humanities—they included works written in *kanbun*. They did not limit themselves only to works in Japanese but also included *kanbun* texts such as *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, and *fudoki* (Records of Wind and Earth) as well as texts in modified Japanese *kanbun*, such as the works known as “historical books” (*rekishisho*) and “local gazettes” (*chishi*). Including such works would not be unlike including Latin works by English writers in a “history of English literature.” In short, the editors were creating a new type of literary history that had not existed in Japan until that point and that deviated from the way literary histories were written in Europe, emphasizing only writings in the vernacular language. The compilation of these literary histories started around 1890, the year the new imperial constitution went into effect and the Imperial Rescript on Education set the policy for a national education, emphasizing a Neo-Confucian brand of worship and loyalty to the imperial family. The trend of the times was toward a revival of *kanbun*. With this as a backdrop, the Japanese created a history of Japanese literature that included not just works in the Japanese vernacular, but also in *kanbun* as well. In these historical studies of literature, the Japanese were “inventing tradition” by applying contemporary ideas to the past. Incidentally, even though China had come into contact with Western European ideas before Japan, it was in Japan that the first “history of Chinese literature” (*Chūgoku bungaku shi*) was compiled. This is because, as mentioned above, the Chinese did not place much value upon fabrications, and there was a strong antipathy among the Chinese to include fiction within the realm of “literature.”³³

3.2.2 The Establishment of the Study of National History (*Kokushigaku*)

In the early Meiji period, history was merely one section in the “study of letters” (*bungaku*), which, more or less, encompassed all of the humanities. The middle of the Meiji period, however, saw an increasing degree of separation between *bungaku*, which was being pared down to mean “language arts” or “literature,” and the study of history. Nowhere is this clearer than in the position accorded the study of history in university curricula. Let us examine the position accorded the study of history during the adjustments to the modern Japanese university system.

The first curricular design for a university system can be found in the *Daigaku kisoku* (University Regulations) drawn up by the government in 1870. The schema consists of five subjects: ethics (consisting of Shinto and Confucian teachings), law, natural science, medicine, and the liberal arts. This system was apparently designed with the structure of nineteenth-century European universities in mind, especially those of Germany. Such universities generally contained departments of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy. Within the liberal arts department of the Japanese university were to be three subjects: *kidengaku* (about

which more will be said in a moment), *bunshōgaku* (the study of composition and rhetoric), and *seirigaku* (consisting of both philosophy and psychology). Before this, in the liberal arts section of Daigaku Nankō, an early institution of higher education and predecessor of the Imperial University, taught classes on the histories of individual countries. It is clear that what the University Regulations were trying to accomplish was the reorganization of these histories under a single umbrella, and the word *kidengaku* was used as a translation of the word “history.” (The character *ki* comes from the compound *hongī*, “descriptions of sovereigns’ reigns” and *den* from *retsuden*, “biographies of great men,” while *gaku* means “study.”) Despite all of this, the plan laid out in University Regulations never materialized because soon after those regulations were laid out, the entire system of education was overhauled.

In 1872, Daigaku Nankō dropped the word *daigaku* “university” from its name and became simply Nankō. It had a number of area studies programs such as English studies, French studies, and German studies, each of which taught the history of the country that was its area of focus. For instance, English studies taught a class on the history of Britain, using an English history text written in England as the basis of its lectures. In 1873, Nankō was reorganized into Kaisei Gakkō. Under the new system, it consisted of five schools: law, science, engineering, arts, and mining. The schools of the arts and mining were dissolved in 1875, but in 1877 a number of programs were added, including literature (*bungaku*), Neo-Confucianism, and history (*shigaku*).

In 1877, Kaisei Gakkō and the Tokyo Medical University were placed under a single administrative umbrella to form Tokyo University. It was comprised of four departments: jurisprudence (*hō*), natural sciences (*ri*), medicine (*i*), and letters (*bun*). The Department of Literature (*Bungakubu*) consisted of two courses of study, one teaching history (*shigaku*), philosophy, and political science and the other teaching Chinese and Japanese studies. The former track focused on Western studies, and the history courses taught the history of the Western world. In 1881, however, the history courses disappeared temporarily from lack of enrollment. Within the Chinese and Japanese studies track were *wabungaku* (the study of Japanese letters) and *kanbungaku* (the study of *kanbun* letters), but there were no courses in history. Here one finds for the first time in the university system a field called *wabungaku*.

The required reading for this field consisted of all the same works in the required reading lists of Imperial Studies in the Ethics track of Daigaku Honkō (another of the former incarnations of Tokyo University): *Kojiki*, *Nihon shoki*, *Man'yōshū* (The Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves), *Kogo shūi* (Gleanings from Ancient Stories), *Norito* (Ritual Shinto Prayers), and *Senmyō* (Imperial Proclamations), and so on. The required reading also took some of the required reading titles from the liberal arts, namely historical tales such as the *Ōkagami*, *Masu kagami*, and *Ima kagami*, plus other texts such as *Genji monogatari* and *Makura no sōshi* (*The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon*). Works enjoyed by the masses from the middle ages through the early modern period were excluded, and therefore the contents of the field of *wabungaku* corresponded to what might have been called “polite literature” in Western Europe.

In 1886 came the Imperial University Order (*Teikoku daigaku rei*). Tokyo University changed its name to Imperial University, and the institution was reorganized into colleges of law, medical science, natural science, engineering science, and liberal arts. The liberal arts college began with four tracks of study (philosophy, Japanese letters, Chinese letters, and linguistics), but the school added a new track in history in 1887. A year later in 1888, a course in Japanese history was added to the history track, and in 1889, a new track called “national

history” (*kokushi*) was established. In this way, the system divided the study of Japanese history and Japanese language arts, turning *rekishi* and *bungaku* into separate fields. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, histories of Japanese literature at the time contained mythological works and local gazettes written in *kanbun*. Even now, this is still the case.

What about the study of the Chinese classics? In the 1880s, the study of *kanbun* swelled considerably. Also, there was a rising tendency for political commentators in the Meiji period to use precedents and stories from the historical narratives of the Chinese classics in writing editorials to argue whether a particular policy was right or wrong. To draw upon European history for the same purpose would have violated tradition.

The university system changed many more times. When Kyoto Imperial University was founded in 1897, the name of the Imperial University name changed to Tokyo Imperial University. (This name stuck until 1947 when the Allied occupying forces abolished the imperial university system and the name of the school reverted to Tokyo University.) In 1904, a major reform took place in the Tokyo Imperial University College of the Liberal Arts. The college was reorganized into three fields of study: namely, philosophy, literature, and history; and under the latter, an area of study called “Eastern History” (*tōyō shigaku*) was created. At the same time that history was separated from what had been called “*kanbun* studies,” the university also created an area within the literature field called “Chinese literature” (*Shina bungaku*). In short, the university system dismantled the traditional notion of *bungaku* by breaking it into distinct areas. This trend was carried into the *kanbun* courses of middle schools and high schools. Students continued to study *kanbun* historical narratives with literary, artistic value—works such as the *Records of the Grand Historian*—along with classical Chinese poetry. Also until World War II, the textbooks for first-year middle-school students customarily included *kanbun* texts written by Japanese, such as excerpts from Arai Hakuseki and Rai San'yō.

The fever for classical *kanbun* studies appears to have subsided sometime after the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95. In the political and ideological writings after the war, one sees little of the tendency to cite stories from history.

3.3. Toward Contemporary History

3.3.1. The Struggles of Bibliographic Positivism

The encounter with the western era of historical studies produced in Japan and increased interest in applying positivistic approaches to studies of historiographic texts. When Kume Kunitake (1839–1931), who is known for accompanying the Iwakura Embassy and serving as the author of *Beiō kairan jikki* (The Iwakura Embassy, 1871–73), saw the massive collections of old volumes in the French national library and had the opportunity to view Christian historical documents forbidden in the Tokugawa period, he set out on the path to become a scholar of history.³⁴ He believed that even in the mythological stories, there was some element of fact that gave the stories their shape, and he set out to locate them. At the same time, however, he used his historical inquiries to advance positions on both international and domestic affairs. Various scholars have written about the furor that arose from Kume’s writings, but the fundamental reasons for the commotion are still poorly understood. In dealing with this issue, this section will consider positivism and what it meant for late Meiji-period Japanese historiography.

