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Notes on Usage

JAPANESE WORDS ARE TRANSCRIBED according to the Hepburn system. Japanese names, including those in the notes and the select bibliography, follow Japanese usage, with the family name first. I have often referred to scholars by their literary name (as is customary in Japan), especially when use of the surname could lead to confusion with other members of the same family. All translations are mine, unless stated otherwise. Works cited are published in Tokyo unless stated otherwise.

Transcriptions of Chinese names and titles of works follow the Pinyin system, except when the author is known to favour an alternative transcription. Where a fairly standard English translation for the title of a work exists, I have used this.

Most Japanese terms have been translated, except for juku, commonly translated as “private academy” (when it refers to the traditional institution), and kangaku, “Chinese Learning”. Kangaku is not always used precisely, but it usually (including here) refers to the study of Chinese texts until around the mid-Meiji period, when modern academic disciplines for studying China emerged (see Chapter 1).
APPLICATIONS TO OPEN A JUKU in the early 1870s commonly include information about fees. During the late Tokugawa and early Meiji period a variety of monetary units were used. The Tokugawa shoguns had a monopoly on coins, but paper money was also issued by the feudal domains. There were gold (shū), silver and copper coins and coins made of cheaper metals. The Meiji government attempted to get rid of the currency confusion, but did not have sole charge of currency until the abolition of the domains in 1871. In 1872 the yen was issued as the new national currency. One yen equalled one ryō of the old currency, 100 sen equalled 1 yen and 10 rin equalled one sen. Merchants used smaller units, not all of them represented by coins, such as bu and hiki.

The best way to determine the value of fees to study at a juku is perhaps to examine the cost of other goods and services at that time. The following prices are taken from *Nedanshi nenpyō. Meiji, Taishō, Shōwa* [Tables for the history of prices in the Meiji, Taishō and Shōwa periods], ed. and publ. Asahi shinbunsha, 1988, and from Basil Hall Chamberlain, *Japanese Things* (orig. *Things Japanese*, 1904), Tuttle 1971, pp. 296–299. Most of the information about juku fees comes from the early 1870s, so prices relating to the 1870s and early 1880s are quoted here. The general tendency during the Meiji period was a sharp rise in prices for most goods and services relating to daily life; prices for things like rice and coal, however, fluctuated considerably.

INCOMES

Policeman, basic starting pay, per month: 1874:4 yen, 1881:6 yen
Day labourer, national average, per day: 1880:21 sen, 1882:22 sen
Carpenter, in Tokyo, per day: 1874, 40 sen, 1877:45 sen (Nedanshi; Chamberlain has 25 sen); 1879:50 sen
Maid servant in Tokyo, per month: 1 yen
Primary school teacher, basic starting pay, per month: 1886:5 yen

RENTS AND LAND PRICES
A family house in Tokyo, Itabashi (as stated in rental contract): 1879: 8 sen
One tsubo (3.31 square metres) of land in Tokyo, Ginza (actual sale price): 1872:5 yen, 1882:20 yen

STAPLE FOODS
Rice, Tokyo, average price per 10 kg: 1869:55 sen, 1872:36 sen, 1877: 51 sen, 1882:82 sen
Miso (bean paste), Tokyo, yearly average per 1 kg: 1879:4 sen, 1880 5 sen
Pickled greens, Tokyo, per barrel: 41 sen

FUEL
Coal, Tokyo, per 15 kg: 1882:42 sen, 1884:32 sen
Lamp oil (vegetable), Tokyo: 1877:3 sen
Firewood, Tokyo, per 50 bundles: 1877:1 yen 50 sen

SCHOOL FEES
Keiō gijuku, per year: 1871:18 ryō
Metropolitan middle school, per year: 1878:9 yen, 1879:7 yen, 20 sen
Tokyo University, per year: 1879:12 yen, 1886:25 yen
Places mentioned in the text
THE WORD JUKU (A PRIVATE INSTITUTION OF LEARNING) today evokes two contradictory images in the minds of most Japanese. One is that of the private cram school where parents send their children to keep up with their school work, pass entrance examinations and get into prestigious schools and universities. This kind of juku stands for everything that is judged to be wrong with the present school system, which is perceived to be examination-driven, to stress factual knowledge and promote rote learning rather than independent thinking and to neglect the needs of the individual child.

The other, different image is full of nostalgia and is associated with the Tokugawa period, which has become the “once upon a time”: “rose coloured” and full of “tradition”. This image conjures up names like Yoshida Shōin, Hirose Tansō and Fukuzawa Yukichi, charismatic teachers who assembled eager disciples in their homes and taught them individually, respecting their personalities.

This nostalgic view of the juku is already evident as early as 1902 in Tokutomi Kenjirō’s novel Omoide no ki (Footprints in the Snow). The author lets his protagonist Kikuchi (whose life resembles Kenjirō’s and his brother Sohō’s) observe his experience at a juku:

The world has progressed: our teachers ride to brick-built schools in private rickshaws, students line up for military-style physical training, wear uniforms, caps—every activity is becoming splendidly organized, or regimented, to put it bluntly. Inevitably, therefore, the old-fashioned type of home school that depended entirely on the personality of one man is disappearing—and with it, unhappily, many of
the qualities it fostered, the deep tie between teacher and student, the peculiar enthusiasm for moral and intellectual improvement, the sense of honour and integrity, the characteristic gaiety, that grew naturally out of the life of such a small community.

Here we have all the elements now commonly associated with the traditional juku.

Do the two images associated with the word juku have anything to do with each other? What happened to the juku of the Tokugawa period after the Meiji Restoration and—more significantly—after the proclamation of the Education Law in 1872? These were the questions that fuelled my interest in juku.

The brief answer to the second question is that the juku played an important role for several years after 1872, when the provisions of the new law had not yet been fully implemented. At the same time the establishment of a national school system meant that their place in society changed significantly. Different juku fulfilled different functions under the new conditions; survival depended on adapting to the changed circumstances, and ultimately this meant becoming less like juku and more like modern schools.

THE JUKU IN THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION

First, however, what is, or was, a juku? The dictionary defines it as an educational institution, where an individual teaches students in his own home, who are attracted because of his scholarship and character and study his personal brand of learning. Students could come from most social classes and geographical regions and their age varied. The earliest juku existed in the eighth century, but from the seventeenth century they greatly increased in number. The subjects taught at a juku belonged to the field of kangaku (Chinese Learning) in the widest sense, that is, the study of classical written Chinese and the literature, history and philosophy of China, the composition of Chinese poetry (kanshi) and, from the late Edo period, the study of Japanese works written in Sino-Japanese (kanbun). A canon of classical Chinese texts, beginning with the Classic of Filial Piety and continuing with the Four Books and Five Classics, was central to the curriculum of most juku. In the second half of the Edo
period *juku* for other fields of learning, including Western learning, emerged. These gained importance in the Meiji period, but the *kangaku juku* were still the most numerous for many years.

