

LIN Shaoyang

## Making National History with Literary History: Hegel's Influence via Taine on Meiji Japan and the Late Qing and Early Republican China

**Abstract** Through analyzing Hegel's influence via Taine on Meiji Japan and later, on the late Qing and early Republican China, this paper will shed lights on the process of the making of national history with literary history in modern Japan and its influences on modern China. It argues that the simultaneous establishment of modern Japanese historiography and the writing of literary history in Japan had a direct impact on the establishment of Chinese historiography in the late Qing, and the writing of Chinese literary history in twentieth-century China. It will focus more on the philosophical ideas of Taine and Hegel and their influence in Japanese literary historiography and, due to the limited length of this paper, only by extension, that of China as well. The primary focus of this paper is the interaction of the modern Japanese and Chinese pursuit of new historical narratives in the construction of new national and cultural identities in the context of global modernity. It also stresses that, an invisible "origin," the writing of Chinese (literary) history in the early twentieth-century, ironically, directly and indirectly, has been internalized by the writing of Japanese national history in an exclusive framework of nation-building.

**Keywords** the establishment of national history, Chinese and Japanese literary history, Hegel, Hippolyte Taine, nationalism

---

### Introduction

History has been transformed, within a hundred years in Germany, within sixty years in France, and that by the study of their literatures.

—Hippolyte Taine<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Hippolyte Taine, *History of English Literature*, 1.

LIN Shaoyang (✉)

Department of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan  
E-mail: shaoylin@chora.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp

In recent decades, much has been done in the reexamination of Chinese literary history.<sup>2</sup> Studies have focused, to a certain extent, on the influence of Japanese historians in the writing of the history of Chinese literature.<sup>3</sup> These discussions have been limited to the scope of Chinese literature per se, however, rather than a modern global perspective of Sino-Japanese cultural encounters during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>4</sup> More importantly, little attention has been paid to the link between the study of Chinese literature and the establishment of Japanese historiography in Meiji Japan. Little attention has also been paid to the linkage between the early formation of modern Chinese historiography in China before the introduction of Marxist thought, and the Western influences via Japan on Chinese historiography and on the writing of Chinese literary history by Chinese historians. As I will argue, the formation of modern Japanese historiography, the writing of history of Japanese national literature and the writing of Chinese literary history in Meiji Japan took place almost simultaneously. This fact is important because the writing of Japanese and Chinese literary history in Meiji Japan went on to play a significant role in the formation of Japanese national literature (*kokubungaku*), and thereby in the construction of Japanese national history in Meiji Japan. This fact directly and indirectly leaves its influence on the early formation of Chinese historiography and on modern writing of Chinese literary history in late-Qing and early Republican China before the Marxist influence. In other words, the issue of the modern writing history of Chinese literature should be understood from a wider perspective, especially within the context of East Asia. As Arif Dirlik points out, when the Reformist Liang Qichao (1873–1929) and his contemporaries encountered the paradigm of modernization, it was in a Social Darwinian phase, and focused primarily on nation-building. That is to say, the nation-state was the ultimate vehicle of modernity.<sup>5</sup> The primary focus of this paper is the interaction of modern Japan and modern China during their phase of nation-building, or

---

<sup>2</sup> In the Chinese-speaking world, a thin book unexpectedly kicked off a reconsideration of narratives in Chinese literary history: Qian Liqun, Huang Ziping and Chen Pingyuan, *Zhongguo wenxue sanrentan*.

<sup>3</sup> For example, Kawai Kōzō eds., *Chūgoku no bungaku shikan*; Dai Yan, *Wenxueshi de quanli*; and Chan Kwok-Kow (Chen Guoqiu), *Wenxueshi shuxie xingtai yu wenhua zhengzhi*.

<sup>4</sup> So far as I know, Chen Guangwen's paper probably is the only paper in Chinese that deals with the linkage between Taine's works, the history of Chinese literature written by Meiji Japan's Sinologists, and their influences on Chinese literary historians. Chen Guangwen, "Taine de wenxueguan yu zaoqi Zhongguo wenxueshi xushi moshi de goujian." Chen's paper focuses on the above-mentioned tripartite relationship, especially in reference to the work of Japanese Sinologists. I would like to thank one of the blind reviewers for this reference.

<sup>5</sup> Arif Dirlik, *Culture and History in Post-Revolutionary China: The Perspective of Global Modernity*, 15.

more concretely, the Japanese and Chinese pursuit of new historical narratives in the construction of new national cultural identities in the context of global modernity.

Before addressing the role of Japan in the Chinese writing of modern literary history, an explanation of Japanese written system may be necessary. The modern Japanese language took shape starting in 1888, during the modern Japanese Vernacularized Writing Movement (the *genbun icchi* movement, literally, the movement for unification of the written and spoken languages), a movement to establish the so-called “national language” (*kokugo*) during the Meiji Period (1867–1912).<sup>6</sup> Before then, there were four types of written systems. The first type of literary Japan is classical Chinese or Sino-Japanese (*kanbun* in Japanese, or *wenyanwen* in Chinese), that was first used in the Nara Period (710–84). The second type of literary Japanese is classical Japanese (*wabun* or *gabun*). It is composed of *kanji* (Chinese characters used in Japanese language) and *kana*. *Kana* is a phonetic alphabet system based on Chinese radicals and the different strokes of Chinese cursive writing, and it was used to record Japanese phonetics. The third type of written Japanese is a mixed type of classical Chinese and classical Japanese (*wakan kongō bun*). The fourth type of written Japanese, *sōrōbun*, is in fact descended from a modified form of classical Chinese developed in Japan in the Middle Ages (*hentai kanbun*, lit., variant classical Chinese), and was used in letters and official documents in early modern Japan.<sup>7</sup> Among these four types of literary Japanese, classical Chinese or Sino-Japanese (*kanbun*), is the oldest and most widely used form of writing. Regarding the privileged status of classical Chinese before Vernacularized Writing Movement, as R. P. Dore has pointed out, the classical Chinese language was “the royal road, and the only road, to all knowledge” at the beginning of Edo Period.<sup>8</sup> Even knowledge of Western science came from Chinese translations or the original writings of the Jesuits in China. Linguistically, the aim of the Vernacularized Writing Movement was eradicate the modern use of classical Chinese and classical Japanese,<sup>9</sup> but in fact, the Vernacularized Writing Movement, accompanied by the discussions about the abolition of *kanji*, went beyond the undermining the privileged status of Classical Chinese. As Karatani Kōjin points

<sup>6</sup> Kanda Takahira (1830–98), a scholar and a statesman coined the phrase *genbun icchi* in his speech in 1885. However, the first novel written in spoken Japanese was by Futaba Teishimei (1864–1909), a well-known writer, and was published in 1888, marking both the beginning of Japanese modern literature and the beginning of the Vernacularized Writing Movement. For the history of the Vernacularized Writing Movement, see Hattori Takashi, “Genbun icchi ron no rekishi,” 21–59.

<sup>7</sup> For more on the development of literary Japanese, see Nanette Twine, *Language and the Modern State: The Reform of the Written Japanese*, 34.

<sup>8</sup> R. P. Dore, *Education in Tokugawa Japan*, 136.

<sup>9</sup> Hida Yoshifumi, “Genbun kenkyū no shiten,” in Hida Yoshifumi eds., *Genbun icchi undo*, 1.

out, the result of the Vernacularized Writing Movement consisted in the repression of the figurative—of Chinese characters.<sup>10</sup>

Before the emergence of the national languages in modern East Asia, classical Chinese remained the common writing system used in Japan before the Meiji Restoration, Korea before 1894,<sup>11</sup> Viet Nam before 1864 after the French occupation of the Southern Viet Nam in 1862,<sup>12</sup> and not to mention, China before the May Fourth Cultural Revolution from 1916 to 1921. This means that Japanese literature before the Meiji Restoration (1868), or in a strict sense, before the 1890s, should have spanned both classical Japanese (*wabun*) and classical Chinese (*kanbun*), with an emphasis on the latter. As Saitō Mareshi has pointed out, the writing of literary history in Japan could be understood as a means of divorcing “Chineseness” (*shina*) or, more precisely, classical Chinese, from the written system of “Japan,” thereby creating a form of “Japanese national literature” in mid-Meiji Japan. Simply put, the goal of writing literary history was to isolate and marginalize Chinese literature (*shina bungaku*) as the other.<sup>13</sup> As a result, from the early 1880s to 1897, at least seventeen books on Chinese literary history were published in Japan;<sup>14</sup> that is to say, the writing of Japanese literary history and the writing of Chinese literary history in Japan were not separate in mid-Meiji era. These books from the Meiji era on the history of Chinese literature later went on to influence Chinese scholars responsible for the writing of Chinese literary history in the late Qing and early Republican era.

In this paper, I argue that the simultaneous establishment of modern Japanese historiography and the writing of literary history in Japan had a direct impact on the establishment of Chinese historiography in the late Qing, and the writing of Chinese literary history in twentieth-century China. To elucidate this point, consider the following sequence of events:

1. Modern Japanese historiography matures, as does the modern writing of Japanese literary history under Western influence. →
2. Around the same time, Japanese Sinologists take an interest in the writing of Chinese literary history. →
3. Modern Chinese historiography enters its early stages and scholars such

---

<sup>10</sup> Karatani Kōjin, *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*, 70.

<sup>11</sup> Iksop Lee and S. Robert Ramsey, *The Korean Language*, 56–57.

<sup>12</sup> Lê Minh-Hãng and Stephen O’Harrow, “Vietnam,” in Andrew Simpson eds., *Language and National Identity in Asia*, 424.