In 1891, Kume was teaching as an assistant professor of national history at Tokyo Imperial University, when he published an essay called “Shintō wa saiten no kozoku” (Shinto Is an Old Custom of Worshipping Heaven) in *Shigakkai zasshi* (Magazine of the Historical Society), the leading journal of historical research in Japan at the time. The following year, Taguchi Ukichi republished it in the January issue of the journal *Shikai* (Sea of History). As is well known, this article provoked a furor among believers in Shinto, and eventually led to Kume’s resignation from the Imperial University. The article argued that “Shinto is not a religion,” but rather a collection of “purification rituals celebrating heaven, preventing disaster, and inviting fortune.” As Kume put it, “These are carried out without order; lord and vassal, superior and subordinate come together to create a strong nation. Tears come to one’s eyes just to think about it.”³⁵ He also commented on the worship of the sun in Shinto, stating that this phenomenon “appears in religious thought around the world, but it differs in its various manifestations. In Japan, the only place in which it evolved properly, it works to preserve the national body” (p. 67). He concluded, “Though there will be future generations that will want to treat it as a religion, to do so will not prove a fruitful endeavor, as the history of our nation does not support this interpretation” (p. 68).

In these passages, Kume’s ideas do not seem especially different than those of Motoori Norinaga who in his 1816 work *Isonokami no sasamegoto* (Whisperings on a Rock), declares the superiority and auspiciousness of Japan because of its belief in the Sun Goddess Amaterasu.³⁶ One senses that Kume is trying to locate the proper position of Shinto within the long history of the nation; what he says has nothing to do with Meiji government’s policies that declared that Shinto was not a religion *per se*. Nonetheless, in the preface to the republished version, Taguchi added some rather incendiary comments aimed at “certain, present-day, fervent believers of Shinto in our country.”

Several issues later in *Shikai*, one begins to see responses to these comments in letters to the editor. Kume and Taguchi responded with a volley of retorts, and the matter attracted an increasing amount of attention. In the February 1892 issue of *Kokkō* (The National Light) there appeared an anonymous article called “Kokka no daiji o bōro suru mono no fuchū fugi o ronzu” (On the Disloyalty and Immorality of One Smearing Important National Matters). This article denounced Kume as “using the name of scholarship to spout far-fetched opinions about the emperor’s ancestors. He is denigrating the Three Jewels and insulting the graves of the Imperial Family.” It was this sentiment that fueled the furor that eventually led to Kume resigning from his post at Tokyo Imperial University. One commentator recently wrote that “Kume and Taguchi had misread the depth of the relationship between the ideology of the modern emperor system and Shinto.”³⁷ However, is that really true?

Katō’s theory mentioned earlier, namely the idea that the ancient imperial system represented a primitive form of rule by a clan leader, had not encountered any ideological opposition. The reason for this difference is not simply that Katō was a leading administrator of the Imperial University and Kume was a lowly assistant professor. Kume had used positivistic means to come to the conclusion that “State Shinto,” which had been set up as an ideology greater than religion in exchange for the guarantee of freedom of religion in the imperial constitution, was not a religion.³⁸ (Of course, the establishment of State Shinto presented a conflict with other religions and precluded the possibility of new branches of Shinto developing. In these ways, the very existence of State Shinto put a limit on the freedom of religion.)

After the Russo-Japanese War, Kume's proposition of 1891 that "Shinto was not a religion" should be taken as meaning that it did not have the same form as other religions, such as Christianity, and that therefore it was more akin to original, ancient practices such as the worship of the sun.³⁹

When we remember that the theory of the evolution of religion from Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* had just been introduced into the world of religious studies, it becomes clear that Kume's discussion of the primitive nature of Shinto relegated it something akin to the Spencerian category of religion before religion, or, in other words, the "religion of barbaric people." His argument that worship of the imperial family—the kind of State Shinto that Basil Hall Chamberlain in 1912 called a "new religion"—was a form of respect to the ancient ancestors of the people, that it was the foundation of the moral code, and therefore not really a religion *per se*, represented a strike at the institutional view in place at the time. It is natural that Shintoists, who revered their own doctrines and rituals and carried out the campaign to "abolish Buddhism and destroy Shakyamuni's teachings" (*haibutsu kishaku*), and who took pride in the imperial constitution's prescription of Shinto as a religion superceding other religions, would have nothing but scorn for this kind of historical reconsideration. This is apparent in *The National Light* where the anonymous author charges that Kume was "denigrating the Three Jewels and insulting the graves of the Imperial Family." The article criticized Kume, stating that the very act of advancing theories about the imperial household is itself an act of disrespect. This appears to be a reference to the idea of the "inviolability" of the emperor written into the Meiji constitution. One important result of the argument that arose between Kume and his detractors was that it ultimately revealed the compromises within the eclectic nature of thinking about the imperial institution—a combination of theories that stated Japan's national polity arose as a result of its divine nature and the theories of constitutional monarchy inherited from Prussia and other places.

The uproar stimulated by Kume's "Shinto Is an Old Custom of Worshipping Heaven" shows that the debate surrounding the ancient history of the emperor system was perceived as a pointed inquiry into the current system of the national polity. For Meiji historians, as for European and American historians of that age, studies of history represented critical inquiries into the current state of affairs. The case of Kume Kunitake's theory of modern history serves as a prime example, and it is to that case study the following section turns.

3.3.2. Kume Kunitake's "Gakkai no dai kakushin" (The Great Revolution in the World of Learning)

The inaugural issue of *Taiyō* (The Sun) was published in January 1895, about the time of the Japanese victory in the Sino-Japanese War. At the head of the editorial column of that issue, Kume, who had already resigned from his professorship at the Imperial University, published an article entitled "Gakkai no dai kakushin" (The Great Revolution in the World of Learning, pp. 3–8). Unlike the public, which cursed China as a land of barbarians in the drunken, nationalistic fervor for military victory, Kume took a different, admonishing approach: "Theories do not have anything to do with the rise and fall of nations. . . . Self-congratulatory expressions such as 'Japan is a pure country with an upright population,' 'it is rich in patriotism and chivalry,' and 'in its bravery, it knows the pathos of things' are merely expressions of conceit and are to be eliminated from the academic world" (p. 3). Kume states further, "There is not a great difference in the history of the development of Japan, China,

and Korea,” but Japan was first in receiving the impact of the “storm of revolution” blowing from the West (*taisei*). He continues that the wind has changed direction; it was now blowing from the East (*taitō*) and the Sino-Japanese War was one manifestation of this historical trend. For Kume, what he termed “the collapsing Qing dynasty” was a symbol of the fall of antiquated societies and had much to do with what he called “moral politics” (*dōtoku seiji*) and “class systems” (*kaikyū sei*). A revolutionary process of the specialization of labor had taken place within the Japanese army, and this contributed to the victory of the Japanese military. In the future, one could expect even further development of the division of labor (p. 4). In order to prevent the kind of society in which “men and women of all ranks are thrown together into a busy theater where one has to compete to survive,” societies created governments “to protect life and property.” Through promulgating a constitution, Japan had “done away with class structures,” established a philosophy of individualism based upon a system of private property, and switched to a constitutional system under which “the citizens have equal rights” (p. 6). Kume attributes Japan’s victory in the war to these factors.

These comments do not spring from the Christian-influenced theory of the natural rights of man or derivative ideas, such as that seen in Fukuzawa Yukichi’s (1834–1901) famous statement in *Gakumon no susume* (An Encouragement of Learning), “Heaven makes no man above man nor no man below man.” Instead, Kume’s ideas belong to a particular trend within the discourse of modern rights. This trend drew on the work of Katō Hiroyuki in the first and second decade after the Meiji Restoration and on the Spencerian theory of Social Darwinism. In a sense, “The Great Revolution in the World of Learning” turns to the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95 for historical proof of the Spencerian theory of Social Darwinism.

Kume claims that the teachings of Confucius were no longer applicable to the current age, and “arguments predicated upon the class system are already doomed.” He states, however, that if the “untarnished golden words” of “ancient wisdom and reason” can “be transformed so that they respond to the times and provide lucid explanations, then the brilliant truth will shine within them.” With this, Kume concluded his essay. As someone “bearing the responsibility of civilization as a scholar from the East (*taitō*),” Kume emphasized that he had a responsibility to elucidate “ancient wisdom and reason” (p. 8). This is an appropriate conclusion for an essay that began by condemning the tide of scorn for China yet described what he calls the “revolution in the east” (*taitō kakumei*).