*juku* were by definition private (the Meiji government described them as *shijuku*, “private *juku*”, to stress their private character, but the *shi* is redundant), in the sense that they received no funding from an official source and suffered minimal if any intervention into what they taught and how they were run. Here, however, the difficulties of a precise definition start. Sometimes the master of a *juku* (*jukushu*) would also be teaching at the domain school (*hankō*) or have some other official position. Moreover, there are cases where the domain government gave financial support; thus the *juku* became similar to a *gōkō*, a local school for commoners set up by the domain. An example of this is the Renjuku in Fukuyama domain, established by Kan Chazan (or Sazan, 1748–1827).\(^4\) Kangien, established by Hirose Tansō (1787–1856), also received official support; in return Tansō had to resist official attempts to influence the running of his *juku*. In fact, the Shōheikō itself, the official school of the shogunate, started as a *juku* of the Hayashi family (Chapter 1). If the distinction between a *juku* and a *gōkō* could be blurred, the distinction between a *juku* and a *terakoya* [private parish school] is even less clear. It is generally accepted that *juku* offered education at a higher level than *terakoya*, which taught basic literacy and numeracy to commoners. But there is not always enough information to determine whether a given institution was a *juku* or a *terakoya*, since they have much in common. Essentially a *terakoya* is a *juku* specializing in elementary education, and historians of education speak of *tenarai juku*, in contrast to *gakumon juku*, *juku* devoted to scholarship. Some authors of local histories make no distinction at all.

The generally private, informal nature of *juku* accounts for the sheer variety of establishments in the Edo and even more in the Meiji period. A few individual *juku* are described in detail in Chapter 3 to illustrate this variety; it is difficult to say how representative they are. The typical *juku* may well be one where a scholar of moderate fame taught a small number of students in his own home. After 1870 it became mandatory to report the opening of a *juku*, and where these reports still exist they give us a few details about the institution, but not every master reported his *juku*. When he died that was the end of his *juku*, unless an heir took over. Often no sources exist to provide more detail. All
we know might be an entry in the list of *juku* and *terakoya* compiled by the Ministry of Education between 1890 and 1898, itself an unreliable source, or in local lists. In some cases grateful students erected a stone to commemorate their teacher, and the inscription gives us some biographical details.

In other cases we are more fortunate. This is especially true of the few *juku* that were transformed into middle schools or other mainstream institutions, since these have often compiled their own histories. *Juku* of local fame feature in local histories. Others are mentioned in the biographies of either the scholars who established them or their students. Primary sources, such as registers of entrants (*monjincho*), rules and curricula sometimes exist. But such records only end up in public archives, if their owners have donated them. If not, they can sometimes be examined in the owner’s home—provided one knows of their existence in the first place.

This may be one reason why there is little research on the subject of *juku*, and most of it focuses on individual institutions, usually the most famous ones. There is hardly any study of *juku* that attempts to present a general picture, even for the Tokugawa period, much less for the Meiji period. After 1868 more sources are available as a result of government attempts to control private education. But official sources alone are not sufficient to obtain a comprehensive picture, which, among other things, requires local studies. Recently a group of Japanese scholars from different parts of Japan has started to conduct a systematic investigation into *juku* and has published some preliminary findings. Like earlier studies, however, the publication limits itself to the presentation of a few individual examples without attempts to generalize.

There is another reason why the *juku* of the Meiji period have received even less attention than those of the preceding era. “It has now become worldwide knowledge that the institution of the educational system is one of the factors which has contributed most to the modernization of Japan during the past 120 years since the Meiji Restoration.” Thus the educational historian Terasaki Masao begins his preface to the 1988 issue of *Acta Asiatica*, which is devoted entirely to the history of education. The question of how Japan could establish a unified national school system in a relatively short time has dominated research on education in modern Japan. This can be traced back to the Meiji period itself; the first histories of education, published in
the 1870s, were strongly influenced by the efforts to modernize Japan and stressed the achievements of the Ministry of Education.\textsuperscript{11}

Since then a diversification of historical writing has taken place, stimulating research into new areas of the history of education and a more critical approach.\textsuperscript{12} Nevertheless, research is still determined by present-day concerns or achievements, and problems of the education system today become the starting point to research into their historical origins.

Sometimes the disillusionment with the education of their day fuels writers’ interest in the \textit{juku} of old, which are then seen as a possible alternative model. Even then there is a tendency to look for “modern portents”, that is, those developments in the late Tokugawa period which foreshadowed the reforms introduced by the Meiji government after 1870.\textsuperscript{13} Hirose Tansō’s Kangien is often cited in this context. It was quite large and had many features that could be described as modern; it was open to students regardless of social rank and academic achievement was the key to advancement in the school. Also, newer practical subjects, like Dutch studies, mathematics, medicine, military studies and geography, were introduced in addition to the traditional study of Confucian classics. Interestingly, although Kangien flourished until 1871 and there are student registers for later years, suggesting that Tansō’s successors continued to teach in some form, historians of Kangien limit their accounts to the Edo period, ignoring developments after 1868.\textsuperscript{14}

The focus on the establishment of the modern public school system and the role of the state is not peculiar to Japan. In his book \textit{Education as History}, Harold Silver remarks about the historians of education in Victorian Britain: “Attempts to explain our modern, industrial, state-ordered society have been uppermost in their historical consciousness” and “Historians of education have used the modern industrial state as a touchstone of relevance”, neglecting perceived “dead ends” in the development of education.\textsuperscript{15}

Even if we concede that the \textit{juku} were such dead ends (which is debatable), they still merit investigation. Their history shows that the establishment of a modern school system was far from straightforward, and that the new schools often had to prove their worth against the well-established and trusted local \textit{juku}. \textit{Juku} can serve as examples of continuity and change during the period of modernization. Under which circumstances dida \textit{juku}
survive and when did it cease to exist? How did the role of the juku change and is there a continuity between the traditional juku and the cram school of today?

Moreover, the study of juku also draws our attention to some of the providers and consumers of education, rather than the policy makers and ideologues. What motivated them? What choices did people make in education? What did educational careers look like before the system was fully established and the progression through the hierarchy of public schools and the imperial universities became the only acceptable route to the top of society? Examining such questions should give us a fuller picture of Meiji Japan; education, an important part of people’s formative years, is generally seen as an important factor in the modernization of Japan.

Finally, what is the fascination of the traditional juku, which inspired later generations and continues to inspire to this day? Some of the scholars who ran juku, who are not generally known, are at least well known locally. A rare, early individual to have a railway station named after him was Yamada Hōkoku (1805–77), in his later years especially respected as a scholar and teacher.

THE FOCUS OF THIS BOOK

Since no comprehensive studies exist to start from, I have concentrated on a few central issues. I have focused on juku for Chinese Learning (kangaku). Education in the Edo period was dominated by kangaku. Even after 1868, kangaku was regarded as the hallmark of a good education. But the school system introduced from 1872 was dominated by Western knowledge and education, and the study of kangaku in the Meiji period has not received sufficient attention. I have examined the juku as an institution and the lives of the people who were shaped by it; the content of juku education and the ideas and debates about kangaku or juku education I have investigated only in so far as they seemed to throw light onto the institution of the juku. In any case, I found little evidence that the juku masters I examined were much interested in debates about pedagogy. Only when the juku were nearly extinct did people who had studied Western views on education discuss the merits of juku education. I have aimed to present both a general overview of juku education in the Meiji period and to do justice to its diversity by examining some kangaku juku in detail.
Chapter 1 positions the *kangaku juku* in the history of education from the late Tokugawa into the Meiji period. The fate of the *kangaku juku* in this general context is summarized in the final section of Chapter 1, and readers familiar with the general history of education may wish to go straight to this section.

Chapter 2 shows the importance of *juku* after 1868 in terms of numbers, largely based on *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō*, which lists 1,505 *juku* nationwide. There were considerable regional variations in the distribution of *juku*.