<sup>13</sup> For the role of Mikami Sanji in the bifurcation of Sino-Japanese (*wa-kan*) in the writing of literary history, see Saitō Mareshi, *Kanbunmyaku no kindai: Shinmatsu/meiji no bungakuken*, chapter 1.

<sup>14</sup> Wada Hidenobu, “Meijiki kankou no chūgoku bungakushi,” 157–59.

as Liang Qichao (1873–1929) discover the possibilities of literature as a source of nationalism. →

4. Chinese authors begin writing the history of Chinese literature in late Qing and early Republican China.

The discussion below generally follows this schema but, due to space limitations, I will focus more on the philosophical ideas of Taine and Hegel and their influence in Japanese historiography and, by extension, that of China as well. The framework expressed in numbers 3 and 4 above shall be covered in greater detail elsewhere.

---

## The Literary History of Taine and the Historical Philosophy of Hegel

The French historian Hippolyte Adolphe Taine (1828–93) is known to be an advocate of literary historicism influenced by the sociological positivism of Auguste Comte (1798–1857), and the idealism of G. W. F. Hegel (1770–1831). Comte’s positivism is a system that attempts to apply the methodology of the natural sciences to philosophy. Comte holds that positive knowledge is restricted to observed facts and phenomena, and to the coordinating and descriptive laws of phenomena.<sup>15</sup> He maintains that the entirety of social history is a history based on human knowledge that evolves from a theological stage, through a metaphysical stage, and finally to the positivistic stage, namely “that of the mature scientific outlook or mentality.”<sup>16</sup> For Comte, each of these “three main stages” or “three laws” is accompanied by a distinct form of social organization.<sup>17</sup> Though philosophical historians think that Taine cannot be called a positivist, the salient characteristic of his thought is his attempt to combine positive convictions with a marked inclination to metaphysics, an inclination stimulated by the study of Spinoza and Hegel.<sup>18</sup> For Taine, the influence of August Comte led him to apply scientific methods to solve moral and social problems, and sometimes even to analyze literature and the arts.<sup>19</sup> As such, Taine’s *History of English Literature* (*Histoire de la littérature Anglaise*, 1864–69) is regarded as the combination of the discovery of the natural sciences

---

<sup>15</sup> Frederick Copleston, S.J., *A History of Philosophy*, vol. IX: *Modern Philosophy: From the French Revolution to Sartre, Camus, and Lévi-Strauss*, 77.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 78–79.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 111.

<sup>19</sup> L. Weinstein, *Hippolyte Taine*, 16–17.

and the influences of Hegelianism.

As discussed above, Taine fused the philosophies of Hegel and Comte into his writing of literary history and, consequently, Taine's literary history could be described as an "idealistic construction" with a scientific foundation.<sup>20</sup> In his *History of English Literature*, Taine deems all forms of literature to be decided by the three conditions: race, surroundings, and epoch.<sup>21</sup> Regarding this point, Delfau and Roche assert that Hegel's "Introduction" to his *Aesthetics* is probably the inspiration for Taine's three conditions, while, as a *consequence*, Taine's system of literary history tends to conform to a scientific model.<sup>22</sup> Hegel asserts that all the arts belong to "une époque" (epoch or times), "un peuple" (people), "un milieu" (milieu).<sup>23</sup> The important difference here is that Taine has replaced Hegel's "people" with "race,"<sup>24</sup> which should be regarded as a consequence of Taine's own understanding of Hegel. In addition, Taine fails to take account of Hegel's dialectical approach in describing the effects that the spirit of the times exerts on art, and the reigning model.<sup>25</sup>

As a matter of fact, the concept of "race" in Hegel is important—but not nearly as important as his "people," and nor as important as Taine's scientific (biological) "race." In his *Lecture on Philosophy of History*, Hegel regards the Caucasoid as the very beginning of world history, that is, in comparison to the other two "races"—the Mongoloid and Negroid. Similar opinions on race can be seen in Hegel's *Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, for Hegel, the decisive historical category was not "race," but people (*Volk*), and it was precisely as a "people" that the Caucasian "race" participated in history.<sup>27</sup> Hegel might be regarded as a philosopher of the modern nation-state because he provides a spiritual apotheosis of a nation and its role in world history.<sup>28</sup> In

<sup>20</sup> Gérard Delfau and Anne Roche, *Histoire/Littérature, Histoire et Interprétation du fait littéraire*, 58. See also the Japanese translation, Gérard Delfau and Anne Roche, *Rekishi to hihyō*.

<sup>21</sup> They are also known as race, milieu, and moment—or, roughly, "nation," "environment" or "situation," and "time." Hippolyte Taine, *History of English Literature*, 17.

<sup>22</sup> Gérard Delfau and Anne Roche, *Histoire/Littérature, Histoire et Interprétation du fait littéraire*, 55.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 59. For a citation of Hegel, see "Introduction à l'Esthétique de Hegel," 98.

<sup>24</sup> Gérard Delfau and Anne Roche, *Histoire/Littérature, Histoire et Interprétation du fait littéraire*, 59.

<sup>25</sup> L. Weinstein, *Hippolyte Taine*, 103.

<sup>26</sup> Hegel, *The Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*, §393. Cited in: G. W. F. Hegel, "Anthropology," 40–42.

<sup>27</sup> Robert Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lotte, *The Idea of Race*, x.

<sup>28</sup> C. J. Friedrich, "Introduction to Dover Edition," in G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*. Friedrich argues here in favor of Hegel, arguing that Hegel refers to cultures or civilizations greater than the nation-state, such as the "Orient," the "Hellenistic world," the "Germanic world," and so on.

Hegel's *Philosophy of History*, Hegel interprets history as the rational development of Spirit, or Idea, in time by conceptualizing the world in terms of the Absolute Idea—that is to say, he views the world history as a process, as a whole.<sup>29</sup> From the perspective of his holistic history and worldview, however, Hegel's philosophy presents a strong and highly systematic theory of nationalism in an early era of globalization.

Taine's works is not just designed to uncover the environmental causes of literature, or to account for literature "scientifically." If he only were to uncover the environmental causes of literature, he would merely be a geographical determinist. The privileging of literature, however, can be clearly seen in Taine. As William K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Cleanth Brooks point out, this is because literature—even more than religion (which is combination of poesy and credulity) and even more than philosophy (which is dry abstraction from poetry)—is the fullest revelation of the motives by which civilizations are determined.<sup>30</sup> Although Taine privileges literature, he only regards literature as a secondary material for the interpretation of History. This is to say, literature—or the literary narratives of history—is nothing but a means to explain History's intentions. On the other hand, either Hegel's "people" or Taine's "race," undoubtedly, forms the basis of nationalized scholarship in the framework of nation-state. In Taine's *History of English Literature*, as Appiah points out, the concept of "race" is the binding core of the English nation, since the Anglo-Saxon race accounts for Taine's decision to identify the origins of English literature, not in its antecedents in the Greek and Roman classics that provided models and themes for so many of the best-known works of English "poesy," and not in the Italian models that influenced the dramas of Marlowe and Shakespeare, but in *Beowulf*, a poem in the Anglo-Saxon tongue, a poem that was unknown to Chaucer, Spencer, and Shakespeare.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Hegel sees the East, especially China, as a symbol for "the childhood of History," the Hellenistic world as "the period of adolescence," the Roman state as the "Manhood of History," and the Germanic world as "the fourth phase of World-History." G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, 106–10.

<sup>30</sup> William K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Cleanth Brooks, *Literary Criticism: A Short History*, 531.

<sup>31</sup> Kwame Antony Appiah, "Race," 285. On the other hand, as Yano Hōjin has pointed out, in this presentation Taine has effectively integrated the complicated combination of more than twenty distinct peoples into the singular "race" of the Anglo-Saxon. See Yano Hōjin, *Bungakushi no kenkyū*, 69.

## Taine's Influence on the Narrative of (Literary) History in Meiji Japan

Here let us consider the introduction of Hegel to Meiji Japan. One can imagine that Hegelianism had a strong influence on Meiji Japan, together with the inflow and rapid spread of evolutionism even before the Japanese translations of Hegel's works appeared. As for the history of translation of Hegel's philosophy, Shibue Tamotsu first translated Hegel's *Philosophy of History* from English in 1894, with the Japanese title of *Rekishi kenkyūhō* (Tokyo: Hakubunkan). Before that, Ernest Francisco Fenollosa (1853–1908), an American professor of philosophy and arts at Tokyo Imperial University, had been lecturing on Hegel between 1878–90.<sup>32</sup> Besides, the papers published in the *Tetsugaku Zasshi* (Journal of philosophical society) from 1887 to 1897, especially around the outbreak of Sino-Japanese War in 1894, illustrated that German idealism was gradually taking place of the Liberty and Civil Right Theory (*jiyū minken riron*, theory of the Western liberalism that linked with Japanese nationalism in Mid Meiji Japan), utilitarianism and English empiricism.<sup>33</sup> These developments echoed in Japanese philosophy, and nationalism began to thrive in those days.

Of course, not only the widespread popularity of evolutionism could have brought Hegelianism into Meiji Japan, but also Western historiography under Hegelian influence may have also been involved in the introduction of Hegelianism to Meiji Japan. As mentioned earlier, Hegelianism via Taine, as the main theme of this paper, for example, is also a means for the spread of Hegelianism in Meiji Japan. Taine's *History of English Literature* was first introduced into Japan in 1891 by Tsubouchi Shoyo (1859–1935), a pioneer of Japanese modern literature, and a lecturer at Waseda University. After that, Shoyo published his own *English Literary History* (1902) that was heavily influenced by Taine.<sup>34</sup> In his essay "The First Publication on the History of Literature" (*Bungakushi no kaikeisha*) in the *Journal of Women's Learning* (*Jogaku zasshi*; 1890, May Issue), the poet Kitamura Tōkoku (1868–94) also quoted Taine, when he discussed the duty of the literary historian to observe and clarify the respective roles of religion, intention (*shisō*), philosophy, surrounding (*gaihen*), disposition (*konjō*), and race in the "times." Obviously, Tōkoku's remarks are under Taine's influence.