Given the fact that Kume Kunitake was the author of the long work chronicling the travels and discoveries of the Iwakura Embassy, it is perhaps not surprising that he would see the value of introducing Western civilization to Japan. Nonetheless, his insistence upon the “Eastern revolution” is somewhat circumspect. One should first ask, why did he call his essay “The Great Revolution in the World of Learning”? After 1881, when Ōkuma Shigenobu (1838–1922) and his colleagues were ousted from powerful governmental positions, the state implemented educational policies that made the emperor system and Confucianism the pillars of national education. As mentioned above, this was a thoroughly modified, Japanese version of Confucianism, emphasizing loyalty and filial piety over ritual or duty and devotion to one’s lord over devotion to one’s parents. It is perhaps possible to detect a note of resistance to this rearranging of ethics within Kume’s article. Whereas the government was trying to instate emperor worship as a fundamental principle of education, Kume, under the influence of Western thought, was trying to take education in a different, modern direction in which patriotic fervor and semi-religious emperor worship did not cloud academic judgment.

3.3.3. Comparison to Fukuzawa Yukichi's Theory of Civilization

Fukuzawa Yukichi, who took a similar position on the introduction of Western civilization, also opposed the policy that put Confucianism at the center of national education. His article "Kyōiku no hōshin henka no kekka" (The Results of the Changes to Educational Policy), published in the 30 November 1892 issue of *Jiji shinpō*, a newspaper he had founded, condemned China as a barbarian nation. His article "Heiba no ikusa ni katsu mono wa mata shōbai no ikusa ni katsu beshi" (Those Who Win Military Battles Will Win in the Battle of Business) appeared in the 8 January 1895 issue of *Jiji shinpō*, soon after Kume Kunitake spoke out against the defamation of China in "The Great Revolution in the World of Learning." In this article, the difference between the two scholars' positions is clear. Kume's "eastern revolution," predicated on the introduction of Western civilization, stood in opposition to the both the Imperial Rescript on Education, which installed State Shinto and Confucianism as an integral part of national education, and to Fukuzawa's slogan "out with Asia, in with the West" (*datsu-A nyū-Ō*). Kume's so-called "eastern revolution" respected the spirit of the system of the modern nation as set out in the imperial constitution, and he advocated the establishing of similar kinds of nation-states in other Asian countries.

Unlike Fukuzawa's 1875 *Bunmeiron no gairyaku* (An Outline of a Theory of Civilization) which explains the multiplication of wealth from the point of view of international economic competition, Kume emphasizes in "Kaikyū sei to kunshi no michi" (The Class System and the Road of a Man of Virtue), which appeared in the second issue of *Taiyō*, that the rigid class system had crumbled. Kume harshly criticizes the system that organized society into an aristocracy, a warrior class, and a class for commoners. Again in an article called "Rinri no kairyō" (Changes in Ethics) in the fifth and sixth issues of *Taiyō*, Kume rearranges the system of Confucian morality based upon Spencerian evolution and egalitarian thought. In doing so, he again expresses his hope for a society in which one could compete on an equal footing for profit.

Kume's thinking again seems to be akin to Katō Hiroyuki's theory of social evolution. As mentioned above, Katō's *Jinken shinsetsu* goes out of its way to explain the significance for all people of Japan's unbroken line of emperors, which, according to him, had made policies from ancient times onward to help and serve the weak within society. Katō does not describe Japanese society as working along principles of natural selection in which the strong are destined to win and the weak lose. The editorial column in the inaugural issue of *Taiyō*, which also carried Kume's "The Great Revolution in the World of Learning," ran an article by Inoue Tatsukurō entitled "Keizaiteki tōsō" (Economic Conflict). In it, the author compares the imports and exports of various countries using figures, and he describes the economic conflicts of each country while emphasizing the important role that struggle plays in world history. Articles about the importance of the existential struggles between countries had been widespread since the 1890s. Frequently this sort of article would suggest that, in order to win in the international arena, citizens should band together and keep domestic struggles to a minimum. This is a theme that Katō Hiroyuki also touches upon. Such articles represent one current in the larger intellectual trend of "Social Imperialism," which reached a new highpoint in Europe during the late nineteenth century.

Kume Kunitake differs from these other authors in that he goes no further than simply emphasizing the equality of all people and negating the differences between social classes. Of

course, he does not negate the view that the imperial household represents an unbroken line of divine emperors, so we should probably add the caveat that the equality of the people was predicated on the assumption that the emperor naturally possessed a superior position. This hard-line constitutionalism thus fell into a different intellectual lineage than Social Imperialism or the thought of Katō Hiroyuki, who came up with his own history of the emperor system by putting his own twist on evolutionary thought.

In a special issue of *Taiyō* commemorating the “The 1100th Anniversary of the Transfer of the Capital to Kyoto” (Issue No. 4), Kume published an article called “Kyōto wa kokubi no kura naru o ronzu” (On Kyoto as the Storehouse of National Aesthetics). This article surveys the development of Kyoto as a tourist city and is perhaps not unrelated to the current of ultranationalism that was then sweeping the country. Fukuzawa Yukichi too published a number of articles in 1892 in his newspaper *Jiji shinpō* about the preservation of old buildings and the development of Kyoto as a tourist city: “Kyōto no jinja bukkaku” (The Shrines and Temples of Kyoto, 13 May 1892), “Nihonkoku o rakukyō to shite gaiyaku o michibikitaru beshi” (We Should Bring Foreign Visitors to Japan as a Pleasure Spot, 14 May 1892), “Kyōto no issen-hyaku-nen sai” (The 1100th Anniversary of Kyoto, 27 May 1892), and so on. In other works, Fukuzawa does not appear interested in preserving old things, and here he only is only interested in preserving old culture in order to market it to non-Japanese tourists. In short, he advocates the preservation of old culture not for the sake of Japanese culture but for the economic benefit of a new, modern Japan. This is perhaps in keeping with Fukuzawa’s negative attitude toward Confucianism and the Japanese classics.

From Kume’s “The Great Revolution in the World of Learning” alone, it is difficult to judge exactly what position he took toward Japanese “tradition” so one needs to turn to other articles for that. In January 1904, before the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War, Kume published an article in *Taiyō* entitled “Shōtoku Taishi no taigai kō” (Prince Shōtoku’s Hard-Line Foreign Policy), in which he rejects the legend that Prince Shōtoku (573–622) was born in a stable, stating that this story was derived from Christianity. He also rejects the slur “the regicidal prince” (*shiigyaku taishi*) attached to Prince Shōtoku by Tokugawa period Confucian scholars who had attacked Shōtoku for supporting the forces that assassinated the Emperor Sushun (r. 587–592). Kume suggests that Confucianists simply wanted to tarnish the name of the man who played the leading role in introducing Buddhism to Japan. Instead, Kume paints his own portrait of Prince Shōtoku as a fine politician, thus changing the image of Prince Shōtoku entirely.

The thirteen hundredth anniversary of the promulgation of Prince Shōtoku’s Seventeen-Article Constitution was observed in 1903, occasioning a move to re-evaluate Shōtoku and his role in history. This is particularly visible in “Shōtoku Taishi jitsuroku” (A Factual Account of Prince Shōtoku), in which Kume applies German bibliographic techniques to pick through the Japanese classics and discard apocryphal stories that seem to be no more than legend. Above all, Kume praises Shōtoku’s political stance toward the Korean peninsula: “We should be filled with awe when we realize that in the realm of foreign policy, he was an advocate of peace.” In conclusion, Kume expresses his hope for the emergence of a politician who will use both carrot and stick to resolve the Russo-Japanese problem peacefully.⁴⁰

In Kume’s rejection of the slur “regicidal prince” and his portrayal of Prince Shōtoku as a superb politician who paved the way for the introduction of Buddhism, one can detect a constitutionalist posture of criticism of the Imperial Rescript on Education, which established

State Shinto and Neo-Confucian morality as the pillars of national ethics. Kume here puts into practice his policy that states that if one takes “untarnished golden words” of “ancient wisdom and reason” and “applies clear understandings, then the brilliant truth will shine within them.” In other words, Kume hoped that along with the revival of *kangaku*, people would learn from Chinese historical accounts and borrow stories so that when they wrote about current policies, they would be able to deploy these precedents freshly with a scientific attitude. Needless to say, this was not enough for those authorities who tried to educate the citizenry in a way that would be in keeping with Japanese-style Neo-Confucianism. From the vantage point of the present, it is clear that even in his supposedly “scientific” reconsideration of history, there something willful about his interpretation of “fact” when he links evaluations of the past with contemporary events in the international and domestic arenas.⁴¹

3.3.4. Vicissitudes in the Philosophy of History

One side effect of Kume’s resignation of his professorship from Tokyo Imperial University was that in 1893, the editors of *Dai Nihon hennen shi* (Chronological History of Greater Japan) ceased their work. Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827–1910), who was the editor-in-chief of the project, had been strict in his distinguishing historical fact from fiction, and people criticized him—as they had Kume—calling him “Doctor Expunge” (*massatsu hakase*). The stances of Kume and Shigeno are especially clear in their critical stance toward the *Dai Nihon shi* (History of Greater Japan), which had followed the *Taiheiki*’s proposition that the Southern Court represented the legitimate branch of the imperial line. As a result, history texts for middle schools and other similar textbooks started recording the stories of both the northern and southern branches of the court.