The fascination of the *juku* to this day, however, does not lie in their number, but in their perceived special characteristics. Chapters 3 and 4 therefore present some of the core material of this book. They describe what life at a *juku* was like, by looking at individual juku in detail and by comparing information from several *juku*. While I have aimed to include a representative sample, my choice was determined by the availability of accessible sources. How well the history of education on a regional level has been investigated and publicized varies considerably. For example, Kii-Wakayama was home of the last but one shogun and was noted for its efforts to introduce reforms, including a Prussian-style army, after 1868. Nevertheless, and although education was a key area in most reform efforts at regional and national levels, no history of education in Wakayama prefecture has been compiled, and the multi-volume general history of the prefecture says next to nothing about *juku*.

The decline of the traditional *juku* and the emergence of a new type of *juku* is treated in Chapter 5. In this process there are no clear boundaries. If we want to name one event as a watershed, it must be the Education Law of 1872, since it laid down the principle of education as a route to worldly success, thus creating the basis for a social order based on academic achievement rather than birth. But although the government aimed to control and at times even suppress *juku*, government measures were only the indirect cause for the institution’s decline in that they brought about the social changes that rendered the *juku* obsolete.

While my interest in the *juku* of Meiji Japan was fuelled by the question, “What happened to the *juku* of Tokugawa Japan?” rather than by any wish to understand the *juku* and private schools of today, there are undeniable continuities. Chapter 6 provides some examples. Above all, I have devoted much space to what I call the “*juku* myth”. It appeared early, as the passage from *Footprints in the Snow* shows, and it inspired many educators and
other critics of the education system. So pervasive is its influence that it is difficult to study the *juku* of the Tokugawa and Meiji periods without looking through the lens of the “mythmakers”. Much of what has been written about *juku* is by authors who idealize it and in the process create a tradition, in a way that illustrates what Carol Gluck has described as “the invention of Edo”. Instead of discarding this invention or merely contrasting it with the “real” *juku*, I have chosen to make it part of my study. After all, its beginnings can be traced to the period under investigation. Moreover, even if the “*juku* myth” is not history, it has certainly “made” history in the sense that a certain image of *juku* (rather than first-hand experience or accurate knowledge of them) inspired educators like Obara Kuniyoshi and others described in Chapter 6.

The public education system is in need of reform in many countries, including Japan. Although it is hardly appropriate to advocate the revival of *juku*—a product of certain historical circumstances—as a solution to present day problems, examining the history of *juku* can remind us that education was once viewed and organized very differently from today, and encourage us to challenge our assumptions about education. My main hope is that this work will contribute to a better understanding of education in the Meiji period and become a starting point for further research into the history of *juku* and of private education in general.

NOTES

3 Hosoya Toshio et.al., eds, *Shin kyōikugaku daijiten* (Daiichi Hōki, 1980), 415; Umihara Tōru, *Nihonshi shōhyakka: Gakkō* (Kondō shuppansha, 1979), 70–71. The accepted English translation, also quoted in the *Shinkyōikugaku daijiten*, is “private academy”, but throughout this book “*juku*” will be used for conciseness.

6 Examples in Takase Yoshio, Manabi no ba to hito (Mainichi shimbunsha, 1982); see also Chapter 6.

7 For literature on juku in the Tokugawa period see Chapter 1.


10 E.g. Inoue Hisao, Meiji ishin kyōiku shi, (Yoshikawa kobunkan, 1984). Inoue states in his preface that his interest in the history of education was stimulated by the attention the Japanese education system had received in the West.


12 Ibid., 119–120.


16 According to Suzuki Hiroo, this is generally true of Confucian educators of the Tokugawa period; Genten/Kaisetsu Nihon kyōikushi (Tosho bunkasha, 1985), 54.

17 NKSS; figures quoted in Umihara, Gakkō, 29.

18 Wakayama-ken shi (24 vols., ed. and publ. Wakayama kenshi hensan iinkai, Wakayama 1977–94); for the training of a “Prussian” army, which included a school for officers, see Margaret Mehl, Carl Köppen und sein Wirken als Militärinstrukteur für das Fürstentum Kii-Wakayama (1869–1872) (Bonn: Förderverein Bonner Zeitschrift für Japanologie, 1987).

CHAPTER ONE

Education in Transition from the Tokugawa to the Meiji Period

THE TRANSFORMATION OF EDUCATION in the Meiji period has been aptly summarized with the phrase “from one room to one system”. Education in the Tokugawa period was decentralized, diverse and often informal. A variety of schools existed, run by the shogunate, the domains or private individuals. They were not part of one coherent system, and by today’s standards they were small. Attendance patterns varied, including different types of schools and private tuition. Different schools catered for different classes of society, and the link between achievement in school and social advancement was at best tenuous.

By late Meiji, Japan had a centralized national school system with predominantly public schools at all levels. The curriculum was Western, although Confucian ethics had a place in moral instruction. Progress through the system depended on passing entrance examinations, and social advancement was conditional upon academic credentials acquired through schooling. In theory the system was egalitarian, and some individuals managed to rise from lowly circumstances through talent and hard work. In practice students coming from a family with a tradition of education and enough wealth to pay for schools were most likely to succeed.

Thus education, like so many other things in Meiji Japan, changed fundamentally within a period of less than forty years. Moreover, whatever “modern portents” there may have been before 1868, the changes were largely motivated by the political leaders’ desire to catch up with the West; consequently they involved the importation of an alien culture. This applied both to the way education was organized and to its content.
The following section traces the changes which formed the background for the transformation of the *kangaku juku*.

**EDUCATION AND JUKU IN TOKUGAWA JAPAN**

The success of Japan’s education system after 1868 is attributed in part to the Tokugawa legacy.² The Tokugawa period saw a steady growth in the amount and variety of schooling provided and in the number of children receiving at least a minimum of education. Social mobility was limited by the boundaries of class; the class one was born into determined one’s educational opportunities and one’s occupation. An exception was the Confucian scholar (*jusha*) and the physician (generally a *jusha*), who could be a commoner, although he was more often a samurai of low rank. Nevertheless, education was highly regarded and its importance gradually increased.

The highest institution of learning was the Confucian academy of the shogunate, the Shōheizaka gakumonjo or Shōheikō. It began as the *juku* of Hayashi Razan (1583–1657) in 1630 and in 1690 became the semi-official school of the shogunate, which supported the Hayashi family. In the 1790s, under Matsudaira Sadanobu, it came fully under the auspices of the shogunate (although members of the Hayashi family still remained head of the school) and was completely reorganized. It provided training mainly for the shogun’s direct vassals, though during the last decades of the bakufu students came from all over Japan. While the bakufu vassals studied at the *nairyō* or *kishukuryō* with a tightly structured curriculum and examinations, students from the domains studied at the *gairyō* or *shoseiryō*, where they were free to study as they chose, mostly by themselves, since teachers only came for lectures and supervised group readings six times a month. Apart from independent study, students also engaged in political discussions. In addition, they would go to the homes of well-known scholars to study with them or just to meet them. Boarding house life at the Shōheikō resembled that at a *juku*, with students administering their own affairs. Many men who played important roles in the events leading up to the Meiji Restoration spent some time at the Shōheikō, where they met other samurai from all over Japan and formed a nationwide intellectual community. The friendships they formed often lasted a lifetime.³ The system of education at the Shōheikō was very influential;
Tatemori Kō, who studied at Oka Senjin’s and Shigeno Yasutsugu’s juku (both had studied at the Shōheikō) even claimed that all juku were modelled on the Shōheikō.4