Here we shall consider works on Japanese literature published around the First

<sup>32</sup> Saigusa Hiroto, *Nihon ni okeru tetsugaku teki kannenron no hattatsushi*, 199–200.

<sup>33</sup> Minao Ōtsuka, *Meiji ishin to doitsu shisō*, 8.

<sup>34</sup> Yano Hōjin, *Bungakushi no kenkyū*, 195.

Sino-Japanese War (1894–95).<sup>35</sup> The first modern Japanese literary history is *Japanese Literary History (Nihon bungakushi)* by the famous historian Mikami Sanji (1865–1939) and Takatsu Kuwazaburō (1864–1921), published in 1890. In Chapter 4 of this book, the authors raised three elements that constitute “the national literature.” According to Mikami and Takatsu,

The first one is the inherent characteristics of a nation. Each nation in the world has its own unique temperament... The second is the outside surroundings (*shingai no genzo*). It refers to the surroundings of a nation, for example, its geographic position, its topography, its weather, its astronomical phenomena, its natural scenes of mountains and rivers, the states and conditions of its animals and plants, and so on... The third one is the trend of the times (*ji'un*). This refers to the Imperial Court's political stratagem, its religious strength, and so on.<sup>36</sup>

To see the impact of Taine on Japanese writing, let us compare the above quotation with Taine's work. Taine writes,

In each case, the mechanism of human history is the same. We continually find, as the original mainspring, some very general disposition of mind and soul, innate and appended by nature to race, or acquired and produced by some circumstance acting upon the race... [W]e may regard the whole progress of each distinct civilization as the effect of a permanent force which, at every stage, varies its operation by modifying the circumstances of its action.<sup>37</sup>

Three different sources contribute to produce this elementary moral state—RACE, SURROUNDINGS, and EPOCH. What we call the race are

---

<sup>35</sup> Cited in: Suzuki Sadami, “*Nihon bungaku*” *no seiritsu*, 233.

1) Mikami Sanji and Takatsu Kuwazaburō, *Nihonbungakushi* [Japanese literary history] (Tokyo: Kinkōdō, 1890), 2 volumes.

2) Haga Yaichi and Tachibana Senzaburō eds., *Kokubungaku dokuhon* [Readers of Japanese national literature] (Tokyo: Fusanbō, 1890).\*

3) Sekine Masanao, *Shōsetsushikō* [A history of novels] (Tokyo: Kinkōdō, 1890).\*

4) Ueda Kazutoshi eds., *Kokubungaku* [Japanese national literature] (Tokyo: Sōsōkan, 1890).\*

5) Ōwada Takeki, *Wabungakushi* [A history of Japanese literature] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1892), 5 volumes.

6) Ōwada Takeki, *Nihon daibungakushi* [The great history of Japanese literature] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1900–1901). A Revised edition of *Wabungakushi*.

\* These works were mainly used as textbooks of Japanese literary history (Hiraoaka Toshio, “Meiji taishō bungakushi shūsei / kaisetsu,” 4).

<sup>36</sup> Mikami and Takatsu, *Nihon bungakushi*, vol. 1, 27.

<sup>37</sup> Hippolyte Taine, *History of English Literature*, 16.

the innate and hereditary dispositions which man brings with him into the world, and which, as a rule, are united with the marked differences in the temperament and structure of the body.<sup>38</sup>

Considering “some very general disposition of mind and soul,” in the words of Taine, “as the original mainspring,” is a kind of essentialist thinking that is based on an approach of collective generalization. Furthermore, the notion that “each distinct civilization,” according to Taine, “as the effect of a permanent force,” is quite similar to Hegel’s Spirit that governs the totality and leads to the *teleos* of the historical process. It is quite clear at a glance that Mikami and Takatsu’s “inherent characteristics of a nation,” “the surroundings of a nation,” and “the trend of the times (*ji’un*)” parallel Taine’s race, surroundings, and epoch. Seemingly they are the variations from Taine’s terms. After the above quotation, Mikami and Takatsu continue to remark that the “eminent French scholar Taine compiles literary history and researches the psychology of his nation.”<sup>39</sup> In his memoirs, Mikami admits that his literary history “was written according to Taine.”<sup>40</sup> It is the same Mikami who was appointed as the member of the Compiling Board of Historical Materials by the Minister of Education and Culture of Japan (*monbushō*) in 1895, and acted as the key person to segregate the Department of National History (*kokushi gakka*) as an independent discipline from Department of History. This was a further important step to establish the nationalized scholarship and the modern disciplinary system around the First Sino-Japanese War.

The capacity of Mikami and Takatsu, the authors of *Japanese Literary History* (*Nihonbungakushi*) as the first modern historical record of Japanese literature, is also worth noting. Both Mikami and Takatsu are representative historians of the Nativist School (*kokugakuha*). The Nativist School can be traced to Edo Period (1603–1867), which emphasizes “the inherent tradition” fused into Shinto ideology, and thus neglect Chinese classical learning, the mainstream scholarship of the Edo Period. In Meiji Japan, this movement turned into the opposition between the historians of the Chinese classics and the historians of the Nativist School in the circle of historiography. Of course, in the context of 1880s and 1890s Japan, both the Nativist School and the School of Chinese classics were different from their Edo precedents in the many respects. Firstly, both of them attempt to oppose Westernization and preserve national essence (*kokusui*), despite the fact that they were indirectly influenced by Western learning. But they differed from each other in their definitions of “national essence,” for the

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 17. The emphasis is in the original.

<sup>39</sup> Mikami and Takatsu, *Nihon bungakushi*, vol. 1, 28.

<sup>40</sup> Mikami Sanji, *Meiji jidai no rekishigakkai: Mikami sanji kaikyūdan*, 49.

Nativist School forsook their own traditions of writing and learning in classical Chinese. Secondly, the Nativist School also included the scholars of national literature (*kokubungaku ha*) and for this reason their discipline was also called the historiography of native learning and national literature (*kokugaku kokubungaku shigaku*).<sup>41</sup>

Nagahara Keiji, a historian of post-war Japan, classifies Meiji historians into four types. The first are those who transformed Confucian morals and loyalty (*dayi mingfen* or *daigi meibun*) into an Emperor-centric ideology, such as Motoda Nagazane (1818–91), the Confucian scholar and court official. The second type consists of those who practiced (especially Confucian) classical learning, particularly the Evidential School of Qing China. Those historians were mostly born into Samurai families of the Edo Period and attempted to overcome the historical view of reverence for the Emperor, such as Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827–1910) and Kume Kunitake (1839–1931). The third type consists of those who are descendants of the nationalistic Edo Nativist School (*kokugaku*), who opposed Buddhism and Chinese classical learning and supported using Shinto and myth as the basis for national identity. The fourth type consists of westernizers, such as Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835–1901) and Taguchi Ukichi (1855–1905), who advocated for Westernization and supported the framework of “the History of Civilization” (*bunmeiron shikan*).<sup>42</sup> According to Nagahara, Mikami and Takatsu can be roughly classified as historians of the Native Learning School, because, although they were also influenced by the School of Civilization History, they tended to criticize the Eurocentric characteristics of the school, as evidenced by the Nativist School’s slogan of preserving the pure Japanese civilization based on national essence.

As for the fourth type of historical narrative in Meiji Japan—that is, the History of Civilization—the history of civilization by the English historian Henry Thomas Buckle (1821–62) and the French historian François Pierre Guizot (1787–1874) remained influential from the beginning to the middle of Meiji Japan. Buckle’s *History of Civilization in England* (1864), which was under a strong influence of positivism, and his *History of Civilization* (1857–61) were translated into Japanese in 1879 and 1887, respectively. Guizot, a politician who favored a constitutional monarchy before the French Revolution of 1848, was also welcomed by the polity of Meiji Japan. The Japanese translation of Guizot’s *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe, depuis la chute de l’empire romain jusqu’à la révolution* (1828) was published from 1874 to 1877, and his *Histoire de la civilisation en France* in 1829. Both Buckle and Guizot were so influential that Fukuzawa Yukichi frequently cites these two foreign historians in his

<sup>41</sup> For example, Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu*, 51–52.

<sup>42</sup> Nagahara Keiji, *Nijusseiki nihon no rekishigaku*, 8–9.

well-known masterpiece, *An Outline of a Theory of Civilization* (*Bumeiron gairyaku*, 1875). Mikami and Takatsu differ from Buckle and Guizot in their emphasis on literature, however, but they share the perspective of civilization in writing their histories. For example, Mikami and Takatsu remark in their book,

It is appropriate to say that literary history is nothing but the history of civilization. The great French scholar Taine had mentioned that to write the literary history of a nation is to study that nation's psychology. This means that, through psychology, one can understand inner phenomena—understand the intellect, emotion and volition—and thus see the soul of the nation through the history of literature.<sup>43</sup>

In his works Buckle also stresses the effects of environment, but he just sees literature as part of civilization. Unlike these histories of civilization, however, the third type of historical narrative in Meiji Japan—that is, the nationalistic Nativist School (*kokugaku*)—tended to privilege literature, just like Taine.

