The Language of Civilization:

Identity and Desire in the Meiji Era Japanese Language Reform Debates

Naoko Hosokawa

University of Oxford

Abstract

This paper will analyze the heated language reform debate in Japan during the Meiji Restoration in terms of a struggle to define Japan in relation to Eastern and Western worldviews. After more than two hundred years of self-imposed closure, Japan experienced a large influx of foreign culture in the late nineteenth century, bringing with it a series of vigorous arguments for and against Japanese language reform. Even though the modernization is often said to have been for pragmatic reasons, this debate coincided with the time when Japan reengaged with the existence of outsiders and started searching for a redefinition of its identity via a newly imported notion of 'nation' instead of through its geographical isolation by sea and self-imposed social isolation in the preceding centuries. On one hand, there were scholars who supported reform, whether to replace the national language by English, as the most extreme position, or to facilitate writing by reducing the number of Chinese characters *(kanji)* and by vernacularizing written language *(genbun itchi)*. These proponents of reform, claiming that it was imperative to approximate the simpler phonetic writing of European languages, sought to define Japan as part of the Western world order based on the concept of time, in which the division of the world is between the advanced countries with modern technology and culture and backward countries where traditional feudalism persists. On the other hand, opponents of

language reform, arguing that by abolishing the use of *kanji* and the knowledge of Chinese text the country would lose access to its rich cultural heritage and obfuscate communication, wanted to see Japan remain in the Eastern Asian world order based on the concept of space, in which China and the countries using Chinese characters are at the centre of a concentric world. In this paper, I argue that the language reform dispute was thus the site of competing views of Japanese identity.

1 - Introduction

Language is a socially constructed entity in that it reflects the power structure and social identity of the society where it is spoken. This applies to the case of the language reform debate in the late nineteenth century in Japan. Although the modernization process is often said to have been generated by practical necessity of retaining the country's independence from Western powers, it was also caught up in a major conceptual shift from the vision of a spatially ordered world to that of a temporally ordered world, along with a reframing of Japanese specificity in terms of nationhood. The language debates during the Meiji Restoration period, as an integral part of modernization process, can thus be interpreted as competing desires to define 'Japan' in a time of rapid social transformation.

The period of the Meiji Restoration has long attracted the attention of scholars as era of unprecedented social change in Japan, marked by rapid modernization and a large influx of Western culture. The reforms undertaken have been typically viewed as the outcome of a pragmatic response of the country's elites when faced with the threat of complete subjugation to Western power. However, behind the debates over the practical merits of any reform proposal lay some fundamentally conflicting worldviews, pitting establishing Eastern conceptions against newly imported Western

conceptions. The present paper will seek to draw these respective positions in relation to the animated language reform debates that took place during the Meiji Restoration.

Since the written form was markedly distinct from speech with a large number of Chinese characters (*kanji*) accessible only to the educated elites, a written language reform for the purpose of more efficient communication and education was widely seen as a necessary step in the modernization of the country. Pro-reform intellectuals and statesmen of the time therefore proposed written language reform to different degrees. Such proposals were however met with vigorous resistance by other scholars who considered the existing writing system to be indispensable to the preservation and transmission of Japanese language and culture. As a result, the Meiji language reform only achieved a modest limitation in the use of *kanji* and no further reforms were made until the postwar period when a series of language-related regulations were established and the constitution was written in the *genbun itchi* form to mark their official recognition.

Why did the language reform movement in Japan fail to achieve the necessary consensus in the late nineteenth century? I argue that at the centre of the debate were two competing desired images of 'Japan', which pulled the language policy in opposite directions and slowed the progress of reform. With the opening of the country, the concept of 'nation' was imported to Japan and efforts were made to define the Japanese nation. The conflicting positions over language reform were manifestations of distinct Western and Eastern conceptions according to which different parts of world were to be viewed and related to, each of which had its own implications for the definition of the Japanese nation.