The late Tokugawa period, from the end of the eighth century to 1868 saw a proliferation of schools of different types.5 The shogunate established new institutions of learning in Edo and the domains it controlled—a college of Western medicine in 1756; an office for the translation of foreign writings (Bansho wage goyō), forerunner of the Institute for the Investigation of Barbarian Books (Bansho torishirabesho), in 1856; a Western-style military school (Kōbusho) in 1854; and a naval school in Nagasaki in 1857, which was transferred to Hyōgo in 1863.6

The feudal lords made similar efforts; many domain schools (hankō) were established from the late eighteenth century, and by the end of the Tokugawa period most domains had their own schools and the larger ones more than one.7 Usually they were exclusively for samurai, but toward the end of the period some were opened to commoners. Other domains established separate community schools for commoners (gōgaku). The most famous of these is Shizutani gakkō in Okayama domain, which existed, with interruptions, well into the twentieth century (see Chapter 6). The shogunate and lords of the domains established schools for commoners partly in response to their demand for education, but also in an effort to control commoner education.8

The rising demand for commoner education was also met by schools run by commoners themselves, the terakoya (private parish schools). Social and economic changes increased the demand for literacy and numeracy, which was met by a growing number of terakoya. Some juku also catered for commoners, as well as samurai, especially in rural areas and towns dominated by merchants, and some were run by commoners. They offered education up to a higher level than the terakoya and usually specialized in one field: Confucian studies, National Learning (kokugaku; a field of specifically Japanese studies opposed to Chinese and other foreign learning) or Dutch/Western Learning (rangaku, yōgaku).9 Students often came from all over the country. Some juku, like Yoshida Shōin’s famous Shōka sonjuku, provided a forum for studying and discussing current affairs and formulating a basis for direct action. Shōin’s academy in Hagi became famous not only because several leaders of the Meiji Restoration studied there, but also because Shōin came to be regarded as the ideal teacher, whose forceful personality and
relationship to his students influenced them for life. The Shōka sonjuku, which only existed from 1857 to 1859, differed from other schools of the time; Shōin’s students had more freedom and were not bound by a strict hierarchy. Shōin built up a personal relationship with every student. His teaching was a mixture of the various ideas of his time, and although Shōin himself was a scholar, he placed more importance on character development than on academic achievement. He spent much time discussing current events with his students and emphasized the close relationship between thought and action.\footnote{10}

Another famous juku of the Tokugawa period was the Kangien, was established by Hirose Tansō (1787–1856) in the town of Hita (Ōita prefecture), an important political and financial centre for the domains in the southwest and the seat of a daikan (local administrator).\footnote{11} The Hirose family was one of a group of eight merchant families patronized by the daikan as money changers and intermediaries between emissaries of feudal lords and the magistrate’s office. Tansō himself was physically weak and bookish and became a Confucian scholar. He was taught by relatives and private tutors until 1797, when he went to Fukuoka to the juku of Kamei Nanmei (1741–1814) and his son Shōyō (1773–1836).

Tansō began tutoring students on his return to Hita, renting rooms for the purpose in 1805 and moving to purpose-built rooms in 1807. In 1817 a school building was constructed and given the name Kangien. Hirose’s juku, although private, had official support from the daikan and the daikan repeatedly attempted to intervene in the running of the school. But Kangien remained independent, and by 1820 could exist on the income from students.

A remarkable feature of Kangien was its merit system; although in most juku merit was given more importance than rank, few had a formal system of grades and examinations, and Kangien may have been the first to introduce such a system. On entry everyone started at grade 0 regardless of status and previous schooling. Students advanced through the 19 grades by collecting points. This system, called gettanhyō, is often cited as one of the “modern” features of Kangien. It was imitated, at least in a simplified fashion, by other scholars, such as Tsunetō Seisō (Chapter 3), who had studied at Kangien, and it may have influenced the educational policies of the Meiji period through
the person of Chō Sanshū (1833–95), a student at Rangien and an educator.

Another “modern” feature of Kangien was the breadth of its curriculum. Although kangaku formed the core, it included Japanese and Western mathematics, medicine, military studies, astronomy, geography, National Learning, Dutch learning and etiquette. Teaching methods were much as those at other juku; individual and group reading as well as lectures. Only the students at higher levels would have learnt directly from Tansō, the others being taught by older students. Life at Kangien was strictly regulated, with students administering their own affairs and performing many manual tasks.

Kangien was continued under Tansō’s younger brother Kyokusō (1807–63) and the adopted heirs Seison (1819–84) and Ringai (1836–74). It closed in 1871, but may have reopened for a time (Chapter 2). Kangien is often cited as a prime example of a juku, and as evidence of “modern” tendencies in juku education. However, although many Kangien students opened juku of their own, taking Kangien as a model, it cannot be said to have been typical.

The same can be said of Tekijuku (Tekiteki saijuku) in Osaka; together with Shōka sonjuku and Kangien it is probably the best-known juku of the late Tokugawa period. Tekijuku, a juku for Dutch studies, was opened by the physician Ogata Kōan (1810–63) in 1838 and probably owes much of its fame to the vivid description of student life there in Fukuzawa Yukichi’s autobiography.12

Another type of juku that played an important role in the years leading up to the Meiji Restoration was the fencing academy, not so much for the martial arts taught there, but because they fostered ties among young men from different parts of the country and became centres for anti-foreign ideas.13

In fact, moving from school to school was an accepted form of travel under a political system which restricted mobility between feudal domains. Feudal lords encouraged and sometimes paid for able men to go and study at the shogunate’s schools in Edo or at prominent private academies. Yūgaku, travelling around to study, enabled young men to study different subjects with different teachers and to meet men from other domains.14 The masters of juku knew each other or knew of each other through their own travels, possibly including a spell at Shōheikō; some travelled around to teach at different establishments. To enter a
*juku*, prospective students generally needed an introduction from someone who would also act as their guarantor.\(^{15}\) This could be a scholar they were already studying with. In this way *juku* were linked together by personal ties, and the scholars in one branch of study formed a nationwide network.

The increase of *yūgaku* in the last years of the Tokugawa Shogunate is one indication of how much society was in a state of flux. The increase in the number of schools, including schools for commoners, is another. The development and increasing complexity of the government bureaucracy and the expansion of commerce and industry resulted in a greater need for educated people.\(^ {16}\) For the increasing number of samurai who were unable to find a job in the overstuffed bureaucracies of their domains, opening a *juku* represented one of the few alternative occupations.

The increase in schools was also an indication of social disintegration. The class system was weakened as economic and political power no longer corresponded to each other and achievement gained importance beside rank as a means to success. The samurai class had initially had a virtual monopoly on education, which they were now losing. While the authorities promoted education for achievement to a limited extent, they also saw education as an antidote to social disorder. Education by the mid nineteenth century was the object of conflicting expectations.\(^ {17}\) Moreover, it was widespread and diverse, catering to different demands and reflecting the lack of political centralization.