The Japanese historians who inherited Chinese (Confucian) classical learning were attacked by the historians of national literature from the School of Native Learning, partially because the former belonged to an orthodox style of Chinese classical learning that would write Japanese history in the form of chronicles using classical Chinese,<sup>44</sup> which was a traditional way of historiography, especially often seen in the Edo Period. Undoubtedly, the orthodox school of Chinese classical learning contradicted the ideological intention of the School of Native Learning, which was attempting to construct a new national cultural identity. Around 1890s especially after the beginning of the First Sino-Japanese War in 1894, the sentiment of nationalism soared, and the enthusiasm for Western learning receded to a certain extent. Contrary to this trend, however, nationalistic German scholarship continued to be highly welcomed.<sup>45</sup> At the time, it appeared to be a good opportunity for supporters of the Historiography of Native Learning to preserve their national essence. Amid this nationalistic atmosphere, the discipline of national history was approved by the Department of Historiography at the Imperial University of Tokyo in June, 1889, and the discipline of Japanese Literature (*wabungaku*) was changed to that of National Literature (*Kokubungaku*). The journal *Japanese Literature* (*Nihon bungaku*) stopped publication in 1889, and was resumed under the new title, *National Literature* (*Kokubungaku*), in April, 1890, with contributions from historians of the School of Native Learning and National literature, such as Konakamura

---

<sup>43</sup> Mikami Sanji and Takatsu Kuwazaburō, *Nihonbungakushi*, vol. 1, 28–29.

<sup>44</sup> Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu*, 50.

<sup>45</sup> Ōtsuka Minao, *Meiji ishin to doitsu shisō*, 24.

Kiyonori, Mikami, Takatsu, and the like.<sup>46</sup> “The so-called national literature is not only the study of our nation’s literary works,” Konakamura, a leading scholar of Native Learning, remarks in his essay, “My Question to the Readers,” “but also the examination of the nation’s history in order to know what happened in the past [and] to study its legal systems... [T]hus this is why literature includes history, legal systems, and literary works.”<sup>47</sup> Ironically, this notion of literature advocated by Konakamura can be traced back to ancient Chinese tradition. For example, Sima Qian (ca. 145 BCE – 86 BCE) accounts in his “Author’s Preface” of his *Records of the Grand Historian*,

In the Han dynasty, Xiao He drafted legal codes, Han Xin submitted military law, Zhang Cang created the system of astronomical calendaring and the system of calculation, weights, and measures, and finally Susun Tong designed rites. Thus literature (*wenxue*) became a bit more refined.<sup>48</sup>

Quoting the same passage, Zhang Taiyan—that is, Zhang Binglin (1868–1936), one of the most important Chinese philologists, linguists, philosophers in the late Qing China—points out that, because Sima Qian himself says that he edits his own literature (*wen*), Sima Qian regards history as literature.<sup>49</sup> Pang Jun (1895–1964), a famous Chinese philologist, commented on the arguments of Sima Qian and Zhang, saying, “Legal codes, military law, the system of astronomical calendaring, the system of calculation, weights and measures, and rites—all these belong to the notion of literature (*wenxue*). This is nothing but a notion from the Zhou and Qin dynasties.”<sup>50</sup> This is a typical traditional Chinese notion of “literature” in the broad sense. As such, we can still see a similar notion of literature in the narratives of the Meiji Nativist School. This is a period in which the modern, that is, the narrow, notion of literature was getting more and more dominant. Undoubtedly, the notion of history in a narrow sense is the very result of the notion of literature in a modern and narrow sense, and vice versa.

Certainly, as a scholar of the Native Learning, although Konakamura attempted to distance himself from this classical Chinese tradition, it was difficult for him to do so, both for ideological and academic reasons. The difficulty arose when he wanted to link literature and historiography together in order to create a national cultural identity for Meiji Japan. In other words, the scholars of the School of Native Learning might have had an ambitious plan for

<sup>46</sup> Cited from Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Nihon kindaishigaku no seiritsu*, 53.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>48</sup> Sima Qian, *Shiji*, vol. 10, 3319.

<sup>49</sup> Zhang Taiyan, *Guogu lunheng*, 58–59.

<sup>50</sup> Pang Jun and Guo Chengyong, *Guogu lunheng shuzheng*, 260.

the history of literature, but it was difficult, if not impossible, to realize this plan. Another difficulty for the scholars of Native Learning was that it was impossible for them to clearly differentiate which classical Japanese ancient works belong to literature in a narrow (modern) sense—which only cover novels, poetry and the like—because traditional Japanese borrowed a similar notion of broad (traditional) literature from China.<sup>51</sup> As a matter of fact, the scholars of Native Learning were acutely aware of the difference between the modern and traditional notions of literature. The most important point for the scholars of Native Learning was to use Japanese literary history to construct a national history, and this new national history needed to locate the imperial family at its core, thereby presenting the Japanese emperors as the representatives of this newly constructed “Japanese culture.” With the history of Japanese literature forming a core part of this new national history project, the emperors, as a great cultural metaphor for Japan, came to represent “pure” Japaneseness. Needless to say, this national history aimed to create a new cultural and national identity to serve for the new nation-state under the rule of Meiji Emperor. To construct a new Japanese national cultural identity means that the historians of Meiji Nativist School had to separate “Japan” from “*Shina*,” as Saito Mareshi pointed out.<sup>52</sup> This is to say, the Nativist historians had to re-organize—that is, to accept and reject—some parts of Japan’s own different “pasts,” because “China” has been an internalized and inseparable Other in the long history of Japan, just like some parts of modern “Japan,” to a different extent and in a bit different sense, has become an inseparable Other of modern China. Thus Meiji Japan’s Nativist historians had to come and go between these two notions of literature.

A few months later, Mikami and Takatsu remarked in their preface to *Japanese Literary History (Nihon bungakushi)*:

Law, political science, economics, historiography, morals, aesthetics and philosophy are deeply connected with literature... because all of them have to depend on words... This is literature in a broad sense. However, because the tendency of specialization in the academy is becoming more and more obvious... Law, political science, economics, historiography, morals, aesthetics, and philosophy, are considered to be independent disciplines, and thereby distinct from literature.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> I would like to point out cautiously, that this fact does not mean that the social, cultural, and political functions of literature are the same in Japanese and Chinese histories. On the contrary, the social and political functions of literature in the Japanese tradition are highly different from those in China.

<sup>52</sup> Saitō Mareshi, *Kanbunmyaku no kindai: shinmatsu/meiji no bungakuken*, chapter 1.

<sup>53</sup> Mikami and Takatsu, *Nihonbungakushi*, vol. 1, 17.

For the scholars of Native Learning, the privileging of the position of literature and insisting on a notion of literature in a broad sense is essential, because they wanted to give Japanese national literature and the history of Japanese national literature, as they defined it, an important mission to replace history written in classical Chinese (*kanbun*) with the framework of Confucianism, thereby positioning Japanese literature at the core of the national history. They also regarded this emphasis on Japanese national literature as a means for discrediting the historians of the School of Chinese classical learning, their chronicles, and classical Chinese itself.

Two years later, the historian Ōwada Tateki (1857–1910) published his *Japanese Literary History* (*Wabungakushi*, 1892), and later its revised version, *The Great Japanese Literary History* (*Nihon daibungakushi*, 1899–1900). In the book, he wrote,

It has been more than two thousand and five hundred years since the founding of Japan. Over the centuries, we have made substantial progress in our innate and independent national language. Great masterpieces were written a few thousand years ago, and have been enticing us to this day. These masterpieces are works from our ancestors and their intelligence [lit., brains].<sup>54</sup>

*The Chronicles of Japan* (*Nihon shoki*, finished in 720) cited Emperor Jinmu's mounting the throne in 660 BCE as the beginning of Japan. Since no written and archaeological evidence supports this, it has been regarded as the discourse of the Emperor-family-centric ideological history. Here Ōwada attempts to use this discourse to construct a national history, for he sees Japanese recorded history as long as “two thousand and five hundred years.” His emphasis on “our innate and independent national language” comes from his awareness of Chinese influence on the Japanese language. Taine's influence can be inferred from his expression regarding the “brains” of Japanese “ancestors.” As Akihiko Nakayama points out, Ōwada applied the notion of “race” to emphasize the continuity of “race” and the significance of Japanese emperors (*tenō*, *sōso*, and *kōso*) as the nation's ancestor (*sonzo*).<sup>55</sup> Ōwada's book reflects the soaring statist and nationalistic sentiment after the First Sino-Japanese War in 1894.

Obviously, Ōwada here sees literary history as a means to unite the nation, thus to compete with the foreign nations. He says,

---

<sup>54</sup> Ōwada Tateki, *Nihon Daibungaushi*, 44.

<sup>55</sup> Nakayama Akihiko, “bungakushi to nashonarizumu.” Concerning citation from Ōwada, Ōwada Tateki, *Nihon daibungaushi*, vol. 1, 44.

How shall we fight with other foreign nations? We must fight as one because of the unbroken line of our Emperors, our shared history, our nation's [*kuni*] eternal sky and sacred land, our native customs and our language. Together with our history, language, and native customs, we will build a strong nation of forty million countrymen, and a strong nation in the Far East. Literary history matters in all these areas.<sup>56</sup>

Ōwada's awareness of the challenges from Western powers can be also seen from his term "Far East," which suggests Japan's competition with other Western powers, especially Russia, for the colonial interests in China and Korea after the First Sino-Japanese War. His way of locating literature at the center of Japanese colonial ambitions stems from Taine's influence. The influence is clear when he mentions "literature is a reflection of outside phenomena... [But literature] is not merely a vivid reflector of outside societies, but a reflector of topography (*chisei*)."<sup>57</sup> Here we can note that the term "topography" (*chisei*) was influenced by Taine's "surroundings," of the three key elements that decide literature.