I will analyze the competing positions on language reform with reference to Morris-Suzuki (1998)'s theory of the conflicting temporal and spatial worldviews

which animated the Meiji era. On one hand, there were those who supported the increasingly popular Western-derived notion of a 'developed nation' for which Japan needed a vernacularized writing system with a phonetic alphabet as found in the West in order to learn and catch up with Western civilization. This idea was based on the temporal division between the developed forward countries and under-developed backward countries. On the other hand, however, there were those who supported the traditionally established Japanese identity constructed through long influence from Chinese civilization and reinforced during the two hundred years of seclusion period. This identity was based on a division between China and its surrounding countries as the center and the rest of the world as peripheral, a distinction partly determined by the use of Chinese characters. This idea was based on the spatial division between the centre and the periphery and the supporters of this idea saw the importance of the knowledge of traditional writing system as a "sacred heritage" (Carroll, 2001, p.173). I am going to suggest the slow progress of the language reform of the time can be attributed to the fierce competition between the two conceptions. I will conclude that the debate encapsulates the general dilemmas that Japan faced during the Restoration period.

2- The Background to the Debate

The Tokugawa government (1603-1868) announced its seclusion policy in 1633, banning exchanges with foreign countries except for limited trading with the Dutch. The purpose of this policy was to establish a stable centralized state free from foreign influence and interference. The policy was in effect until 1853 and established a self-contained, stable country. Twine (1991, p.10) states that by the time of seclusion policy a linguistic identity based on the Japanese spoken language already

existed despite the persistence of various dialects. However, being remarkably different from the speech form and requires rigorous training, the Japanese writing system of this time was mainly used for scholarship and administration rather than daily communication.

There were wide varieties in the written Japanese of this time, collectively divided into the *bungotai* and *kanbun* forms. *Bungotai* is based on Early Middle Japanese language and its grammar as well as its vocabulary was different from the spoken language of the period. *Kanbun,* which enjoyed special privilege, covers texts written only in Chinese characters based on classical Chinese. Elites were educated in vocalization of Chinese text in Chinese pronunciation (*kanbun-ondoku*) as well as rendition of Chinese text in Japanese, by annotating the text with diacritics and numbers to show the Japanese word order (*kanbun-kundoku)*. *Kanbun* started in Nara period (710-794) in efforts to understand Chinese documents, especially Buddhist scriptures and later Confucian textbooks, which were seen to be essential to the elite's education. *Kanbun* became the official writing form of Japan and its position was reinforced during the Tokugawa Period by the government revival of Confucian studies (Twine, 1991, p.35). The influence of *kanbun* on Japanese language was so heavy that a large number of Chinese loan words came into Japanese.

This *kanbun*-based education supported the feudal system as an invisible barrier, where the educated few dominated the ruling class while the majority of the population was excluded from the public writing system. Twine (1991, p. 8) points to the role of writing of this period as "an artistic and intellectual show-case, and as the province of the upper class, an idea carried over from the feudal era when only peers and samurai received government sponsored instruction in the archaic styles then in use".

In 1853, the country was opened by Commodore Matthew Perry and a large and sudden influx of Western culture followed, which led to the change of government to the Meiji government in 1868 and a series of modernization policies, collectively known as the Meiji Restoration. Having witnessed the large gulf in the respective levels of science and technology in the West and in Japan, a number of scholars saw that it was imperative for Japan to modernize the country to survive as an independent nation and stave off the imperialist threat from the European and American powers. A large number of restoration leaders thus saw the necessity of reforming the writing system for the wider population to have access to the written language in order to raise the educational level. Different possibilities were suggested, from a limitation of Chinese character (*kanji*) use to entire Romanization of the writing as well as vernacularization of the written language (*genbun itchi*). However, the modernization process met some opposition despite the fact that the practical need for some form of social transformation was recognized almost unanimously throughout the country. This is can be at least partly attributed to a conceptual resistance to the shift that Japan was going through in regard to how Japan and the rest of the world are viewed and defined.

The opening of the country brought with it the Western concept of the modern nation to Japan, which is different from the worldview that traditional Japan had developed as a result of the geographical and political seclusion of the country. As a result, there was a growing desire to integrate Japan as a nation and establish a new identity. While there were those who desired to define Japan as a modern nation and an aspiring member of a newly encountered Western civilization, the opponents of the reforms desired to define Japan based on the traditional value framework established and preserved during the seclusion period, although they also recognized the need to

re-establish national identity vis-à-vis the rest of the world that Japan was now opened to. The modern concept of nation is defined as "a relatively large group of people who feel that they belong together by virtue of sharing one or more such traits as common language, religion or race, common history or tradition, common set of customs, and common destiny" (Rejai and Enloe 1981, quoted in Twine, 1991, p.8). Miller (2005) also asserts that language is an integral part of one's national and social identity. It is therefore little wonder that the language reform debates became a battlefield for the competing images of national identity. It is also during the Meiji period that the word *kokugo* 'national language' started to be widely used to refer to the Japanese language as opposed to *nihongo* 'Japanese language'.