In 1911, this issue came to a head when historical circles began to debate fiercely whether the northern or southern court had been the legitimate heir to the throne. This was the year after the Great Treason Incident, which led to a harsh crackdown on socialist thought, and people became extremely concerned that not enough loyalty (*chū*) was given to the imperial institution. In this context, claims were made against textbooks that recorded the stories of both the northern and southern branches of the court in the fourteenth century, and these resulted in the “dispute regarding the legitimacy of the northern and southern courts” (*Nanboku seijun ronsō*). This is one of two disputes that arose in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese War as the authorities attempted to bring about a greater degree of worship for the emperor and a stronger sense of the nation as a family. (More will be said about the other later.)

The question of the *Taiheiki* and the two branches of the court had been touched upon earlier in the Meiji period in the twelve-volume series *Katei kyōiku rekishi dokuhon* (Household Education: Readers in History), edited by Ochiai Naobumi and Konakamura Yoshikata and published by Hakubunkan (1891–1892). In its avoidance of outright legend and its selection of authoritative classical sources, it shows a relatively modern approach toward historiography; however, it weaves the stories it tells into narrative form. Written in twenty-seven short sections and relatively easy language, the collection became a bestseller and helped to give birth to collections of historical texts for young audiences. Both editors were graduates of the two-year classical studies program established by Katō Hiroyuki at Tokyo University in 1882, and both were worked as teachers at the prestigious First Higher School.

In their work, neither Prince Shōtoku, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, nor Tokugawa Ieyasu make an appearance. Even important figures such as Taira no Kiyomori, Minamoto no Yo-

ritomo, and Oda Nobunaga only put in appearances as secondary characters. As a work that purported to represent all of Japanese history, there were big omissions in what it included; in fact, among the other historical textbooks from the time, there were none that were quite this extreme. Apart from Prince Shōtoku, the “regicidal prince” who denounced followers of Confucianism, most of the most important people who were missing as major figures in *Household Education: Readers in History* were those who had helped to strengthen the power of warrior families. In other words, the editors had decided to place little emphasis on the role that warrior families had played in ruling the country. Interestingly, seven out of twenty-seven stories deal with figures from the Period of Northern and Southern Courts, and of these, the majority have to do with Kusunoki Masashige (?-1336) and other important figures of the southern court. Other noteworthy inclusions are the Soga Brothers, two warriors who took revenge on the murderer of their father at the beginning of Kamakura period, and the *Chūshingura* rōnin who took revenge on their master who had been forced to commit suicide. Volume four includes biographical sketches of Kesa Gozen, a Heian-period lady who was killed by her lover Endō Moritō who had accidentally mistaken her for her husband, and Hosokawa Gracia, the loyal Christian wife of the samurai Hosokawa Tadaoki. In short, *Household Education: Readers in History* tended to recount Japanese history through the stories of loyal lords and virtuous wives.

This series was compiled in a way that emphasized the theme of loyalty, the same virtue that informed the entire spirit of the Imperial Rescript on Education. In emphasizing loyalty, it made sure to place special stress on the “Kenmu Restoration” (now called the era of the “direct rule”), which attempted to return authority to the emperor and his family. In doing so, it tended to put the southern court in the advantageous position. “Official histories” and other histories that were more or less treated as official, such as the *Dai Nihon shi*, traced their lineage back to the *Taiheiki* and advocated that the Southern Court was the legitimate successor to the throne. The imperial line that had succeeded to the Kyoto court, however, was that of the Northern Court, and needless to say, the Meiji emperor traced his lineage back to it. Indeed, this was one problem in the logic of who emphasized that an unbroken line of emperors had ruled over Japan since time immemorial. Nonetheless, those who believed in the Southern Court claimed their victory. The more twisted the imperial lineage became, the more important the virtue of loyalty (*chū*) became as a means to suppress this problem. In the end, the textbooks officially sanctioned by the government claimed the Southern Court was the legitimate branch; however, the government continued to promote worship of the Meiji emperor who had descended from the Northern Court.⁴²

The other large historical debate that arose in 1911 had to do with the institution of the emperor. Using the Germanic theory of the nation as a unified, organic whole as his basis, Ichiki Kitokurō, a professor at Tokyo Imperial University, argued that sovereignty lay with the institution that is the state, and that the emperor played a role that corresponded to the head of the nation. Among his students was Minobe Tatsukichi (1873–1948) who argued for something akin to the British parliamentary system, stating that the Diet, the institution that represented the citizenry, could be restricted by the will of the emperor as expressed through the Cabinet. As a result, he backed the idea of governmental reform. (Later, Uesugi Shinkichi [1878–1929] and others would take issue with this interpretation.) Hozumi Yatsuka (1860–1912), a professor of constitutional law in the Law Department of the Imperial University developed his idea of the Japanese race as a “group linked by blood pedigree” (*kettō*

dantai)—an idea that fit nicely with Katō Hiroyuki's theory of the nation as family. At the beginning of his 1897 book *Aikokushin* (Patriotism), he wrote, "The distinctive structure of the Japanese people is that of a group linked by blood pedigree. . . . Our ancestors are those glorious heavenly ancestors of the emperor. The heavenly ancestors are the ancestors of the citizenry, and the imperial family are the sacred family of our people."⁴³ With this, the old guard lost, and until about 1935, the theory of the emperor as an institution (*tennō kikan setsu*) held sway in the academic world.

In sum, at the same time that Meiji intellectuals were busy absorbing modern European ideas about the study and philosophy of history, older notions of history which had served as receptors underwent significant transformation. Shaped by the changing trends of the times, ideas of history underwent frequent modifications, and histories that laid out the past in the form of narrative tales played an important role in this process. Late Meiji-period thinkers helped to provide "evidence" that supported the view of Japan as an imperial nation, and this plus several other leaps of logic, eventually culminated in the impetus in 1935 a drive to clarify the nature of the national structure (*kokutai meichō undō*). The result was the rise of an ideology of Japanese nationalism that steamrolled across the country, and by late 1937, the population had started intoning "Japan is the land of the gods" as if this idea had always held true and always would. A close view of these historical vicissitudes negates the prevailing postwar oversimplification that the dominant attitude toward history in the Meiji period onward was simply that Japan represented a "divine" imperial nation. In fact, the reality was more complex and hinged largely on the changing views of history enumerated above. Also, it is an oversimplification to state that the Western-style study of history was deformed by "reactionary powers." The reason is that the views of history espoused by those "reactionary powers" were in themselves formulated when Japanese layered western modern ideologies of history upon older modes of historiography.