Here, once again, let us closely analyze the complicated relationship between the Nativist School—that is, the third type of historical narrative of Meiji Japan—with the fourth type, the History of Civilization. Ōwada also sees literary history as "the largest part of the history of civilization (*bummeishi*)."<sup>58</sup> Here we once again see Taine's influence on him in his attempts to transform history by the study of literature or, more concretely, by writing the history of literature. On the other hand, the discourse on the history of civilization in the first twenty years of the Meiji Period also reflects Japan's shift toward Westernization based on the dichotomy between civilization and barbarism, in which Europe, as well as Japan in this period, were considered civilized, while China was deemed barbaric. As Jennifer Pitts has discussed, from 1830 onward, European liberals experienced a drastic turn to empire that was accompanied by the eclipse of nuanced and pluralist theories of progress as they gave way to more contemptuous notions of "backwardness" and a cruder dichotomy between barbarity and civilization.<sup>59</sup> Together with the global influence of social Darwinism, the binary structure between barbarity and civilization became an influential ideology in the support of imperialism. With this strong European influence, the rising empire of Japan also took advantage of this dichotomy to justify its expansion in East Asia. In this context, the discourse on civilization (*bummei*), shared both by the Nativist School and the School of the History of

---

<sup>56</sup> Ōwada Tateki, *Nihon daibungaushi*, 48.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 34–35.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>59</sup> Jennifer Pitts, *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, 2.

Civilization as represented by Fukuzawa Yukichi, became the typical discourse for the justification of imperial expansion.

To echo this expansion, domestically, from the late 1880s to early 1890s, ideology based on the Emperor-centric-statist nationalism emerged, as marked by the issue of the Imperial Rescript on Army in 1882, and the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890. In terms of foreign relationship, Japan was obviously marching along a path toward imperialism and colonialism. Ōwada's usage of the word "civilization" should be understood partially in this context, but we can mainly regard it as the influence from "the School of Civilization History" during the early Meiji. However, as for the scholars of Native Learning, they sought to build national identity with national history, particularly with the history of national literature. It is also worth noting that these books on Japanese literary history by Ōwada as well as Mikami and Takatsu were designed as middle school textbooks to build national identity among the young generation.<sup>60</sup>

Historically, the identity of the Japanese state can be seen as early as the Taika Reforms (*Taika kaishin*) in 645, when Japan was in a rival relationship with Sui and Tang China as recorded in the *Chronicle of Japan* (*Nihon shoki*, 720 CE).<sup>61</sup> This chronicle of the historical Japanese state was different, however, from a modern national history in the following respects: First, the historical narratives before the Meiji era did not discuss "race," "nation," nor "national history," "national literature" and "national language." Moreover, unlike history before the Meiji era, history after the Meiji era is in the Western framework of evolutionism, idealism, positivism and the like. More importantly, history after the Meiji, unlike that before the Meiji, is used as a means of constructing national cultural identity and as a means of mass mobilization—that is, nationalism. It is in these senses that the history of Japanese literature figures centrally in the enterprise of modern Japanese nation building.

---

## **East Asian Studies (Sinology) and the Writing of Literary History: The Writing History of Chinese Literature in Meiji Japan**

In this section, I shall discuss the linkage between the establishment of modern Sinology and the writing of the history of Japanese literature in a Meiji Japanese context. In what follows, I will also point out that the writing of Chinese literary history, as part of the results of Meiji Sinology, has a direct connection with the establishment of the discipline of Japanese national literature. It is also necessarily connected with the establishment of Japanese East Asian studies

---

<sup>60</sup> Suzuki Sadami, *Wenxue de gainian*, 193.

<sup>61</sup> Ōkubo Toshiaki, *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu*, 18–19.

(*Tōyōgaku*), especially with respect to Chinese studies from Meiji to wartime Japanese context, the latter being called “Sinology” (*Shinagaku*).

The history of the Studies on Oriental or East Asian history (*Tōyōshi*), lying at the core of East Asian studies, was under the influence of the Western Orient Studies or Asian Studies, particularly studies on Chinese history. However, Japan has only selectively absorbed some elements from European Oriental studies, for example, its “scientific” stance. One of the characteristics of the Japanese notion of “East Asia” (*tōyō*) is that the notion of “East Asia” does not include Japan itself. To be blunt, the first meaning of “East Asia” is an appellation for China. It is worth noting that, in this case, the existence of Korean peninsula is very blurred, weak, or even “missing.” In this regard, as Liang Qichao pointed out in 1900, “The term ‘East Asian history’ (*tōyōshi*) coined by the Japanese is a term for the Westerners. This is to say, though it refers to Asia, as a matter of fact, the major character is only China.”<sup>62</sup> Another implication for the notion of “East Asia” was also based on their sense of competition with the West. In this case, “East Asia” is another appellation for a new Empire to compete with the Western powers. In this sense, “East Asia” is not just in a geographical and political sense, but also in a cultural sense. It implies Japan as the new leader of East Asia culturally and geo-politically. In sum, the notion “East Asia” serves, on one hand, as an instrument for Japan to separate from Asia, and on the other, to strengthen identity of Japan as a modern nation among its Western peers, as well as its sense of geo-cultural opposition to the West. With this identity, Japan came to regard itself as “civilized” and China, representing “East Asia,” as backward. Thus, Japanese East Asian studies is different from its European counterpart, with regard to the scope of its objects of scholarship, its structure, Japanese self-positioning in East Asia, and Japanese desire to separate itself from East Asia.<sup>63</sup>

Another term, *Shina*—a frequently used appellation for China in Meiji Japan—also served the purpose of creating a new Japanese identity. Historically, another Japanese appellation was common, *Chūgoku*—the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese term for China, *Zhongguo*, meaning the Middle Kingdom. Subtle changes took place after Japanese elites encountered the Dutch learning (*Rangaku*) around the middle of eighteenth century. Because of this encounter with Dutch learning, Japan presumably began to realize the existence of other civilizations, and thus begin to question the legitimacy of China’s position as the center of civilization. For example, in his *Ladder to Dutch Learning* (*Rangaku Kaitei*, 1788), the well-known scholar of Dutch learning,

<sup>62</sup> Liang Qichao, *Yinbingshi heji*, vol. 1, 98.

<sup>63</sup> Nakami Tatsuo, “Nihon teki ‘tōyōgaku’ no keisei to kōzu,” 15. Please also see Stefan Tanaka, *Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*, 1–28.

Ōtsuki Gentaku (1757–1827), writes to his friend, feudal lord (*daimyo*) and fellow scholar of Dutch learning, Kutsuki Masatsuna (1750–1802), in the preface to the book, “Although *Shina* is on the periphery, it is the only country that is named as the Middle Kingdom. This is nothing but arrogance.”<sup>64</sup> What Kutsuki criticizes here is the Han/non-Han (*hua yi*) distinction. According to this view, China is considered to be at the center of civilization, which functions under a virtuous ruler with a Heavenly Mandate (*tianming*) that is maintained by rites. Domestically, once a ruler loses virtue and, therefore, the Heavenly Mandate, he should be replaced according to the Confucian concept of revolution (*geming*). Thus, in this Sino-centric world order, the peripheral order is supported by an inner moral order. In the Han/non-Han distinction, both the positions of the Han (*wen*, or civilization, culture) and non-Han (*ye*, or barbarity) are variable and transformable. Thus, in a natural way, the barbarous non-Han people, sooner or later, will be cultivated by *wen*, because *wen* is open and attractive to everyone, irrespective of ethnicity. On the other hand, different players of the Sino-centric world order were differentiated through degrees of civility (*wen*) according to their distance from the center. Still, although Ōtsuki and Kutsuki appear to have seen China as a representative of civilization, they also began to question the location of that civilized center.

As Stefan Tanaka has pointed out, in modern Japan various groups used the word *Shina* to denote differences: Native scholars (*kokugaku*), for example, used *Shina* to extract Japan from the binaries of barbarian/civilized or center/periphery that are implied by the term *Chūgoku*. In early twentieth-century Japan, *Shina* emerged as a word that signified China as a troubled place, mired in its past, in contrast to Japan, a modern Asian nation.<sup>65</sup> Thus, the Japanese use of the *Shina* began to frame Japan as a nation of superior development and China as a nation of inferiority. For this reason, starting in the late 1880s, especially around the First Sino-Japanese War in 1894, we begin to see a common usage of the word *Shina* in publications, such as the “History of Chinese Literature” (*Shina bungakushi*).<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Kutsuki Masatsuna, “Rangaku kaitei jo,” 1.

<sup>65</sup> Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*, 4.

<sup>66</sup> Books on the history of Chinese literature before the First Sino-Japanese War:

1) Suematsu Kenchō, *Shina kobungaku ryakushi* [The brief history of classical Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Bungakusha, 1883);

2) Kojima Kenkichirō, *Shina bungakushi* [Journal of history of Chinese literature], serial essays from the First Issue to Eleventh Issue (Tokyo: Dōbunsha, 1892–93);

3) Kōjō Teikichi, *Shina bungakushi* [The history of Chinese history] (Tokyo: Keiza zasshisha, finished in 1892, published in 1897).