3- Language Reform Proposals

The first formal proposal to the government to reform the language was made in 1866 by Maejima Hisoka. Having studied Dutch and English, Maejima was a government translator at the Institute of Foreign Learning. He proposed to the Tokugawa government a comprehensive reform to all-*kana* script as well as to the *genbun itchi* style writing in order to raise the educational level of the whole population. In his "*kokuji kokubun kairyô kengisho*" (1899), he states that Japanese students are required three times as much effort to learn the same thing as the Western students because of the non-vernacularized written system with various styles according to the purposes as well as numerous *kanji*. He emphasizes that not only it would save time and money to educate people, the *kana* script is more suitable to translate books written in Western languages, quoting the fact that several Western books were translated into Japanese in *kana* script.

Following Maejima, those scholars who had studied abroad in Europe advocated the simplification of writing system and *genbun itchi*. The underlying idea behind these proposals was to establish a similar writing system to Western-style phonetic and vernacularized writing, which was perceived as the basis of their civilisation. Yukichi Fukuzawa was one of the supporters of the language reform. Although Fukuzawa was *kanbun*-educated himself, he became a teacher of Dutch and later of English and, as can be seen in his autobiography (2001), he emphasized the importance of spreading the values of Western civilization to as many countrymen as possible through books written in an accessible style. Fukuzawa became the author of popular books dedicated to introducing Western ideas. Fukuzawa's main suggestion for language reform was to reduce the use of *kanji* to around one thousand and to make the written language accessible to all. Intellectuals like Fukuzawa inspired further individuals to support language reform and from the 1880's multiple organizations came into being, including the *kana no kai* 'kana society' to promote all-kana script and the *Rô-maji kai* 'Roman alphabet society' to promote the use of alphabet, though these *genbun itchi* groups were not powerful enough to bring about the change they sought. The movements also inspired the literary world and a number of novelists attempted to write their works in the *genbun itshi* style, for example Futabatei Shimei and his 1887 novel *Ukigumo*.

Among the supporters of writing simplification, Mori Arinori was particularly radical with his suggestion in 1873 that the language of Japan be replaced by English. Mori was one of the samurai who were sent to the United Kingdom and the United States to study abroad in the wake of the country's opening. Mori later became Minister of Education in 1886 and shared his view on educational reform with American authorities. Mori's letters to William D. Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit

Language and Literature at Yale University, clearly depicts the vision of Japan supported by Mori and other reformist scholars. Mori writes to Whitney in regard to Romanization of Japanese, arguing that "[a]ll the schools the Empire has had, for many centuries, have been Chinese; and strange to state, we have had no schools nor books in our own language for educational purposes[…]. Schools for the Japanese language are found to be greatly needed, and yet there are neither teachers nor books for them. The only course to be taken, to secure the desired end, is to start anew, by first phonetic principle. It is contemplated that Roman letters should be adopted" (quoted in Unger, 1996, p.14). In this letter, Mori refers to the traditional Japanese writing system as 'Chinese' in terms of a foreign language and suggests the Roman alphabet become 'Japan's own writing system'. We need to bear in mind that in this letter, Mori included not only *kanbun* text but also Sino-Japanese loans as a foreign language as is also pointed out by Ivan Hall (1973, p.191). Mori's designation of Chinese characters as an alien system indicates a desire to extract Japan from its traditional place within the world order of Chinese civilization and redefine it as part of Western civilization.

Although Maejima, Fukuzawa and Mori all invoked the need for an enlarged educational system to modernize the society as the reason for language reform, what really lay behind the argument was ideological support for the Westernized worldview. Their conception of modernization, including the need for universal education, was based on the Western notion of equality and democracy. The advocates of language reform also believed in the importance of equality. Fukuzawa is known for his quotes: "It is said that heaven does not create one man above or below another man. This means that when men are born from heaven they all are

equal" (Fukuzawa, 1969, p.1). Mori was also known for his contributions to improving women's social position.