4. Conclusion

To summarize, one can identify several characteristics of the ways that the Japanese people thought and wrote about history before the Meiji Restoration. First, a major purpose of premodern historical documents was to emphasize the pedigree of the government and those that wielded power. As a result, records might be doctored or perhaps even falsified to justify a change in power, or if something was felt to have been handled inappropriately, then new historical records would be produced to present a revised version of events. Second, Japanese historians took the position that the Japanese imperial family had consisted of an unbroken line throughout history. In view of this, the authorities tended to produce "official histories" that treated Japanese history as a continuous string of events, although they used different types of language, literary styles, or historiographic formats at various points. These include the Six National Histories written by the ancient court in *kanbun*, the "Mirrors" written by the Fujiwaras in Japanese in the style of tales, and the *Honchō tsugan* written for the Tokugawa authorities in *kanbun*. This makes three categories of continuous histories—or four, if one also includes the *Dai Nihon shi* written in the province of Mito. Third, accounts related to Buddhism were included even histories—even in *kanbun* "official histories" (which were included in the category of *bungaku* inherited from China). The Buddhist theory of cause and effect infiltrates historical documents written in *wabun* or in a combination of *wabun*

and *kanbun* (*wakan konkōbun*)—forms of writing that tend to include a significant amount of fictionalization, thus departing significantly from other more recent models of recording history. Fourth, historical records were mined for individual stories that could be performed in kabuki plays, puppet plays, the stories of raconteurs, and so on—performances that helped spread knowledge of history among the common people. Fifth, among the common people, there arose a skepticism regarding history that helped people to identify the intentions of those who were in power and read historical truth hidden behind elements of fiction. Sixth, within the trend of secular thought in the Tokugawa period, writers of historiographic material paid increasing attention to the role of sentiment and subjective moments in history. Finally, as Japanese nationalism *vis-à-vis* China grew in the late Tokugawa period, there was a trend to create individual histories of various genres of writing and various other subjects.

Whereas earlier manifestations of nationalism took China as the object of comparison and rivalry, the nationalism of the Meiji period was rearranged in way that the Japanese felt competition with the major powers of the West. In order to express pride in their long history—a history longer than that of the West—the Meiji state went about “inventing” a history of the Japanese state that dated the origin of the nation to its mythological founding. This is the first characteristic of Meiji treatments of history. A second is that the Western view of history as a teleological process of development was introduced into Japan along with the biological theory of evolution as a “principles of heaven” (*tenri*). Thinking it necessary to reconcile these ideas with the idea of the imperial system as an unbroken line of rulers, Japanese historians developed their own theory of the history of the Japanese state as a “familial nation” (*kazoku kokka*) that had continued over time. Again, one could see this as a form of “invented history.”

Third, as Japanese historians encountered the Western era of historical studies, they learned about positivism and began to create ways of studying history that sought out the historical facts hidden beneath layers of mythology and legend. The tendency to read history in order to find precedents and stories that would help establish directions for current policy was especially pronounced in the Tokugawa period, but we see it once again the revival of “Chinese studies” in the Meiji period. As the case of Kume Kunitake shows, some attempted to reconsider historical precedents and stories in ways that would make them applicable to the modern, post-Restoration world. The question of what historical precedents and stories were used and how they were re-evaluated is inseparable from the question of how contemporary writers understood their own moment in history. In other words, the Meiji-period interest in history played an integral part in the progress of contemporary events. In this context, Kume’s article “Shinto Is an Old Custom of Worshipping Heaven,” which attempted to apply the philosophy of positivism to the use of textual sources, by showing the nature of early Shinto belief. In arguing that Shinto involved the rituals of the imperial household involved a form of respect to the ancestors of the Japanese people and that Shinto was not a religion per se, he came into conflict with those who argued for the supremacy of Shinto ideology, and Kume was harshly criticized.

Fourth, the Japanese set out on a process of creating a “history of Japanese literature” (*Nihon bungaku*), using the Western models of the history of literature—which in practice meant something broader than its contemporary meaning, something more like a history of the humanities. In this way, Japan created a history of its own writings even before China, which was less willing to accept the idea the narrow definition of “literature,” which placed

value on literary fabrications. In the process of doing so, the Japanese conceived of “literature” as a bilingual arena consisting of both writings in its adopted language of *kanbun* as well as in native *wabun*—a fact that makes Japanese literary histories unique on the world stage. This inclusion of writing in both Chinese and Japanese is another indication that the structure of post-Meiji Japanese cultural nationalism had more to do with the dichotomy of East versus West than with Japan versus China.

Although this article has not mentioned it, there were several other factors that helped to shape popular views of history among the common people. The newspaper *Kokumin no tomo* (The Citizen’s Friend), started by Tokutomi Sohō (1863–1957) in 1886, argued that theoretical readings of history were at the very heart of “the study of letters” (*bungaku*). About the same time, biographies of great men became popular among young men as models of how to make a name for themselves in the world. As a weapon in the struggle for popular rights in the 1880s, a new line of “historical fiction” (*rekishi shōsetsu*) emerged from the so-called “political novel” (*seiji shōsetsu*). These, plus the stories of raconteurs told in the public halls and reprinted in newspapers, significantly shaped the ways that the common people viewed history.

The end of the Meiji period brought caused the Japanese to look back and evaluate the long historical period which had seen so much tremendous change, including a doubling in the size of the territory of Japan. The Meiji emperor was widely praised as the greatest emperor since the legendary emperor Jinmu. Yet even as the country continued to adopt elements of Western civilization, there were those that looked back on the Meiji period and attempted to correct its excesses. These processes were inextricably linked to the process of finding Japan’s position in the convergence and intersection of Eastern and Western civilization. In other words, positioning Japan within world history at the time and recapitulating the history of the Meiji era were mutually reinforcing processes; one inevitably led to a conclusion for the other. The relationship between Japan’s view of its own history and its own position in the world has remained integrally linked for virtually all of modern history: from the era of the Russo-Japanese War through World War II, and even well into the postwar period. Still, that must remain the subject for another essay.

REFERENCES

Butterfield 1968–74

Herbert Butterfield. “Historiography.” In *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Philip P. Wiener. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1968–74.

Chamberlain 1912

Basil Hall Chamberlain. *The Invention of a New Religion*. London: Watts and Co., 1912.

Fukuchi 1966

Fukuchi Ōchi 福地桜痴. *Fukuchi Ōchi shū* 福地桜痴集. Vol. 11 of *Meiji bungaku zenshū* 明治文学全集. Chikuma Shobō, 1966.

Hanyu da cidian 1986–94

Hanyu da cidian 漢語大詞典. Shanghai: Hanyu Da Cidian Chuban She, 1986–94.

Hardacre 1991

Helen Hardacre. *Shintō and the State 1868–1988*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.

Hobsbawm and Ranger 1984

Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Hyōdō 1995

Hyōdō Hiromi 兵藤裕己. *Taiheiki “yomi” no kanōsei: Rekishi to iu monogatari* 太平記「よみ」の可能性：歴史という物語. Kōdansha, 1995.

Hyōdō 2000

———. *Heike monogatari no rekishi to geinō* 平家物語の歴史と芸能. Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 2000.

Inami 2003

Inami Ryōichi 井波陵一. *Chi no zabyō: Chūgoku mokurokugaku* 知の座標：中国目錄学. Hakuteisha, 2003.

Ishida 1992

Ishida Takeshi 石田雄. *Meiji seiji shisō shi kenkyū* 明治政治思想史研究. 1954. Reprinted by Mirai Sha, 1992.

Iwakura Embassy, 1871–73

The Iwakura Embassy, 1871–73: A True Account of the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary's Journey of Observation through the United States of America and Europe, editors-in-chief Graham Healey and Chushichi Tsuzuki, 5 vols. Matsudo: The Japan Documents, 2002.

Katō 1990

Katō Hiroyuki 加藤弘之. *Katō Hiroyuki monjo* 加藤弘之文書. Dōbōsha, 1990.

Kimura 1971

Kimura Ki 木村毅. “Kaisetsu” 解説 and “Henshū kōki” 編集後記. In *Meiji bunka kenkyū hen* 明治文化研究会, supplemental vol. 2 of *Meiji bunka zenshū* 明治文化全集. Nihon Hyōron Sha, 1971.

Kinsei shikidō ron 1976

Kinsei shikidō ron 近世色道論, vol. 60 of *Nihon shisō taikei* 日本思想大系. Iwanami Shoten, 1976.

Kume 1892

Kume Kunitake 久米邦武. “Shintō wa saiten no kozoku” 神道は祭天の古俗. *Shikai* 史海 8:1 (1892).

Mehl 1998

Margaret Mehl. *History and the State in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Miyachi 1991

Miyachi Masato 宮地正人. "Kaisetsu." In *Rekishi ninshiki* 歴史認識, vol. 13 of *Nihon kindai shisō taikai* 日本近代思想大系. Iwanami Shoten, 1991.