Books on history of Chinese literature after the First Sino-Japanese War:

1) Kojima Kenkichirō, *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Waseda shuppanbu, publication year unclear);

Here let us compare the time of publication of Japanese writing on Chinese literature with the time of publication of Japanese literary history by the scholars of Nativist School (both shown in footnote 68 above). Two facts can be seen here. The first fact is that the writing of the history of Japanese literature and the writing of the Chinese literature began almost simultaneously. This suggests that the two subjects were interrelated. More precisely, the writing of Japanese literary history on the basis of a newly defined notion of “Japanese national literature” (*kokubungaku*) was the precondition and ideological preparation for Japanese historians to write the history of Chinese literature, because the notion of a national literary history excludes even the Japanese literature written in literary Chinese. The second fact is that the publication frenzy of Chinese literary history in Japan took place around the First Sino-Japanese War. The popularity of such publications during this time frame illustrates Japan’s strong determination to separate itself from China and other East Asian countries. It indicates Japan’s strong desire to differentiate its own history from that of China, to be the political

- 
- 2) Fujita Toyohachi, *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Tokyo senmon gakkō, 1893–98);
  - 3) Fujita Toyohachi, *Shina Bungaku shikō: senshin bungaku* [A script on the history of Chinese literature: Pre-Qin literature] (Tokyo: Tōkadō, 1897);
  - 4) Sasakawa Rinpū, Shirakawa Riyō, Ōmachi Keigetsu, Fujita Kenhō and Taoka Rei’un, *Shina Bungakushi daikō* [An outline of history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Dainihon tosho, 1897–1905), 16 volumes. A book series on the history of literature in a broad sense that includes Chinese philosophy;
  - 5) Sasakawa Taneo, *Shina Shōsetsu gikyokushi* [A history of Chinese novels and drama] (Tokyo: Tōkadō, 1898);
  - 6) Sasakawa Taneo (Sasakawa Rinpū), *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1899);
  - 7) Takase Takejirō, *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Tetsugakukan, 1901);
  - 8) Nakane Kiyoshi, *Shina Bungaku shiyō* [An outline of the history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Kinkodō, 1901);
  - 9) Kobo Tenzui, *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Kinbunsha, 1904);
  - 10) Kobo Tenzui, *Shina Bungakushi* [A history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Waseda shuppanbu, 1905);
  - 11) Matsudaira Yasukuni, *Shina Bungakushi dan* [Discussions on the history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Waseda shuppanbu, date of publication unclear);
  - 12) Miyazaki Shigekichi, *Shina kinsei bungakushi* [A history of early modern Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Waseda shuppanbu, 1905);
  - 13) Kojima Kenkichirō, *Shina daibungaku shi* [A great history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Fusanbō, 1909);
  - 14) Kojima Kenkichirō, *Shina Bungaku shikō* [An outline of the history of Chinese literature] (Tokyo: Fusanbō, 1912).

The above list is based on Wada Hidenobu “Meijiki kankō no Chūgoku bungakushi”; and H. Matsumoto et al., “Shiryōhen: nihon de kankō sareta chūgoku bungakushi: Meiji kara heisei made.”

and cultural leader of East Asia, and to compete with the West. It is in this context that we can understand the shift from the term “Classical Chinese studies” (*kangaku*)—the mainstream of scholarship in Edo Japan—subsequently degenerated to be called “Sinology” (*shinagaku*) in Meiji Japan. *Shinagaku* literally also means China studies, but has the same connotations as the word, “*Shina*” (China), as a mere foreign research object. It refers to a historically rich and strong China but also a backward and stagnate “China.”

Now, the relationship between the two terms, “Sinology” (*shinagaku*) and “East Asian studies” (*tōyōgaku*) might be confusing. Just as mentioned above, the existence of the Korean peninsula in East Asian studies is weak or even missing. Additionally, Japan identified itself as an “advanced” or “civilized” country and, thereby, separated itself from the rest of “East Asia” (*tōyō*), which became another appellation for China. Thus Sinology sometimes was used synonymously with East Asian studies, of which East Asian history (*tōyōshi*)—especially that of China—occupied the core part. This also stems from “the Guideline” (*yōrō*) issued by the Ministry of Education and Culture of Japan (*monbushō*), published at *the Bulletin of the Association of the Great Japanese Education (Dainippon kyōikukai zasshi)*, 157<sup>th</sup> Issue in November 1894, which clearly defines that the subject of World History (*sekaishi*) for high school is divided into European History (*seiyōshi*) and East Asian history (*tōyōshi*) and that *tōyōshi* will focus on Chinese history.<sup>67</sup> Although Sinology and East Asian studies formed a new shift from Classical Chinese studies (*kangaku*), they never enjoyed the privileged position that Classical Chinese studies had occupied during the Edo Period. On the other hand, however, the fact that books on the history of Chinese literature rose one after another also suggests that the disciplines of East Asian studies or Sinology were flourishing in a new international situation. Especially after the First Sino-Japanese War, a new generation Sinologists appeared. The rising of these new disciplines during this period also meant that, for the Japanese, as East Asian studies or Sinology rose, China in reality fell.

On the other hand, East Asian studies or Sinology also played the role of clarifying its cultural roots when those Japanese Sinologists faced European civilizations and political powers. In writing the history of Chinese literature, for example, *The Brief History of Classical Chinese Literature* (1883) by Suematsu Kenchō (1855–1920), is based on a notion of literature (*bungaku*) in a traditional (broad) sense, emphasizing the importance of Chinese classical literature as the source of East Asia itself.<sup>68</sup> This stance probably is partially related to concepts popular in England at that time, where the author studied as an international

<sup>67</sup> Cited from: Kubodera Kōichi, *Tōyōgaku shimatsu: Naka michiyo to sono jidai*, 197.

<sup>68</sup> Suematsu Kenchō, *Shina kobungaku ryokushi*, 1.

student and wrote his *Brief History*. Even after the First Sino-Japanese War, in *An Outline of History of Chinese Literature* (*Shina bungakushi daikō*, 1897), Sasakawa, Shirakawa, Ōmachi, Fujita, and Taoka also emphasize that “Half of Japanese literature will be understood if one knows Chinese literature... Chinese literature is the source of East Asian literature.”<sup>69</sup> For the younger generation of Sinologists, it also was a mission for them to be the new leaders of this East Asian culture, and to thus overcome the Westernized modernity that had seldom been questioned since the Meiji Restoration. Although Sinologists were also part of the project of building up the cultural and political identity of Japan as the leader of East Asia, they also were different from the Native Learning School due to the particularism and the Shinto statist-nationalism of the latter.

In 1885, at the University of Tokyo, the Department of Japanese and Chinese Literature (*Wakanbun gakka*), which was founded in 1877, was divided into the Department of Classical Chinese Literature (*Kanbun gakka*) and the Department of Japanese Literature (*Wabun gakka*). In June 1889 the Department of National History was founded, and at the same time the name of the Department of Japanese Literature was changed to the Department of National Literature (*Kokubun gakka*). These changes can be regarded as a reflection of nationalism before the First Sino-Japanese War. It is in the late 1880s that the conservative Japanese National Essence Movement (*kokusui shugi*) appeared on the stage as a counter response to the prevalent policies favoring Westernization. The Japanese National Essence Movement is the very consequence of the binary oppositions of the West versus the East, and at the same time, of Japan versus China. In regard to Japanese cultural nationalism, another paralleling binary opposition of Japanese versus Chinese (*wa kan*) is also highly necessary. In the first place, just as Saitō Mareshi pointed out, Chinese literature (*shina bungaku*) is nothing but a necessary other to be discovered for the establishment of Japanese national literature in the context of mid-Meiji Japan.<sup>70</sup> However, politically and militarily, the binary opposition of the West versus the East was nothing but the byproduct of another more central binary opposition: the West versus Japan. Even for this byproduct, the East was then understood as being under the leadership of a rising Japan.

This is to say that, although the Japanese Sinologist authors of Chinese literary history were not the scholars of the Meiji Nativist School, consciously or unconsciously, the early writing of Chinese literary history had been internalized by the writing of Japanese national history, just as the later literary historians of China, as we shall see below, also had been indirectly internalized by this same “origin.”

---

<sup>69</sup> Sasakawa Rinpū, et al., *Shina Bungakushi daikō*, 1.

<sup>70</sup> Saitō Mareshi, *Kanbunmyaku no kindai: shinmatsu/meiji no bungakuken*, chapter 1.

## Influences of/via Japan: From the Establishment of Chinese Modern Historiography to the Modern Writing of Chinese Literary History

Liang Qichao fled China to live in Japan from 1898 to 1911 because of the failure of the One Hundred Days' Reform in 1898. Thus Japan played a decisive role for Liang when he began to make his contributions to the early formation of modern Chinese scholarship.<sup>71</sup> From my point of view, the first novelty that Liang Qichao had discovered in Japan was the power of nationalism embedded in Japanese modern literature and modern Japanese historical narratives. The second novelty that Liang Qichao discovered in Japan was a new theoretical framework adapted from the West for organizing historical narratives, and the possibilities of developing nationalism within this new framework, thereby serving the enterprise of nation building. Through modern scholarship in Meiji Japan, Liang absorbed essential Western ideas and their Japanese transformations for his New History (*xinshixue*). Among them, the relationship between race, geography, and civilization in Liang's historical narratives forms one of the core parts of his new learning. His concern for the relationship between civilization, race, and geographical surroundings marks Liang's enthusiastic period from 1899 to 1902. Liang's works in this period show a kind of theoretical generalization, a theory to grasp Chinese history as a linear whole, for example, and a kind of theoretical generalization that can be seen in Hegel's *History of Philosophy*, and the like.

As for the influence of Chinese literary history as portrayed by Japanese Sinologists, Qing scholars had shown enthusiasm for Japanese textbooks on the history of Chinese literature from the late Qing to the early republican China. Chinese scholars did not just use the Japanese textbooks; rather, they compiled literary history under Japanese influence.