**THE EDUCATION POLICIES OF THE MEIJI GOVERNMENT**

The Meiji Restoration and the ensuing political centralization provided the necessary conditions for organizing education on a national scale. The leaders of the Meiji Restoration introduced reforms in all areas, and education was high on their agenda.\(^ {18}\) The *Five Point Charter*, issued in April 1868, stated that knowledge was to be sought from all over the world. The earliest government measures concentrated on higher education. The first state schools were established in Kyoto in 1868. In the summer of 1868, following the transfer of the capital to Tokyo, the former bakufu schools of medicine (*Igakusho*), Western studies (*Kaiseijō*) and neo-Confucian studies (*Shōheikō*) were reopened.\(^ {19}\) A few
months later, the Shōheikō was placed under the jurisdiction of the Executive Council (gyōseikan) in the Council of State. The Shōhei gakkō or gakkō was not only a school, but also an administrative office responsible for the entire education system. In the summer of 1869 it was renamed daigakkō (university) and the schools of medicine and Western studies were placed under its jurisdiction, while the university (daigakkō) received the status of a ministry of education. When the school was closed the following year and most of the teaching staff dismissed, the university retained its administrative functions until the Ministry of Education was established in 1871. The schools of medicine and Western studies became independent again until they were merged in 1877 to form the core of Tokyo University. The closure was a result of conflicts between scholars of kokugaku (National Learning) and kangaku, who competed for influence in the new education system and for political power, and of tensions between teaching staff and students.20

Initial plans to introduce a comprehensive education system were made around 1870, and in 1871 attempts to reform the education system began in earnest. Meanwhile, traditional patterns of schooling persisted. The domain schools continued to play a central role in the education of samurai, and feudal lords sponsored yūgaku (travelling for study), with Tokyo as the most important destination.21 In 1871 the Meiji government abolished the domains which had retained much of their independence in the years immediately following the Meiji Restoration. The domains were replaced by a system of prefectures. Jurisdiction over the entire country and its populace, control of the revenues of the former domains and control over their military power were thus consolidated in the hands of the central government. Following the introduction of the prefectural system, the Council of State (dajōkan) was reorganized. A Ministry of Education was established, and plans were made to introduce a centralized education system. In some prefectures (Kyōto, Shizuoka, Aichi) the authorities had already developed ambitious education programmes.22

The abolition of the domains formally spelt the end of the domain schools and of yūgaku sponsored by the domains. However, many schools were reopened as private schools by members of the local elite, often with the support of the former feudal lord. Equally, sponsorship of yūgaku continued in some cases. Thus the domain school, in the form of its private
successor, continued to be central to samurai education even after the abolition of the domains. On 5 September 1872 the Education Law (gakusei) was issued by the Council of State. Influenced by French and German ideas, it attempted to regulate education by introducing compulsory attendance and establishing a centralized education system. This was the most important aspect of the law, as it provided the basis for subsequent education policies. Above all it demonstrated the government’s determination to take control of education. On the day the Education Law was proclaimed, all existing schools were ordered to close, to be reopened according to the provisions of the new law. Private schools were not forbidden, but they were to be regulated. Whether the law was enforced throughout the country is open to question; the responsibility lay with the local authorities, and their approaches varied.

The Education Law included detailed regulations for organizing schooling on a national scale. The country was divided into school districts, eight for universities, 256 for middle schools and 53,760 for elementary schools. But by 1879 only half of the planned elementary schools had been built, and even in 1902 the target had not been reached. Middle schools and universities took even longer, and consolidation did not begin until the 1880s. Secondary education (middle schools) in particular was neglected by the central government for many years, thus leaving more scope for private initiative than in any other sector. Lack of resources limited the extent of control of the central government and the local authorities responsible for schools. There were no trained teachers or, at first, institutions for training them. Guidelines for curricula and textbooks were issued, but not enforced. Consequently, the new regulations did not immediately change existing arrangements. In many cases the traditional terakoya, now renamed primary schools, operated as before, and Confucian scholars continued to teach in the new schools, presumably (though this needs further investigation) with little change to the curriculum of reading, writing, some arithmetic and Confucian ethics. At the same time Western ideas of education were influential, and translations of Western textbooks were widely used. Despite the general tendency of government policy towards stronger regulation and standardization, the climate in the 1870s was fairly liberal.

From the end of the 1870s authoritarian tendencies became stronger. In 1879 the kyōgaku taishi (Great Principles on
Education), drawn up by Motoda Eifu, heralded a conservative reaction to the previous liberal trends. The document deplored the extremes of Westernization and reasserted Japanese values and the importance of Confucianism in moral education. At the same time a new Education Ordinance (kyōikurei), also issued in 1879, continued the policy of Westernization and devolved authority over education to local levels. However, before it could be fully implemented, the Revised Education Ordinance of 1880 reversed some of its provisions. More specific measures followed in the Elementary School Regulations in 1881 and in the moves to reform and regulate the publication of textbooks.

The centralization of education culminated in the reforms that were introduced by Education Minister Mori Arinori in 1886. With the backing of Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi, he transformed the education system and gave it the shape it retained until the end of World War II.²⁶ Itō was engaged in preparing Japan’s first modern constitution and the reforms in education were part of a general reorganization of the government. The result was a centralized, hierarchical and elitist system, characterized by a marked distinction between primary and some secondary education for the general public and further secondary and higher education for a small privileged elite. At the top of the hierarchy was the Imperial University (from 1897 Tokyo Imperial University to distinguish it from Kyoto). Compulsory schooling was four years. There were two divisions of middle schools, a terminal one and one leading to university. The number of public middle schools was reduced and entry to the remaining ones was by a rigorous examination.

The “higher middle schools”, which became “higher schools” (kōtō gakkō) under Minister Inoue Kowashi in 1894, were to educate the future leaders of society, whether they went straight into the business world or continued into higher education after graduation. Only a small number of graduates gained entry into the imperial universities. Others attended one of the many different types of “specialist schools” or senmon gakkō. This official category first appeared in the ordinance of 1879, to describe a tertiary-level institution that offered only one rather than several subjects. In reality many private schools, which offered a range of subjects—such as the future Waseda University (established in 1881 as Tōkyō senmon gakkō)—were included in this category. Until private schools were allowed to become universities in 1918, the category of senmon gakkō was the
highest level they could reach. The specialist schools were further regulated by an ordinance in 1903 (*Senmon gakkō rei*). Education Minister Inoue Kowashi in 1893–94 reformed vocational education, including technical education at middle school level. By the early twentieth century there was a hierarchy of vocational and technical schools parallel to the academic pyramid.

Private education was subject to control, but the government could not afford to abolish it. The Education Ordinance of 1879 made it harder for private institutions to qualify as middle schools. But it also created a new category of “miscellaneous schools” (*kakushu gakkō*), a kind of catch-all, which may actually have made the establishment of a private school easier, since new schools did not have to qualify for the status of a mainstream category. For example, the Shijodō in Akita (Chapter 5) benefited from this new regulation. Other government measures clearly aimed to reduce the status of private schools and may have resulted in student numbers falling. In 1883 public officials, including faculty members of public schools, were forbidden to lecture at private schools. Also in 1883, exemption from military conscription for students from certain private schools was abolished. In 1884 it was stipulated that a certain number of teachers at the new middle schools had to have a diploma from a certified teacher training school or a university. The privileges of graduates from the Imperial University in the civil service examinations also ensured that private schools could not attain the prestige of public ones.

Under Mori Arinori, private schools were treated more positively. Private schools offering training in law received privileges which made it possible for their graduates to be exempt from the regular judicial examinations. Other private schools found it easier to raise funds in the more tolerant atmosphere and in some cases even received public support. In 1899 the Private Schools Ordinance (*shiritsugakkōrei*), while firmly establishing state control over private schools, also secured their position. Thus the role of private education was firmly established by the end of the Meiji period.