The idea of equality was in conflict with the view of the traditional feudal society where only the educated few can receive higher knowledge, as well as the more deeply rooted hierarchical structures of Japanese society. Nakane (1990) argues that the *ie* system, the structure of household, was completed in the Edo period governed by Tokugawa shogunate and is the foundation of contemporary Japanese institutions. There consequently were other groups of scholars who were fiercely opposed to language reform. Unger (1996, p.4) points out that there is a traditional myth that Chinese characters are unique, which thereby shapes the linguistic and cultural identity of the speakers of all the languages that use Chinese characters. This myth still exists in contemporary Japan and supported a psychological division between countries using these characters and the rest of the world.

Opponents of the language reform deployed this rhetoric of uniqueness of the Chinese characters as well as invoking the specificity of the Japanese language in claiming that the limited range of its phonological system would cause confusion in the absence of the appropriate Chinese characters. These seemingly practical reasons for opposing language reform also masked an underlying worldview. The opponents of the language reform, including Takasugi Shinsaku who opened a school for Chinese studies in 1852, supported the preservation of Eastern Asian values, fostered through the study of Buddhism, Confucianism, and Chinese classics, by retaining the knowledge of the Chinese language and Chinese characters as an essential part of education. Blacker (1964, p.17) analyzes the beliefs held by the opponents to the adoption of Western science: "Western learning appeared to these thinkers to rest on a spirit and scheme of values entirely opposed to those which they conceived to be

Japan's glory and safeguard. To allow such studies to gain any footing in Japan would therefore be simply hastening the country's corruption". These opponents to adapting the Western culture later came to be called *jôi* 'expelling barbarians', a Sino-Japanese term originated in China. The *jôi* scholars included many elites from the Tokugawa period who were educated in *kanbun* and enjoyed the fruits of the elitism of the time.

It is interesting to note that the *jôi* scholars and the reformers often used the same rhetoric to validate their claims. For example, the loss of China in the Opium War in 1840 and the British colonization of India were used by reformers as evidence of Western superiority in military and economic terms over Asia. On the other hand, the *jôi* scholars attributed Eastern defeats to the acceptance of Western learning in China and India. In analysing the positions taken by proponents and opponents of the language reform, it is however important to distinguish between Westernization and adoption of Western conceptions of the world as well as between signification and preservation of Eastern conceptions of the world.

For example, Fukuzawa, while being an enthusiastic reformer as well as an advocate of Western values and philosophical ideas of Enlightenment, remained a strong nationalist and was critical of superficial addiction to Western learning and modes of life (Dilwoth in Fukuzawa, 1969, p.xv). In his *Encouragement of Learning*, Fukuzawa (1969, p.65) states that Japanese dependency on the Western civilization needs to be only a temporary expediency. What he emphasizes is the importance of national independence. Comparing the situations in Japan and Britain, he writes "British independence is beyond the realm of doubt. This is quite different from our own case. […] In the final analysis, we still cannot avoid raising this question of Japan's independence in the modern world" (Fukuzawa, 1969, p.21) and that is why Japan needs to learn lessons from the West to preserve national independence.

Similarly, as Swale (2000, p.30) clarifies, Mori's position was not a call for a total Westernization of the country. Mori resisted uncritical worshipping of the West. What he was seeking to do was to establish a Japanese identity, not to subsume Japan under a large umbrella of Western civilization. Rather, what he used for defining Japanese identity was the Western concept of 'development'. Mori answered in an interview regarding his view about Western civilization that "it has its drawbacks. That goes without saying. But when you point to the misery, the vice, and all the other drawbacks, of the civilization of the West, I reply that I have faith in the power and vitality and vigor of your race to overcome these temporary evils" (Swale, 2000, p.102).

What the language symbolized was a nation and the question asked in this period was how the language can be reformed best to foster patriotic unity in Japan. Carroll (2001, p.39) and Yasuda (2007, p.190) rightly point out that the focus in the language reform discussions shifted from the language itself to the role of the language as a symbol of national unity and identity. The practical need to reform the language was, therefore, counterbalanced by the *jôi* arguments, which, as Carroll (2001, p.60) suggests, caused "the lack of actual language reforms" of the Meiji period.