Nakamura 1965

Nakamura Yukihiko 中村幸彦. *Kinsei zuisō shū* 近世随想集. *Nihon koten bungaku taikai* 日本古典文学大系 96. Iwanami Shoten, 1965.

Nihon bungei shi 1986–88

Nihon bungei shi 日本文芸史. Vols. *Kodai* 古代 1, *Kodai* 2, *Chūsei* 中世, and *Kinsei* 近世. Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 1986–1988.

Satō 2004

Satō Masayuki 佐藤正幸. *Rekishi ninshiki no jikū* 歴史認識の時空. Chisen Shokan, 2004.

Shinchō Nihon koten shūsei 1983

Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長. *Shinchō Nihon koten shūsei: Motoori Norinaga shū* 新潮日本古典集成 本居宣長集. Notes by Hino Tatsuo 日野龍夫. Shinchō Sha, 1983.

Suzuki 1998

Suzuki Sadami 鈴木貞美. *Nihon no "bungaku" gainen* 日本の「文学」概念. Sakuhin Sha, 1998.

Suzuki 2000a

———. "Meiji Nihon ni okeru shinkaron juyō: Sono mondai gun no kōzō o megutte" 明治日本における進化論受容：その問題群の構造をめぐって. In *Nihon no kagaku to bunmei: Jōmon kara gendai made* 日本の科学と文明：縄文から現代まで, ed. Itō Shuntarō 伊東俊太郎. Dōsei Sha, 2000.

Suzuki 2000b

———. "Shinkaron juyō shi no wakugumi no kentō: Gakusaiteki kumikae ni mukete" 進化論受容史の枠組みの検討：学際的組み替えに向けて. In *20 seiki no seimei kagaku to seimeikan. Heisei 9-nendo sōkatsu shinpojiumu (hōkokusho)* 20世紀の生命科学と生命観：平成9年度総括シンポジウム（報告書）. Hayama: Sōgō Kenkyū Daigakuin Daigaku, 2000.

Suzuki 2001

———. "Meiji-ki *Taiyō* ni kokumin kokka shugi no hensen o yomu" 明治期『太陽』に国民国家主義の変遷を読む. In *Zasshi Taiyō to kokumin bunka no keisei* 雑誌『太陽』と国民文化の形成, ed. Suzuki Sadami. Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2001.

Suzuki 2003

———. "The Reformulation of the Idea of History and the Publication of Historical Texts in Late-Nineteenth Century Japan," trans. Jeffrey Angles. In Joshua A. Fogel and James C. Baxter, eds., *Historiography and Japanese Consciousness of Values and Norms*. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2003, pp. 147–183.

Suzuki 2005

———. *Nihon no bunka nashonarizumu* 日本の文化ナショナリズム. Heibonsha Shinsho, 2005.

Suzuki 2006a

———. *The Concept of “Literature” in Japan*, trans. Royall Tyler. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2006.

Suzuki 2006b

———. “Nihon kingendai no jidai shōsetsu: Nakazato Kaizan, Yoshikawa Eiji o chūshin ni” 日本近現代の時代小説：中里介山、吉川英治を中心に. In James C. Baxter, ed. *Historical Consciousness, Historiography, and Modern Japanese Values*. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies, 2006, pp. 167–183.

Yamashita 1983

Yamashita Shigekazu 山下重一. *Supensā to Nihon kindai* スペンサーと日本近代. Ochanomizu Shobō, 1983.

Yanagida 1965

Yanagida Izumi 柳田泉. *Meiji shoki no bungaku shisō* 明治初期の文学思想, vol. 1. Shunjū Sha, 1965.

Yokota 2004

Yokota Fuyuhiko 横田冬彦. “Kinsei no gunsho to ‘rekishi’” 近世の軍書と〈歴史〉. Talk delivered 20 November 2004, at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies, in the joint research project “Shuppan to gakugei janru no hensei to saihensei: Kinsei kara kingendai e” 出版と学芸ジャンルの編成と再編成——近世から近現代へ (Publishing and the Formulation and Reformulation of Genre: From the Early Modern Era to the Modern and Contemporary Eras).

NOTES

1 Please note that in this chapter, English equivalents of the titles of Japanese and Chinese works are not italicized except when a published English translation by that name exists; thus we have *Shiji* (*Records of the Grand Historian*) and *Heike monogatari* (*The Tale of the Heike*), but *Jingxue lishi* (History of Confucian Studies) and *Hōgen monogatari* (The Tale of the Hōgen War).

2 Satō 2004, p. vi.

3 Satō 2004, pp. 17–18.

4 Satō 2004, p. 209.

5 I have borrowed the word “receptor” from biology in order to clarify the conceptual structures that help this to happen. A receptor is an organ that receives information; its function is to select information to take in, to carry it into the organism, then to activate a reaction that affects the external part of the organism; however, unlike the receptors of insects which take in information and process it in a value-free fashion, the receptors that help to absorb various ideas from culture are intimately connected to the systems of value within that society.

6 See chapters 2 and 4–8 in Suzuki 1998 and Suzuki 2006a.

7 For more information, see the first chapter of Inami 2003.

8 See Butterfield 1968, pp. 555–87; Kobayashi 1983, p. 178 [JA: Suzuki-Sensei does not have this work in his list of references. Please get a complete citation from him.]; and Satō 2004, p. 5.

9 *Hanyu da cidian* 1986–94.

10 One sometimes still sees the same expression “history of successive generations” (*rekishi no shi*) in Japanese sources, such as volume 35 of Yamaga Sogō’s *Yamaga gorui* (The Yamaga Dictionary) and the final volume of Arai Hakuseki’s *Koshitsū wakumon* (A Gate into Old History). See Satō 2004, p. 44.

11 This book appeared in a Japanese edition in 1663.

12 Satō 2004, pp. 4–5.

13 There exists a hand-written manuscript of the the work *Kingin rekishi* (History of Gold and Silver) by the late Tokugawa-period townsman scholar Yamagata Banchō (1748–1821). This is an example of a work where the title only is in classical Chinese, but the word *rekishi* as it is used here, makes it clear that this is used only within a certain field of study. For more on the establishment of the word *rekishi* as specialized field, see section 2.2.3 of this essay.

14 *Kinsei shikidō ron* 1976, p. 211.

15 Contemporary scholars of history deal with historical records that take the form of a tale as falling within the realm of history proper, but scholars of Japanese literature in the early twentieth century called such works “historical tales” (*rekishi monogatari*). In 1918, Haga (1867–1927) helped make this rubric well known. Along with this new noun, more and more people began to read the work more as tales. Incidentally, before World War II, when the view of the nation that put the emperor at the center of the nation had reached a high tide, the “New Island Guard” chapter of *The Clear Mirror* appeared in nationally sanctioned textbooks, as did numerous *waka* poems about Emperor Go-Toba’s exile. As a result, both became especially well known to the public.

16 Yokota 2004.

17 Education for the masses took place in temple schoolhouses (*terakoya*), which had their origins in the monastic schools earlier in the medieval period. Education in the temple schoolhouses became common in the eighteenth century, and as the nineteenth century began, in farming regions with villages where levels of commerce and production were relatively high, school entrance rates were nearly fifty percent.

18 *Shinchō Nihon koten shūshū* 1983, p. 414, note 1.

19 After the Meiji restoration, “period pieces” (*jidaimono*) were also called *magemono* (*mage* pieces), after the distinctive hairstyles (*chonmage*) worn before the Restoration. Later on, the word “period piece” gave birth to the expression “period novels” (*jidai shōsetsu*), which refers to novels set in the historical past, usually that of pre-Restoration Japan.

20 Suzuki 2006b.

21 In 1940, right at the height of the war between Japan and China, the song *Kigen wa ni-sen rop-pyaku-nen* (The Year of Our Era is 2600) gained some popularity. This system of counting years from the mythological founding of the nation ended in the postwar period, when the wartime nationalist take on the founding of the country was discredited. Nonetheless, the holiday was revived in 1966 as the “National Foundation Day” (*Kenkoku kinenbi*). In the history of this holiday, we can read the zigzagging vicissitudes of nationalism in modern Japan.

22 See chapter 5 of Suzuki (1998). China had to wait until the early twentieth century for people to write continuous histories that reflected the view of history as a continuous development. In European universities at the time, divinity schools held a solemn place in the university, and there religious studies were taught. In Japan, however, religious studies (consisting of Indian philosophy, Buddhism, and other similar subjects) were taught in philosophy sections within Departments of Letters (*Bungaku-bu*). Here we see a difference between the concept of “literature” in the West and *bungaku* in Japan.