In 1903, the Chinese translation of Sasakawa Taneo's *A History of Chinese Literature* (*Shina bungakushi*, 1899) was published in China as *A History of the Literature of Successive Dynasties* (*Lichao wenxueshi*), translated by an anonymous translator arranged by the publisher Zhongxi shuju in Shanghai. This was the first modern book on Chinese literary history to be published in the Chinese language.<sup>72</sup> In the following year, *A History of Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo wenxueshi*) by a scholar official named Lin Chuanjia (1877–1922)

<sup>71</sup> Joshua A. Fogel, ed., *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao's Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*, is the first relatively systematic book to shed light on the role of Japan in the formation of Liang Qichao's modern scholarship.

<sup>72</sup> For the publication date of Lin's book, please see: Taguchi Ichirō, "Chūgoku saisho no 'bungakushi' toha nani ka." I would like to thank one of my blind reviewers for this reference.

was published as the textbook of the Capital University (*Jingshi daxuetang*, later known as Peking University), where Lin Chuanjia held an office of professorship. At the very beginning of the book, Lin writes, “I compiled my book by imitating Sasakawa Taneo’s intention in his *A History of Chinese Literature*.”<sup>73</sup> In January, 1904, Zhang Zhidong (1837–1909), an eminent Court official and a well-known scholar, who advocated “Chinese learning for fundamental principles and Western learning for practical application,” wrote in his “Approved Memorial to the Throne on the Regulations of the University” (*Zouding daxuetang zhangcheng*), “[t]here are books on the history of Chinese literature in Japan. We can follow their model to compile textbooks by ourselves.”<sup>74</sup> As is commonly known, most of the textbooks on humanistic disciplines suggested by the “Approved Memorial to the Throne on Regulations of the University,” were textbooks from Japan, and literary history is just one of them. Until the First World War (1914–18), especially in the so-called *Xinzheng* period from 1898 to 1912, when China had regarded Japan as its model for modernization.<sup>75</sup> The late Qing literatus, Huang Ren (also known as Huang Zhenyuan and Huang Moxi, 1866–1913), had his *History of Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo wenxueshi*) published by Guoxue fulunshu after 1909.<sup>76</sup> Just like Lin’s literary history, Huang’s book was also used as a textbook at Dongnan University. Huang Ren’s notion of literature obviously was influenced by Western and contemporary Japanese influences, which can also be seen from his quotation of Ōta Yoshio’s *Brief Introduction to Literature* (*Bungaku gairon*), published in September 1906.<sup>77</sup>

Chinese scholars and educators generally took a very positive attitude toward Japanese textbooks and this can be told from the Chinese literary historians evidently copied the style, structure from their Japanese counterpart, as the above-mentioned existing researches elaborated. I believe that my paper has provided a theoretical/philosophical background of the influences both from the perspectives of intellectual history and literary history. However, probably we may say that the Chinese literary historians attached more importance on modernization of their educational system, while Japan was more focused on the

<sup>73</sup> Lin Chuanjia, Zhu Xizu and Wu Mei, *Zaoqi Beida wenxueshi jiangyi sanzong*, 29.

<sup>74</sup> Qu Xingui, Tang Liangyan eds., *Zhongguo jindai jiaoyushi ziliao huibian: Xuezhixianbian*, 365. Regarding Zhang Zhidong’s role in the establishment of China’s modern disciplinary system, please refer to Chan Kwok Kow, *Wenxueshi shuxie yu zhengzhi wenhua*, 11–30.

<sup>75</sup> See Douglas R. Reynolds, *China, 1898–1912: The Xinzheng Revolution and Japan*.

<sup>76</sup> According to Taguchi, Xiao Tui—one of Huang Ren’s colleagues of the Southern Society (*Nanshe*), a literary and revolutionary association in late Qing China—mentioned in his essay that Huang had not yet finished the book in September, 1909 (Xiao Tui, “Moxi yigao xu”). Taguchi Ichirō, “Chūgoku saisho no ‘bungakushi’ toha nani ka,” 19–20.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

building of its cultural and national identity. More interestingly, it is still difficult to find the records from Chinese scholar officials and intellectuals of this period regarding the ideological background behind all of these Japanese historical narratives. Instead, it is not that difficult to find evidence that Chinese scholars actively introduced and copied these Japanese patterns. Considering it a matter of the greatest urgency, Chinese elites were eager to modernize China in order to prevent further humiliation in the face of Western powers and the new rising power of Japan. To achieve this goal, to survive in the modern world, China also would need a new national identity.

As is well known, the composition of Chinese literary history under Japanese influence had been a mainstream, continuing until the 1920s, even the 1930s.<sup>78</sup> In this regard, Aoki Seiji (1887–1964), a well-known Japanese Sinologist, writes in 1935, “[l]iterary history arrived in Japan earlier than in China, thus so many Chinese imitators appeared.”<sup>79</sup> Aoki also points out that both Gu Shi’s *Outline of Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo wenxue dagang*, 1926) and Ge Zunli’s *History of Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo wenxueshi*, 1933), display a strong Japanese influence.<sup>80</sup> Even two earlier publications, Zeng Yi’s *History of Chinese Literature* (*Zhongguo wenxueshi*, 1915) and Xie Wuliang’s *Great History of Chinese Literature* (*Da Zhongguo wenxueshi*, 1918), are both imitations of Japanese books.<sup>81</sup> Before that, Zeng Yi himself admits in his 1929 revised edition that “I have absorbed the results of many Japanese scholars.”<sup>82</sup> Other books on the history of Chinese literature in 1930s, to a certain extent, also have drawn on Japanese books of this kind.<sup>83</sup>

To conclude, we can see a kind of circulation of “national literature” in a different context of East Asia, but with slightly different motivations in Japan versus China. Interestingly, at this early stage, we have to admit that it is Japan that made this modern notion of literature (*bungaku*, *wenxue*) circulate in East Asia, where traditionally a notion of literature in a broader sense had been the main stream before the Westernized modernization.<sup>84</sup> Ironically, it is Japanese nationalism and modernist ideology that made this modern notion of “Chinese

<sup>78</sup> For this issue, see Dai Yan, *Wenxueshi de quanli*, 34–35.

<sup>79</sup> Aoki Seiji, *Aoki seiji zenshū*, vol. 1, 291.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 292.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>82</sup> Zeng Yi, “Xiuzheng wenxueshi bianyan,” 1.

<sup>83</sup> Dai Yan, *Wenxueshi de quanli*, 45.

<sup>84</sup> Lu Xun writes in his essay, “A Layman’s Discussions on Literature” (*Wenwai wentan*) of August 1934: “We have called the abstracts from classics written with such difficult words as *wen* before, now for the New School, we call it *wenxue*. This is not the notion of *wenxue* from Ziyou and Zixia [two disciples of Confucius]. It is imported from Japan as their translation for the English term ‘literature.’” Lu Xun, *Lu Xun quanji*, vol. 6, 95–96. Also see Negeshi Sōichirō, “Shūsakuji ni okeru han, Tenu no juyō to bungakukan no keisei,” 205–19.

literature” become established in China during the early process of China’s formation of its modern scholarship.

Evidently, both the modern writing of Japanese national (literary) history by Japanese historians in Meiji Japan, and its Chinese counterpart in the late Qing and early Republican China, share a similar “origin.” Regardless of the Japanese nationalistic and modernist narratives in an exclusive framework of the nation-state, which is strongly influenced by Western philosophy such as Hegelianism (or, in this case, Taine’s Hegelian variant), the Chinese historians loyally accepted the Japanese framework and reproduced it in their own context of late Qing and early Republican China. Of course, there are a few types of historical narratives of Chinese literature from the 1910s to the 1930s in China. For example, highly traditional framework still can be seen in the *Lecture Notes on History of Literature in Middle Ancient China* (*Zhongguo Zhonggu wenxueshi jiangyi*, first appeared in 1917) by the great learned literatus Liu Shiwei (1884–1919), and *A Contemporary History of Chinese Literature* (*Xiandai Zhongguo wenxueshi*, first appeared in 1932) by Qian Jibo (1887–1957). As Alif Dirlik points out, however, Marxist historiography did not appear as a distinct trend until after 1927 when, with the so called “social history controversy,” it emerged rapidly as possibly the most dynamic and stimulating current in Chinese historiography.<sup>85</sup> The complicated relationship between these different types of historical narratives in republican China has yet to be fully discussed.

The above discussion also indicates the collapse of traditional East Asian scholarship and, as a consequence, its replacement by a new system of modern scholarship in the framework of a nation-state. Just as Michel Foucault pointed out, “statistics,” as part of the knowledge of the state, means the science of the state,<sup>86</sup> and Foucault also points out in his influential masterpiece, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, that our subjects are nothing but the very results disciplined by the modern knowledge system. Thus, Foucault lays stress on the importance to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualization linked to the state, because the modern state, as the matrix of a new form of pastoral power, is a very sophisticated structure in which individuals can be integrated.<sup>87</sup> In this sense, the establishment of new scholarship is also the result of homogenization and generalization of the people, the culture, the land, etc., into a linear path—to which Hegel and his disciples like Taine contributed theoretically. Before the strong influence of Marxism on Chinese

---

<sup>85</sup> Arif Dirlik, *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919–1937*, 2. For an overview of Marxist historiography in China, please see Arif Dirlik, *Culture and History in Post-Revolutionary China: The Perspective of Global Modernity*, 68–90.

<sup>86</sup> Michel Foucault, “Governmentality,” 212.

<sup>87</sup> Michel Foucault, “The Subject and the Power,” 335, 336.

historical narratives, we can see that Western influences via Japan, together with Western influences directly flowing into China from other Western channels, were so dominant for the early formation of modern Chinese scholarship. Even up to the present day, we have to admit that the ideas behind this “new learning” are still so dominant and so self-evident that we cannot avoid them. This is to say that, Western philosophical and historiographical influences, together with their Japanese variations and Japanese transformation, without our consciousness (because they have become the inseparable part of our modernity), have some kind of continuing role in the construction of our subject. In this sense I believe that this paper has provided a critical perspective for us to reconsider the history of East Asian modernity.