4 – Conflicting Worldviews

The Japanese traditional world order before the Meiji Restoration was constructed on the basis of the Chinese civilization, which created a division between the world which uses Chinese characters and the world which uses the Roman alphabet. This division has played a crucial constitutive role in Japanese notions of self and other since the appropriation of Chinese characters alongside Sinic culture. A

totally new way of viewing the world was introduced at the time of the country's opening. Although there was a gradual shift from the traditional view to the newly imported view, these two opposing worldviews remained in the Meiji society and caused various debates during the Restoration. Among many conceptual factors behind these debates, the main element is competing images of Japanese identity. In his consideration of the social construction of identity, Jenkins (1996, p.27) stresses the importance of "the centrality of time and space". As Morris-Suzuki (1998) explains the Japanese social transformation in Meiji era using the concept of time and space, I am going to outline her points and argue that the Meiji language reform debates can be also explained as an example of competition between Chinese-derived 'spatial view' and Western-derived 'temporal view' of the world that Morris-Suzuki introduces.

Terajima (1929, quoted in Morris-Suzuki, 1998, p.15) explains that prior to the opening of the country in 1853, the world beyond Japan was divided into two parts: ""foreign countries" (*ikoku*) populated by those who used Chinese characters and chopsticks and "outer barbarians" (*gai-i*), peopled by those who wrote horizontally and ate with their hands, and describes this vision of the world as a series of concentric circles [...] drawn from the Chinese *Hua-yi* (in Japanese *ka-i*) model of the world, in which barbarism (*i*) increases the farther one moves away from the settled and civilized center (*ka*)". Japan, the name of the country means 'origin of the Sun' because Japan locates itself in the East of China. The country name itself, the basis of national identity, was based on this Chinese perspective. With the ideas of central and periphery, this worldview was based on the spatial concept. The *jôi* scholars based their support for Chinese learning and the use of Chinese characters on this worldview. The Chinese characters were seen as a link to the central world.

With the opening of the country, however, the worldview based on a spatial division of central and outer worlds encountered an alternative Western worldview that divided backwards and advanced regions in relation to a line of progress. With the ideas of underdeveloped past and developed future, this worldview was temporally ordered. Morris-Suzuki (1998, p.10) explains that "new ideas of historical progress, imported from Europe and North America, allowed officials and scholars to reinterpret the unfamiliar features of the outerlying societies in terms of time rather than space: to see them, in other words, as symptoms of "backwardness" rather than "foreignness". How Meiji reformers adopted the temporal worldview can be seen in the following passages from Fukuzawa: "there are strong and wealthy nations which are called mature civilizations and in which the arts of peace and war are highly developed. There are also poor and weak nations which are primitive or underdeveloped and in which culture and military capacities are still low" (Fukuzawa, 1969, p.15). Fukuzawa also writes on Western hygienic customs that "Japanese do not know the meaning of the word [cleanliness], that they are like infants who are still too immature to distinguish cleanliness from filth" (Fukuzawa, 1969, p.96). By using the words such as 'mature' and 'developed' to describe Europe and America, and as 'infants' to describe Japan, he saw Japan on an earlier stage than in the West, and having similar writing system was a link to the developed world.

Morris-Suzuki (1998, p.27) further explains that with the new temporal vision of the world, the concept of 'civilization' was brought into Meiji Japan, which led to the emergence of "a much more ambitious and totaling vision of "Japaneseness" than had existed in the Tokugawa period". Although the notion of 'civilization' was a Western concept newly introduced to Japan in the Meiji Restoration, it quickly became a slogan of the period itself and the question of 'Japaneseness' became a

common theme for arguments by both reformers and *jôi* scholars alike. The vision of Japaneseness infused the language reform debate, which was thus caught up in the process of this redefinition of 'Japaneseness'. Although what each advocate was representing was imported concepts from either China or the West, the center of the discussion was on 'Japaneseness' vis-à-vis the rest of the world, including China or Western countries. Each side of language reform debate carried an image that they desired to give to Japan.

As a result of the fierce competition between two worldviews, the language reform during the Meiji Restoration thus saw slow progress and only obtained the modest result of limiting the use of *kanji* to around three thousand, as was suggested by Fumio Yano, a student of Fukuzawa. The language reform debate lost its centrality as part of a discussion on Japanese identity towards the end of the Meiji period until the loss of World War II, when Japan faced another need to redefine its national identity and *genbun itchi* was officially realised in the post-war constitution.