One area where private education was particularly important was female education. For the Meiji government, schooling for girls was not a priority. The Education Law of 1872 specified that both girls and boys should receive elementary education, but school attendance by girls lagged behind that of boys throughout most of the Meiji period. In particular, schooling for girls
beyond elementary level was largely neglected. In Tokyo, a government school for girls having graduated from elementary school existed from 1875 to 1877. The government also established Tokyo Normal School for Girls in 1875, which became the Higher Normal School for Girls, a department of the Higher Normal School, in 1885. Not until 1899 did the government take steps to expand further education for girls with the Girls’ High School Law. Meanwhile private institutions, especially missionary schools, provided education for girls beyond elementary level.

By the early twentieth century girls’ education had grown in importance. School attendance had at last risen to over 50 percent and in 1902 reached 87 percent. The number of girls’ schools had risen from fifteen nationwide in 1895 to eighty in 1902. Most of them were public schools, but in 1901 Tsuda Ume and Naruse Jinzō established private high schools for girls. With the increasing official interest in education for girls came more controls and restrictions for private schools. However, many schools did not attempt to gain official recognition since, for girls, gaining formal qualifications was still not seen as a priority.

By the end of the Meiji period the national school system was fully established and provided the most reliable means for social advancement. School attendance had risen from just over 40 per cent (males: 60 per cent) of an age cohort in 1880 to over 90 per cent in 1904 for primary school. Thus nearly everyone received a basic education, but further and higher education was limited to a privileged few; in 1905 only 12 per cent of males (females: 4 per cent) went on to secondary education. While in early Meiji men could rise to power and wealth by various routes, the options had narrowed by the early twentieth century. Even in the business world, where large companies followed the example of government institutions, attending the “right” schools increasingly became the only way to success (see Chapter 5).

Thus within four decades the variety of schools had given way to a centralized, uniform system, which privileged public schools. Private institutions had largely been incorporated into the system.

**TYPES OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS**

The rising demand for education and the inability of the new system to keep up with it resulted in a wealth of private institutions, which the government had to tolerate. Among these,
kangaku juku were the most numerous, at least initially, but there were a variety of others; before turning to the kangaku juku the different types of private schools shall be introduced.35

A large group of private schools were established to teach knowledge required by the changing times, such as Western studies in general, as their predecessors taught before 1868, or specialized knowledge geared to a particular profession or to securing entrance into the government schools. The most famous of the first group was Keiō gijuku.36 Fukuzawa Yukichi’s school originated in 1858, when he was ordered to give lessons in the residence of his feudal lord in Tokyo. Later the school was moved to its own buildings and named Keiō gijuku in 1868. It was established as a cooperative school; the term “gijuku” was used to indicate that it was a school established for the public good and financed by donations and fees. It was not teacher-centred like the traditional juku, but employed several teachers, who received salaries. Regular tuition fees were charged to pay for these after the abolition of the samurai stipends. In 1868 regulations for the school and the dormitory were issued; the style of teaching was similar to that of the traditional academies with lectures (on Western books), simple reading (sodoku) and group reading (kaidoku). The system of having the older students teach the younger ones was used more systematically than in the traditional juku. Keiō gijuku was larger than most juku and in standard comparable to the best government schools;37 it became a model for other schools and its graduates taught in state schools as well as other private schools. Several other new schools adopted the term gijuku in their names. Among contemporaries, Keiō was known as one of the three great juku of Meiji (Meiji no san daijuku), together with Seki Shinpachi’s (1839–86) Kyōritsu gakusha and Nakamura Masanao’s (1832–91) Dōjinsha. Another famous school of this type was the Kōgyoku juku, founded by Kondō Makoto (1831–1886).38 These juku offered an education at secondary level or higher in several, mostly Western, subjects.

Several schools were established in connection with the Freedom and People’s Rights Movement in the 1870s and early 1880s. They were similar to the Keiō gijuku in that their purpose was to teach Western ideas and promote enlightenment. Education was a significant issue for the participants in the movement, many of whom were teachers.39 Tokutomi Sohō’s Ōe gijuku is the best known example. Its name “gijuku” seems to
indicate Fukuzawa’s influence, but Sohō himself cites Yoshida Shōin’s example. Ōe gijuku was indebted to a tradition of the private academy as a place of learning for the free exchange of ideas that was not dictated by the needs of the government. Western authors were added to the Confucian classics (taught by Sohō’s father). Sohō’s aim was to raise political consciousness as a precondition for political activity. Ōe, like many (not all) schools established by the Freedom and People’s Rights Movement, was founded from opposition to the state education system, emphasizing freedom and independent thought. These schools flourished at the time when the state’s attitude was at its most liberal but began to decline as government regulation of schools increased and freedom of expression was curtailed.

An earlier and different example of an institution motivated by political opposition was the system of private schools (shigakkō) established by Saigō Takamori in 1874, after he had left the Meiji government and returned to Kagoshima. There were branches all over the prefecture, the governor being a supporter of Saigō’s aims. Saigō wanted to train young men to be loyal soldiers with the samurai spirit, who would be prepared to sacrifice themselves for the nation, and his “schools” were in practice places of military training, although lectures in the Confucian classics were included. In spite of the emphasis on traditional Japanese values, foreign teachers were employed and students sent abroad. By 1875 there were 7,000 students in Kagoshima alone and 300 to 1,000 students in each of the branch schools established in 124 districts.40

Establishments like Saigō Takamori’s shigakkō and the schools founded by adherents of the Movement for Freedom and People’s Rights aroused the suspicions of the Meiji government and may well have motivated the repressive policies of the late 1870s and early 1880s. But other private schools, far from posing a threat to the system, supported it by offering subjects from the curriculum of the public schools. Nagai Michio calls them “adaptor schools”.41 Many were law schools that prepared students for a career in government or for entrance into the Imperial University. A few of them were given privileges exempting their students from the judicial examinations under Mori Arinori.42 Some of them later became private universities, like Hōgakusha (Hōsei University), Senshū gakkō (Senshū University), Meiji hōritsu gakkō (Meiji University) and Igirisu hōritsu gakkō (Chūō University).43 Other schools offered training
in skills necessary for a specific career in a modern field, often in science and technology, like the Butsuri gakko, which began in 1881 as a night school, or the Tokyo seii koshûsho, a medical school established in 1881.\textsuperscript{44}

Mission schools also tended to offer accepted Western subjects. They were established either by foreign missionaries, the Japanese church or individual Christians.\textsuperscript{45} One of the earliest was the Ferris Seminary, established in 1870, when Mary Eddy Kidder took over Mrs Hepburn’s private school, Hebon juku. Kidder reorganized it as a school for girls with about thirty students, and in 1875 it was named the Issac Ferris Seminary (after the head of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Reformed Church). English was used in the morning classes: philosophy, history, mathematics, English, natural science and gymnastics. Japanese was used in the afternoon classes: calligraphy, Japanese language, history and literature. The dormitories and the food were Japanese style.\textsuperscript{46} The best-known example of a mission school established by a Japanese is Dôshisha in Kyoto, founded by Niijima Jô in 1874. The school had a theological course and a general course and most of the teachers were foreign missionaries. Niijima’s aim was to establish a Christian university, but Dôshisha did not receive university status until after his death, when it became the leading Christian university.\textsuperscript{47}

Mission schools played a particularly important role in women’s education above elementary level, as this area was neglected by the state and less subject to regulation than boys’ education. These girls’ schools taught mainly English and Japanese literature, home economics, sewing and music, combined with a Christian education, until a law in 1899 prohibited religious instruction in schools.\textsuperscript{48} By providing girls with a chance to learn and even to make an independent living, the mission schools contributed significantly to the emancipation of women, but they did not directly challenge the official view of women’s role in society.