- 23 On *Hyakugaku renkan*, see chapter 4 of Suzuki 1998. *Hyakugaku renkan* was edited from the notes of Nishi and his students after World War II; the ideas in the book, therefore, were not necessarily in wide circulation during the Meiji period.
- 24 The scholar Yanagida Izumi (1894–1969) has surmised that this project started earlier than *Nihon kyōiku shiryaku*, but under Murray’s guidance, the *Outline* was completed first. See Yanagida 1965, pp. 325–26.
- 25 See Suzuki 1998, pp. 142–50.
- 26 See *Kyōeki Kashihon Sha shoseki mokuroku*, rev. ed. (1887), p. 10. Also see Ishikawa Chiyomatsu’s (1861–1935) introduction of Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* in *Dōbutsu shinka ron* (1883). The first translation of *The Origin of Species* was Tachibana Senzaburō’s *Seibutsu shigen* in 1896.
- 27 Katō 1990, vol. 3, p. 178. This comment appears in his article “Kokkai seizon no saidai kiso ni tsuite tōzai ryōyō no hikaku kenkyū” (A comparative study of East and West with special regard to the greatest fundamentals of the existence of the nation).
- 28 Katō 1990, vol. 3, p. 222.
- 29 Katō lectured on the work *Allgemeines Staatsrecht* (1851–52) by the Swiss legal scholar Johann Caspar Bluntschli (1808–1881) to the Meiji emperor, and in 1876, he published a Japanese translation of the book under the title *Kokuhō hanron* (An Outline of the Laws of Nations). Bluntschli’s argument is based in the theory of the organic nature of the state, which advances the idea that the state represents a living body, and from this point of view, he argues against many other prominent theories of the state: the social contract theory that says that the state was formed through a social contract by individual parties, the theory that argues that the state seizes the private resources of its citizens, the theory of the absolute monarch which is grounded in the divine right of kings, and the theory of popular sovereignty, which contrasts with all of the theories mentioned above. In arguing against these theories, he arrives at the idea that the principal authority lies in the state itself, namely the theory of national sovereignty. He argued for the right of peoples to determine their own future; he emphasized that the cultural collaboration that is the nation should be grounded in the traditions of the people, and he even dreamed of a union of sorts between European monarchies. This was the form that German nationalism would adopt. This was taught in Japanese universities where it influenced the thinking of the next generation of bureaucrats. After the Russo-Japanese War, it was the basis for the popularity of the theory of the organic unity of the Japanese nation. See Kimura 1971.
- 30 Hobsbawm and Ranger 1984 uses the phrase “invention of tradition” to refer to the original creation of traditions within modern culture, but here, I am using the word to refer to the reformulation of the culture into “tradition” within the modern era. One sees early references to this same sort of idea in the 1934 article “Kokuminteki seikaku toshite no Nihon seishin” (The Japanese Spirit as the People’s Character) by the journalist Hasegawa Nyōzeikan, and the postwar work *Nihon no dentō* (Japanese Traditions) by Okamoto Tarō. See Suzuki 2006a, p.25 and 37.
- 31 Both *kanbun* and study of a European language such as English were included on the entrance exams of the Imperial University, and in 1879, it was decided that graduation thesis for the Department of Letters in Tokyo University should be written either in English or in *kanbun*.
- 32 Fukuchi 1966, p. 342.
- 33 See Chapter 4 of Suzuki 1998, Chapter 3 of Suzuki 2005, and Chapter 5 of Suzuki 2006a.
- 34 A translation of Kume’s journal of the Iwakura mission is available as *Iwakura Embassy 1871–73*.
- 35 Kume 1892, p. 41. Hereafter, page numbers will be included in the main body of the text.
- 36 See Hino 1983, pp. 443–44.
- 37 Miyachi 1991, p. 445.
- 38 “State Shinto” is a term that came to be used after World War II, but it is worth using here since the Meiji constitution did, in fact, establish an institutional justification for the form of Shinto that

worshipped the imperial family by helping it supersede all other religions.

39 For more on this point, see Hardacre 1989, p. 129 and Mehl 1991, p. 127.

40 *Taiyō* (January 1904), p. 166.

41 Suzuki 2001, pp. 351–57.

42 Suzuki 2003, pp. 75–79.

43 Hozumi 1897, p. 1.

GLOSSARY

- Aikokushin* 愛国心
Amaterasu Ōmikami 天照大神
Arai Hakuseki 新井白石
Arakida Reijo 荒木田麗女
Ashikaga Yoshimitsu 足利義満
Azuma kagami 吾妻鏡
baishi 稗史
Beiō kairan jikki 米欧回覽実記
benji 本紀
biwa hōshi 琵琶法師
bun 文
bungaku 文学
bungei 文芸
Bungei gairyaku 文芸概略
Bungei ruisan 文芸類纂
bungu 文具
Bunmeiron no gairyaku 文明論之概略
bunshōgaku 文章学
chishi 地誌
chū 忠
chūgakkō 中学校
Chūgoku bungaku shi 中国文学史
chūkō 忠孝
chūkō ippon 忠孝一本
Chūshingura 忠臣蔵
Daigaku Honkō 大学本校
daigaku kisoku 大学規則
Daigaku Nankō 大学南校
Dai Nihon shi 大日本史
Dai Nihon wa shinkoku nari 大日本者神
 国也
dangi 談義
dangi-bon 談義本
datsu-A nyū-Ō 脱亜入欧
dōri 道理
dōtoku seiji 道德政治
duandai shi 断代史
Edo sakusha bunrui 江戸作者分類
Eiga monogatari 栄花物語
Emura Hokkai 江村北海
Endō Moritō 遠藤盛遠
Endō tsugan 艶道通鑑
ershisi shi 二十四史
ershiwu shi 二十五史
fenshu kengru 焚書坑儒
fudoki 風土記
Fujita Tōko 藤田東湖
Fujita Yūkoku 藤田幽谷
Fujiwara 藤原
Fujiwara no Michinaga 藤原道長
Fukuchi Ōchi (Gen'ichirō) 福地桜痴(源
 一郎)
Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉
Fusō ryakki 扶桑略記
Gakkai no dai kakushin 学界の大革新
gaku 学
Gakumon no susume 学問のすすめ
geibun 芸文
Genji monogatari 源氏物語
Genpei jōsuiki (*seisuiki*) 源平盛衰記
Genroku 元禄
Gikeiki 義経記
Go-Daigo 後醍醐
Go-Komatsu 後小松
Go-Toba 後鳥羽
Go-Yōzei 後陽成
Gukanshō 愚管抄
gunki-mono 軍記物
Hakubunkan 博文館
Han 漢
han 藩
hanshu 藩主

- Hayashi Gahō 林鶯峰
Heiba no ikusa ni katsu mono wa mata
shōbai no ikusa ni katsu beshi 兵馬の戦
 に勝つ者は亦商売の戦に勝つべし
Heiji monogatari 平治物語
Heike monogatari 平家物語
heikyoku 平曲
hennentai 編年体
hentai kanbun 変体漢文
 Himiko 卑弥呼
 Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤
bō 法
Honchō rekishi 本朝歴史
Honchō seiki 本朝世紀
Honchō tsugan 本朝通鑑
Honji suijaku setsu 本地垂迹説
hongji 本紀
 Horikawa 堀川
 Hosokawa Gracia 細川ガラシャ
 Hosokawa Tadaoki 細川忠興
Hotaru 蛍
 Hozumi Yatsuka 穂積八束
Hyakugaku renkan 百学連環
i 医
 Ichiki Kitokurō 一木喜徳郎
Ike no mokuzu 池の藻屑
 Imagawa Ryōshun (Sadayo) 今川了俊(貞
 世)
Ima kagami 今鏡
 Inbe Hironari 齋部(忌部)広成
 Inoue Tatsukurō 井上辰九郎
issho ni iwaku 一書二曰ク
 Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎
 Iwakura 岩倉
 Izanagi 伊邪那岐(伊弉諾, イザナギ)
 Izanami no Mitonomaguwai 伊邪那美(伊
 弉冉, イザナミ)の美斗能麻具波比
 (ミトノマグハヒ)
ji 字
ji 集
jidaimono 時代物
 Jien 慈円
Jiji shinpō 時事新報
jing 経
 Jingū 神功
Jingxue lishi 經学歴史
Jinken shinsetsu 人權新説
 Jinmu 神武
Jinnō shōtō ki 神皇正統記
 Jinshin 壬申
jizbuan 紀伝体
 Jōkyū 承久
Jugyōhen 授業編
kagami mono 鏡物
kaikyūsei 階級制
Kaikyūsei to kunshi no michi 階級制と君
 子の道
 Kaisei Gakkō 開成学校
kami 神
 Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵
 Kanadehon Chūshingura 仮名手本忠臣蔵
kanbun 漢文
kangaku 漢学
kanshi 漢詩
katari-bon 語り本
Katei kyōiku rekishi tokuhon 家庭教育歴史
 読本
 Katō Hiroyuki 加藤弘之
kazoku kokka 家族国家
kazoku kokka ron 家族国家論
 Keichū 契沖
keizaiteki tōsō 経済的闘争
 Kenmu Restoration 建武中興(新政)
 Kesa Gozen 袈裟御前
 Ke Shaomin 柯劭忞
kettō dantai 血統団体
kiden 紀伝
kidengaku 紀伝学
kigensetsu 紀元節
Kinsei mono no hon 近世物之本
 Kitabatake Chikafusa 北畠親房
kō 孝
 Kōbun 弘文
kobunjigaku 古文辞学
kōdan 講談
 Kōen 皇円
kogigaku 古義学
Kogo shūi 古語拾遺
Kojiki 古事記
Koji ruien 古事類苑