5 - Conclusion

Milroy and Milroy (1991, p.19, 45) state that language attitude is attributable to the symbolic role it plays in society, and language standardization should be taken as an ideology since the language itself is a natural, descriptive phenomenon that varies across space and time and cannot be fully standardized in reality. One can therefore explain the language debate in Meiji Japan as a contest between opposing ideologies since the discussion was driven not only by the practical linguistic considerations, but also by non-linguistic motives. Discussion of the Meiji language reform debates from the point of view of its symbolic role brings two perspectives to the understanding of these debates. Firstly, it reveals the ideological backdrop to the

reform debate that is often overlooked in favour of the arguments over practicality. Secondly, it shows that two competing worldviews on Japaneseness co-existed in Meiji Japan when the Meiji Restoration is often simply understood as a Westernization of Japan.

In the Meiji Period, two distinct divisions of the world according to which Japanese identity was constructed were in competition. The first promoted a spatial organisation of the world in which the distance from the centre of civilisation increased in concentric circles from China and those countries that used Chinese characters. Those intellectuals who supported this view considered Chinese characters not only essential to appreciate old literature and history, but also essential to write Japanese because of the special role the characters play and the specific phonological characteristics of Japanese. The second and novel worldview rested on a temporal ordering which divided countries into backwards and developed along a fixed line of historical progress. Proponents of language reform sought to adopt those aspects of Western writing as a means to modernize Japan, increase access to education, and best allow for the persistence and flourishing of a distinct Japanese culture.

Although language debates are always shaped by collective identity and power relations in the society where it is spoken, Meiji Japan is a unique case in that there were two competing concepts influencing Japan and therefore two competing identities struggling to establish 'Japaneseness'. While there was a gradual shift from the latter to the former, the fierce struggle between them during this period ensured that language reform remained limited.

The specific practical arguments which animated the language reform debates of the Meiji period are no longer relevant today. However, Japanese search and desire for national identity is still ongoing as social identity is always contested. At the level

of linguistic debate, it has shifted to the discussion of the use of foreign loan words and foreign language education, the full implications of which in will be examined in future research. (4554 words excluding abstract and bibliography)

6- Bibliography

Blacker, Carmen. *The Japanese enlightenment: A Study of the writings of Fukuzawa Yukichi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Fukuzawa, Yukichi. *The Autobiography of Yukichi Fukuzawa*. Translated by Dilworth, David. A. New York and Chicester: Columbia University Press, 2007.

Fukuzawa, Yukichi. *An Encouragement of Learning*. Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1969.

Hall, Ivan Parker. *Mori Arinori*. Harvard East Asian Series 68. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Hannas, Wm. C. *Asia's Orthographic Dilemma*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1997.

Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Joseph, John E. *Language and Identity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Kelman, Herbert C. "Language as an Aid and Barrier to Involvement in the National System" in Rubin, Joan and Jernudd, Björn eds. *Can Language Be Planned?*. Honolulu: East-West Centre Press, 1971. pp.21-51.

Maejima, Hisoka. *Kokuji Kokubun Kairyô Kengisho*. Kindai Digital Library. Tokyo: National Diet Library, 1899. http://www.ndl.go.jp/portrait/datas/327.html (accessed February 22, 2010).

Miller, Robert McColl. *Language, Nation and Power: An Introduction*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Miller, Roy Andrew. *Japan's Modern Myth: The Language and Beyond*. New York: Weatherhill, 1982.

Milroy, James and Milroy Lesley. *Authority in Language*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. *Re-Inventing Japan: Time Space Nation*. New York and London: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.

Nakane, Chie and Ôishi, Shinzaburô eds. *Tokugawa Japan: Antecedents of Modern Japan*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1990.

Twine, Nanette. *Language and the Modern State: The Reform of Written Japanese*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Swale, Alistair. *The Political Thought of Mori Arinori*. Surrey: Japan Library, 2000

Unger, J. Marshall. *Literacy and Script Reform in Occupation Japan*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Yasuda, Toshiaki. *Kokugo Shingikai*. Tokyo: Kôdansha Shinsho, 2007.