Christian schools were not the only schools sponsored by religious groups. Organized Buddhism, which had had a monopoly on education before the Tokugawa period, also set up schools. Some of them had older predecessors, like the Sôtôshû senmon gakko established in 1875, which goes back to a temple academy in 1592, or the forerunner of Ryûkoku University in Kyôto, which dates back to an institution founded in 1639.\textsuperscript{49}
Following the example of the Christian missionaries, some Buddhist schools for girls were established. In Hakodate, where many missionaries were active, members of several Buddhist sects cooperated to found the Rikuwa jogakkō, later Hakodate Ōtani gakuen, in 1888. In 1891 Yamamoto Kō, a graduate from the Ferris Seminary, became the first full-time head mistress. She died young, however, and her successors were men. Buddhist schools concentrated on the Buddhist scriptures and Chinese classics, but also taught other subjects. At middle school level they modelled themselves on the state middle schools.

Educational institutions for Shintō studies were established as part of the nationalistic reaction in the 1880s by Shintoists and scholars of National Learning. The present Kokugakuin University was founded as Kōten kōkyūsho (Institute of Japanese Literature) in 1882 to provide students with an education in Japanese classics and Japanese history, literature and other branches of National Learning. The Ise jingū kōgakkan was also founded in 1882; there had been a library and school in Ise since the Tokugawa period, and at the beginning of Meiji the Uji gakkō was established and run by the shrine office from 1873. In 1903 the school came under control of the interior ministry as a government professional school (kanritsu senmon gakkō).

Tetsugakukan (forerunner of Tōyō University), founded in 1887 by Inoue Enryō (1858–1919), was another institution that specialized in Eastern thought. Enryō was a Buddhist scholar who had graduated in philosophy from Tokyo University in 1885. His school mainly trained future Shintō and Buddhist priests and teachers, and the curriculum included Western philosophy. In 1899, after two unsuccessful previous applications, Tetsugakukan was granted a privilege exempting its graduates from the state examination for teachers introduced in 1886, which only 20 percent of the candidates passed. In return Tetsugakukan had to submit to strict government controls. Tetsugakukan lost the privilege again in the so-called Tetsugakukan Affair of 1902, which sparked off a major confrontation between private institutions of higher learning and the government.

Most private schools that survived in the long run did so either by becoming similar the public schools or by offering a specialized subject which was highly in demand, such as law, science or technology. Kangaku juku were just one among several types of private institutions. A brief look at the fate of kangaku during the Meiji period will suggest why they held their own for
so long, despite the increasing importance and prestige of Western knowledge.

**KANGAKU IN THE MEIJI PERIOD**

Meiji Japan tends to be studied under the overall themes of “modernization” (although modernization theories are no longer generally accepted or explicitly referred to) and Westernization. As a result, the importance of *kangaku* even after 1868 has been underestimated. However, while most of the future leaders of Meiji Japan had some background in Western learning, nearly all of them had been educated in the *kangaku* tradition and were influenced by it. The Meiji Restoration has even been interpreted as an attempt to inherit China.\(^{54}\)

The opening of Japan in 1853 increased the possibilities for contact with China as well as the West. The first official mission to China took place under the Shogunate in 1862. The members of the Iwakura mission to Europe and America in 1871 also visited China, if only for a few days on their way back. Apart from these official missions, the first group of Japanese to travel to China were the *kangaku* scholars, and many of them wrote extensive travelogues in *kanbun*; for example Oka Senjin, who also had a *kangaku juku* (see Chapter 4). Their knowledge of *kanbun* helped them to communicate in writing with Chinese, at least with scholars. The direct contacts with China did not strengthen their respect for that country. They contrasted the China of their day unfavourably with the China they knew from the classics. Kume Kunitake, the official chronicler of the Iwakura mission, wrote his account in a heavily sinicized style with numerous Chinese terms and allusions, but when the group reached China he was far from impressed.

China had begun to be the object of contempt even in the Edo period, a tendency which increased during the Meiji period, especially after the Sino-Japanese war in 1894–95. But the fate of *kangaku* is not directly related to Japan’s relations with contemporary China. Perhaps the most important area where *kangaku* remained influential was language. Until the language reforms in the late Meiji period, most writing styles were variants of Sino-Japanese (*kanbun*) and far removed from the spoken language. The use of Chinese loanwords, *kango*, even increased around 1868. There were two practical reasons for this. First, the increasing centralization of Japan brought men from all over
Japan together. They spoke regional dialects, and Sino-Japanese was their common language, in which they could best communicate. Second, the importation of Western concepts meant that new words had to be devised, and as in the past the Japanese used Chinese morphemes for this purpose, in a similar way to the use of Greek in Europe. In short, at a time when Japan had no national language and most of its people had no sense of national identity, *kangaku* provided both a language and a sense of common heritage, at least for the male elite.

At the same time the use of *kanbun* reflected the influence of Confucian education and thought. And since Confucian thought inspired many measures taken by the new government, this in turn helped perpetuate the necessity for reading and writing *kanbun*. A good example of this is the criminal law proclaimed in 1871 in the *Shinritsu kōryō*. This was based on the Chinese law of the Ming (1368–1644) and hardly influenced by Western concepts before its partial revision in 1873. This meant that in order to work with these laws and to take part in government, a knowledge of *kanbun* and Chinese language and culture was essential.

Moreover, *kanbun* was still the language of scholarship, literature and *kanshi* poetry. The so-called “Three Literary Masters of the Meiji Era” (*Meiji no Sandai bunsō*) were all *kangaku* scholars: Mishima Chūshū (1830–1919), Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827–1910) and Kawada Takeshi (1830–96). Incidentally, all three of them opened *juku*. Educated in the Tokugawa period, they and others were respected figures in the literary world after 1868.

Chinese poetry (*kanshi*) in different styles was popular in Japan from ancient times and reached a new hight in the Meiji period. Most leaders of the Meiji Restoration composed *kanshi*; Saigō Takamori, who became the leader of the Satsuma rebellion in 1877, expressed his disillusionment with the new government in this form. The author Natsume Sōseki had a high reputation as a writer of *kanshi* as well as a novelist. Several literary societies, anthologies and literary journals were devoted to *kanshi* and even the general newspapers and periodicals printed them. Western poetry was translated into *kanbun*. Even the Sino-Japanese War inspired numerous *kanshi*, many of them written by soldiers.

An example of the importance of *kangaku* in scholarship and political thought is the Meiji government’s effort to revive official historiography in the tradition of the *Six National Histories* (*Rikkokokushi*). These were inspired by the Chinese dynastic
histories and compiled in Japan during the height of imperial power. The first attempts to set up an office for the compilation of a national history were made in 1869, and work was begun in earnest in 1875, when an Office of Historiography (*shūshikyoku*) was set up in the Council of State, the highest executive organ of the new government. Most of the officials were scholars of *kangaku*. In 1882 the office’s members began writing the *Dainihon hennenshi* [Chronological History of Great Japan]; the name clearly shows its indebtedness to the *Dainihonshi* [History of Great Japan], compiled in the feudal domain of Mito from the mid-seventeenth century, and faithfully imitated the format of the standard histories of China. It had been accorded the status of an official history. The *Dainihon hennenshi* became in effect its sequel, written in *kanbun*. Like the compilers of the *Dainihonshi*, the members of the Office of Historiography did not perceive *kanbun* as a foreign language.