**Acknowledgement** I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Tze-ki Hon for his frank but valuable comments on an early version of this paper. I would also like to thank the two blind reviewers for their close reading of my paper and their insightful comments.

---

## References

- Aoki Seiji. *Shinabungaku gaisetsu* [The outline for Chinese literature]. In *Aoki seiji zenshū* [The complete works of Aoki Seiji]. Tokyo: Shunshūsha, 1975 [repr. 1935].
- Appiah, Kwame Antony. “Race.” In *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, edited by Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Bernasconi, Robert, and Tommy L. Lotte. “Introduction.” In *The Idea of Race*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lotte. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 2000.
- Chan Kwok-Kow [Chen Guoqiu]. *Wenxueshi shuxie xingtai yu wenhua zhengzhi* [The ways of writing on literary history and cultural politics]. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2004.
- Chen Guangwen. “Taine de wenxueguan yu zaoqi Zhongguo wenxueshi xushimoshi de goujian” [Taine’s literary history and the early formation of the narratives of Chinese literature]. In *Qinyunji xubian: Fudan daxue zhongwenxi bashi zhounian jinian luwen ji* [Qinyun collections: Commemorative papers for the eightieth anniversary of Chinese department of Fudan University], edited by Fudan daxue zhongwenxi. Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2005.
- Copleston, Frederick, S. J. *A History of Philosophy, Vol. IX: Modern Philosophy: From the French Revolution to Sartre, Camus, and Lévi-Strauss*. New York, NY: Image Books and Doubleday, 1994.
- Dai Yan. *Wenxueshi de quanli* [The power literary history]. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2002.
- Delfau, Gérard, and Anne Roche. *Histoire/Littérature, Histoire et Interprétation du fait littéraire* [History / Literature: The history and interpretation of literary fact]. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977.
- . *Rekishi to hihyō*, translated by Kawanago Hiroshi. Tokyo: Hōsei daigaku shuppankai,

- 1986.
- Dirlik, Arif. *Revolution and History: The Origins of Marxist Historiography in China, 1919–1937*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.
- . *Culture and History in Post-Revolutionary China: The Perspective of Global Modernity*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2011.
- Duara, Prasenjit. *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Dore, R. P. *Education in Tokugawa Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1965.
- Fogel, Joshua A. *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao's Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality," "The Subject and the Power." In James D. Faubion eds., *Power, Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954–1984*, vol. 3. New York, NY: the New Press, 2000.
- Friedrich, C. J. "Introduction to Dover Edition." In G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree. New York, NY: Dover Publications, 1956.
- Karatani, Kōjin. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Translated by Brett De Bary. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Kawai, Kōzō, ed. *Chūgoku no bungaku shikan* [The Chinese view on history of literature]. Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 2002.
- Kubodera, Kōichi. *Tōyōgaku shimatsu: naka michiyo to sono jidai* [The formation of East Asian studies in modern Japan: Naka Michiyo and his times]. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 2009.
- Kuwano, Takashi, and Ōishi Masahiko, eds. *Formalism: Shiteki Gengo Ron* [Formalism: On poetic language]. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1988.
- Lee, Iksop, and Robert S. Ramsey. *The Korean Language*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.
- Lê Minh-Hăng and Stephen O' Harrow. "Vietnam." In Andrew Simpson eds., *Language and National Identity in Asia*, 424.
- Liang Qichao. *Yinbingshi heji* [Collected essays of Ice-Drinker's Studio]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2003.
- Lin Chuanjia, Zhu Xizu, and Wu Mei. *Zaoqi Beida wenxueshi jiangyi sanzong* [Three textbooks on history of Chinese literature in early Peking University], edited by Chen Pingyuan. Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2005.
- Hattori, Takashi. "Genbun icchi ron no rekishi" [The history of movement of uniting written and spoken language]. In *Genbun icchi undo* [Japanese Vernacularized Writing Movement], edited by Hida Yoshifumi. Tokyo: Meiji shoyin, 2004.
- Hegel, G. W. F. *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree. New York, NY: Dover Publications Inc., 1956.
- . *The Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- . "Anthropology." In *The Idea of Race*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and Tommy L. Lotte. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 2000.
- Hida Yoshifumi. "Genbun icchi kenkyū no shiten" [The perspective of research on movement of uniting written and spoken language]. In *Genbun icchi undo* [Japanese Vernacularized Writing Movement], edited by Hida Yoshifumi. Tokyo: Meiji shoyin, 2004.

- Matsumoto, H., K. Kōfuku, Y. Asami, Qian Ou, N. Takemura, M. Nishigami, H. Wada, and H. Yoshimura. “Shiryōhen: nihon de kankō sareta chūgoku bungakushi: meiji kara heisei made” [Data: The publications in Japan on the history of Chinese literature from the Meiji Era to the Heisei Era]. In *Chūgoku no bungakushikan* [Chinese views of literary history], edited by Kawai Kōzō. Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 2002.
- Mikami Sanji and Takatsu Kuwazaburō. *Nihon bungakushi* [Japanese literary history]. Tokyo: Nihon tosho center, 1999 [repr. Tokyo: Kinkōdō, 1890].
- . *Meiji jidai no rekishigakkai: Mikami Sanji kaikyūdan* [The academic circle of Meiji historiography: Mikami Sanji’s memoirs]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1991.
- Nagahara Keiji. *Nijusseiki nihon no rekishigaku* [Japanese historiography in the twentieth century]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2003.
- Nakayama Akihiko. “Bungakushi to nashonarizumu” [Literary history and nationalism]. In *Iwanami kōza kindai nihon no bunkashi • 3 • kindai no seiritsu: 1870–1910* [The genealogy of modern knowledge: 1870–1910], edited by Y. Komori, K. Chino, N. Sakai, R. Narita, S. Shimazono, and S. Yoshimi. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2002.
- Nakami, Tatsuo. “Nihon teki ‘tōyōgaku’ no keisei to kōzu” [The composition and formation of Japanese style East Asian studies]. In “*Teikoku*” *Japan no gakuchi* [The scholarship of the “empire” Japan], edited by Kishimoto Mio. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2006.
- Ōkubo Toshiaki. *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu* [The establishment of modern Japanese historiography]. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1988.
- Ōtsuki Gentaku. *Rangaku kaitei* [The ladder to Dutch learning]. Tokyo: Yumani shobō, 2000 [repr.].
- Ōwada Tateki. *Nihon Daibungaushi* [The great Japanese literary history]. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1899.
- Pang Jun and Guo Chengyong. *Guogu Lunheng Shuzheng* [An annotated commentary on Zhang Taiyan’s discussion and evaluation of Chinese ancient learning]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2008.
- Pitts, Jennifer. *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006.
- Qian Liqun, Huang Ziping, and Chen Pingyuan. *Zhongguo wenxue sanrentan* [Three discussants on Chinese literature]. Beijing: Renminwenxue chubanshe, 1988.
- Sasakawa, R., Shirakawa Riyō, Ōmachi Keigetsu, Fujita Kenhō, and Taoka Rei’un. *Shina Bungakushi daikō* [An outline of history of Chinese literature]. Tokyo: Dainihon tosho, 1897.
- Saigusa Hiroto. *Nihon ni okeru tetsugaku teki kannenron no hattatsushi* [The development of philosophical idealism in Japan]. Tokyo: Sekai shoyin, 1947.
- Saitō Mareshi. *Kanbunmyaku no kindai: Shinmatsu/meiji no bungakuken* [The modernity and the context of classic literary Chinese: The circle of literature in Late Qing/Meiji]. Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2005.
- Sang, Bing. “Japan and Liang Qichao’s Research in the Field of National Learning.” Translated by Minghui Hu and Joshua Fogel. In *The Role of Japan in Liang Qichao’s Introduction of Modern Western Civilization to China*, edited by Joshua A. Fogel. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- Sima Qian. *Shiji* [Records of the grand historian]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2010.

- Suematsu, Kenchō. *Shina kobungaku ryokushi* [The brief history of classical Chinese literature]. Tokyo: Bungakusha, reprinted version, 1888.
- Suzuki Sadami. “*Nihon bungaku*” *no seiritsu* [The genealogy of “Japanese literature”]. Tokyo: Sakuhinsha, 2009.
- . *Wenxue de gainian* [The notion of literature in Japan]. Translated by Wang Cheng. Beijing: Zhongyang bianyi chubanshe, 2011.
- Taguchi, Ichirō. “Chūgoku saisho no ‘bungakushi’ toha nani ka” [What is the earliest “literary history” in China?]. In *Hyōfū* [Biaofeng] 32 (1997):17–28.
- Taine, Hippolyte. *History of English Literature*, translated by H. Van Laun. Philadelphia, PA: Henry Altemus Co., 1908.
- Tanaka, Stefan. *Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.
- Twine, Nanette. *Language and the Modern State: The Reform of the Written Japanese*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1991.
- Wada, Hidenobu. “Meijiki kankō no Chūgoku bungakushi” [Publications on history of Chinese literature in Meiji Era]. In *Chūgoku no bungakushikan* [Chinese views of literary history], edited by Kawai Kōzō. Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 2002.
- Weinstein, L. *Hippolyte Taine*. New York, NY: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972.
- Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., and Cleanth Brooks. *Literary Criticism: A Short History*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.
- Yano, Hōjin. *Bungakushi no kenkyū* [Studies on literary history]. Tokyo: Sōhakusha, 1958.
- Zhang Binglin. *Guogu lunheng* [Discussion and evaluation of Chinese ancient learning]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang tushuguan, 1919.