Kokin waka shūshō 古今和歌集抄
kokka saishi 国家祭祀
 Kōkō 光孝
kokubungakusha 国文学者
kokugaku 国学
kokugo 国語
Kokumin no tomo 国民之友
kokushigaku 国史学
kokutai 国体
kokutai meichō undō 国体明徴運動
Kokutai shinron 国体新論
 Konakamura Yoshikata 小中村義象
Kon'yo bankoku zenzu 坤輿万国全図
Kottōshū 骨董集
 Kumano Gongen 熊野権現
 Kume Kunitake 久米邦武
 Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成
kyōiku no hōshin henka no kekka 教育の方
 針変化の結果
Kyōto no issen-hyaku-nen sai 京都の一千百
 年祭
Kyōto no jinja bukkaku 京都の神社仏閣
Kyōto wa kokubi no kura naru o ronzu 京都
 は国美の庫なるを論ず
 Liang 梁
lidaì zhi shi 歷代之史
liezhuan 列伝
lishi 歴史
Lishi dafang gangjian bu 歴史大方綱鑑補
Makura no sōshi 枕草子
Man'yōshū 万葉集
mappō 末法
massatsu bakase 抹殺博士
 Masuho Zankō 増穂残口
Masu kagami 増鏡
 Matsuo Yūen 松岡雄淵
Meitoku ki 明德記
 Minamoto 源
 Minamoto no Yoritomo 源頼朝
 Míng 明
 Minobe Tatsukichi 美濃部達吉
 Mito 水戸
Mizu kagami 水鏡
monogatari 物語
 Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長

Mutsu waki 陸奥話記
nagatobon 長門本
 Nakatomi 中臣
Nanboku seijun ronsō 南北正潤論争
Nanqi shu 南斎書
Nan-taiheiki 難太平記
Nihon bungaku no fushin o tanzu 日本文学
 の不振を歎ず
Nihon bungaku shi 日本文学史
Nihon gaishi 日本外史
Nihongi 日本紀
Nihongi ryaku 日本紀略
Nihongi shiki 日本紀私記
Nihon kaika shōshi 日本開化小史
Nihon kōki 日本後紀
*Nihonkoku o rakkō to shite gaikyaku o
 michibikitaru beshi* 日本国を楽郷と
 して外客を導き来るべし
Nihon kyōiku shiryaku 日本教育史略
Nihon Montoku tennō jitsuroku 日本文徳天
 皇実録
Nihon oyobi Shina bungaku 日本及支那文
 学
Nihon sandai jitsuroku 日本三代実録
Nihon shisen 日本詩選
Nihon shishi 日本詩史
Nihon shoki 日本書紀
Niijima mori 新島守
nikkitai 日記体
 Ninmyō 仁明
 Nishi Amane 西周
 Nishimura Shigeki 西村茂樹
 Nitta 新田
norito 祝詞
 Ōama (prince) 大海皇子
 Ochiai Naobumi 落合直文
 Oda Nobunaga 織田信長
 Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠
Ōkagami 大鏡
 Ōkuma Shigenobu 大隈重信
ōrai-mono 往来物
 Ōta Gyūichi 太田牛一
 Ōtomo (prince) 大友皇子
 Oze Hoan 小瀬甫庵
 Pei Songzhi 裴松之

- Pi Xirui 皮錫瑞
 Qianlong 乾隆
qijuzhu 起居注
 Qin 秦
 Qing 清
 Rai San'yō 頼山陽
rei 礼
rekishi 歴史
rekishi monogatari 歴史物語
rekishi ninshiki no jikū 歴史認識の時空
rekishisho 歴史書
rekishi shōsetsu 歴史小説
renga 連歌
retsuden 列伝
ri 理
Rikkoku shi 六国史
rinri no kairyō 倫理の改良
rishō 利生
ruijū kokushi 類聚国史
saishi 祭祀
 Sakakibara Yoshino 榊原芳野
Sanguo zhi 三国志
sankyō-itchi ron 三教一致論
 Santō Kyōden 山東京伝
 Satō Masayuki 佐藤正幸
seiji shōsetsu 政治小説
seirigaku 性理学
 Seiwa 清和
senki-mono 戦記物
senmyō 宣命
sewamono 世話物
Shaku Nihongi 釈日本紀
shi 史
Shigakkai zasshi 史学会雑誌
shigaku 史学
 Shigeno Yasutsugu 重野安綱
shiguan 史館
shiigyaku ōji 弑逆王子
Shiji 史記
Shikai 史海
shilu 実録
 Shina 支那
Shinchōki 信長記
Shinchō kōki 信長公記
Shin kokushi 新国史
 Shinshū 神州
Shintō gakusoku Nihon-damashii 神道学則
 日本魂
Shintō wa saiten no kozoku 神道は祭典
 の古俗
Shoku Nihongi 続日本紀
Shōmonki 将門記
shōsetsu 小説
Shōtoku Taishi jitsuroku 聖徳太子実録
Shōtoku Taishi no taigaikō 聖徳太子の対
 外硬
 Sima Guang 司馬光
 Sima Qian 司馬遷
 Soga 曾我
Soga monogatari 曾我物語
 Sōgi 宗祇
sonnō jōi 尊皇攘夷
 Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真
Sui shu 隋書
 Suma 須磨
 Taguchi Ukichi 田口卯吉
Taiheiki 太平記
Taikōki 太閤記
 Taira 平
 Taira no Kiyomori 平清盛
 Taira no Masakado 平将門
taisei 泰西
taitō 泰東
taitō kakumei 泰東革命
Taiyō 太陽
 Takeda Izumo 武田出雲
 Takizawa Bakin 滝沢馬琴
 Tang 唐
Teikoku daigaku rei 帝国大学令
 Tenmu 天武
tennō kikan setsu 天皇機関説
tenri 天理
toku 徳
 Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康
 Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀
Tokushi yoron 読史余論
 Tokutomi Sohō 徳富蘇峰
tongshi 通史
tōyō shigaku 東洋史学
 Toyotomi Hideyoshi 豊臣秀吉

Tsuki no yukue 月の行衛
 Uda 宇多
 Uesugi Shinkichi 上杉慎吉
 Urabe Kanekata 卜部兼方
wabun 和文
waishi 外史
waizhuan 外伝
waka 和歌
wakan konkōbun 和漢混交文
wenxue 文学
wenyi 文芸
 Wu 武
xiaoshuo 小説
 Xiao Zixuan 蕭子顯
Xin yuan shi 新元史
yamato uta 大和歌
 Yingzong 英宗
yiwen 芸文
 Yōzei 陽成
 Yoshida Shintō 吉田神道
Yotsugi monogatari 世継ぎ物語
 Yuan Huang 袁黃
zhengshi 正史
zhiguai 志怪
zhongyong 中庸
zhuanqi 伝奇
 zi 子
Zizhi tongjian 資治通鑑