In the late 1880s this view began to change, and by the 1890s *kanbun* and *kangaku* were in retreat. This resulted in part from the rise of nationalist thought. Critics of the Office of Historiography rejected the choice of *kanbun* on the grounds that it was wrong to write a national history in a foreign language. Even so, in 1894, on the eve of the Sino-Japanese War, Shiga Shigetaka published his *Nihonfūkeiron* (Japanese Scenery) with the purpose to arouse national pride in Japan’s environment. The work was written in a style heavily influenced by *kanbun*. Although language reform—until then discussed mainly from pragmatic considerations—became a nationalist issue after 1895, the main argument against *kanbun* may well have been that it had become a dead language (*shigo*). The education minister, Inoue Kowashi, referred to it as such when he ordered the abandonment of the *Dainihonhennenshi* in 1893. The same minister introduced more *kanbun* into the school curriculum. He emphasized that writing *kanbun* was no longer required, but that the ability to read it was necessary for studying the Confucian classics as well as Chinese history. He also stressed that the Japanese language could not be separated from the influence of Chinese in its written form. But for Inoue *kanbun* was a specialist subject among other school subjects. In the same way, *kangaku* at university level became a set of specialized disciplines; *tōyōshi*, *tōyō bungaku* and *tōyō tetsugaku* (East Asian, mainly Chinese, history, literature and philosophy). *Kangaku* was the philological study of China, which stressed close reading of the classics in
order to determine the truth that they defined. The new disciplines used Western concepts and methods and claimed to be scientific. They were established by young scholars who had studied in the new schools and abroad, but most of them had also studied at kangaku juku before entering university.  

That these developments coincided with the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95 has less to do with the deteriorating relations between the two countries than with the development of the education system. By the 1890s men (and to a lesser extent women) were reaching adulthood; they had studied in the new schools, dominated by Western learning, where kangaku was just one subject among many. To be sure, some had also attended kangaku juku, but they were not steeped in the kangaku tradition as the previous generation.

Kangaku retained a fundamental, although limited, role in education, a role that was strengthened from the 1880s: moral and ethical training based on Confucian principles. When political and intellectual leaders perceived a need to instil moral values into the citizens of Japan, they turned to Confucianism. The Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 is a prime example of this. During the 1880s and 1890s several Confucian organizations were established with the aim of spreading Confucian education. This was not to contradict nationalism. Kangaku and Confucian morals were interpreted as part of Japanese tradition. Studying Confucian texts provided not only moral principles but cultural identity in an era of continuing Westernization, symbolized by the Rokumeikan, a Western-style hall where politicians (and their sometimes reluctant wives) demonstrated their acquisition of Western civilization in balls, concerts and charity bazaars.

Thus kangaku remained important until at least the late 1880s, and with it the demand for the kangaku education provided by juku. When the new school system was well established, and such aspects of kangaku as were still considered useful, basic training in reading kanbun texts and in Confucian ethics had been incorporated into mainstream education.

KANGAKU JUKU IN TRANSITION

Education and scholarship were transformed completely within a few decades; this complex process of transition included trial and error, false starts and loose ends.
How did the *kangaku juku* fare within the process? The statistics on *juku* (see following chapter), however unreliable, clearly show that although most *juku* and *terakoya* were formally abolished with the Education Law of 1872, many continued to exist, often under a new name. *Kangaku juku* were listed as private elementary or middle schools and later as “miscellaneous schools” (*kakushū gakkō*). Not only did older *kangaku juku* continue to thrive, new ones were established even as late as the 1880s. In some areas *juku* survived into the early twentieth century. Others transformed into regular schools and prosper to this day.

The *kangaku juku* as an institution continued long after 1872, but that does not mean that a *kangaku juku* in 1885 was the same as one forty or fifty years earlier. The *juku* of the Tokugawa period was seldom subject to regulation, and anybody could establish one. Most people who did were samurai, who often could not get official appointments in an already overstaffed bureaucracy. Attendance of *juku* was also open, although in practice it was limited to samurai and the more wealthy merchants and farmers, who could afford to take time off for pursuits not linked to making a living. Although the significance of *yūgaku* (travelling to study) has been stressed, the evidence seems to suggest that most *juku*, at least outside Tokyo, catered mainly for local students. Even in the more famous *juku*, with many students from farther afield, local students predominated. Nevertheless there was a group of students who attended several different establishments, a tendency that continued into Meiji. Although most of the known *juku* had boarders, the majority of students were often day pupils. Boarding house life was therefore not necessarily a dominating feature of *juku* education; it was incidental rather than part of a conscious educational programme.

Since *kangaku* was the mainstream of learning, the general content of what *kangaku juku* taught was undisputed; such rivalry as existed was between different schools of *kangaku*. There was no system of compulsory education that demanded the teaching of a certain curriculum or linked academic achievement to social mobility. Thus, although the rigid class system limited people’s chances to choose their place in society, the lack of central control and the absence of a strong link between schooling and social advantage meant that freedom of intellectual pursuit was a reality for those with sufficient means.
The Education Law of 1872 changed this situation fundamentally in three ways. First, it explicitly linked learning to worldly success. Together with the abolition of the class system, this principle paved the way to a society where mobility depended on merit defined in terms of educational achievement. Second, it established (in principle, if not yet in practice) a system of public education that was centrally regulated. A third fundamental change to affect the kangaku juku was that Western learning became the key to prestige and power. Nearly all the men who rose to leadership after 1868 had had at least minimal exposure to Western learning, and a Western education increasingly became the key to success. The new schools taught mainly Western subjects.

The full extent of these changes did not make itself felt immediately. The system took years to implement. Educational achievement only gradually became the condition for entry into most professions. Moreover, kangaku retained its prestige for years. This is why the kangaku juku could survive for as long as they did, and even in the first years after 1872 were under little pressure to change. Kangakujuku often filled the gap in public provision, especially between elementary and university level. Gradually the situation changed. The juku of the Tokugawa period and the first years of Meiji began to disappear. Members of the samurai class were finding it harder to attend schools, having lost their income and privileges. On the other hand, the demand for commoner education increased. As more people received elementary education and the demand for secondary education rose, private middle schools, often former kangaku juku, began to flourish, filling the gap in government provision. New juku for studies beyond elementary level were established in rural areas and provincial towns at this time, attended by the sons of samurai who could not afford to study in Tokyo, or by wealthy commoners who expected to inherit the family business.

Gradually, the kangaku juku had to adapt to the new situation. By offering a broader curriculum some became private versions of the public schools. Others functioned as preparatory schools for students wanting to take public examinations (these included kanbun); this function became more significant as examinations became increasingly important.

But the kangaku curriculum could also present an alternative to the Western education provided in the public system. For those who did not seek education as a way into a profession, this type
of education was often preferred. In rural areas, apart from being the only type of post-elementary education on offer, it appeared more suited to people’s lives, which had not (yet) changed dramatically since the Tokugawa period. In towns, studying at a kangaku juku was more likely to be in addition to education at the new schools, and in the late Meiji period it often took on the role of continuing education. All these different ways in which juku responded to the challenges of the new era may well have increased their diversity. Of course, in addition to finding a place in the new system, factors like the presence of a suitable and interested heir and the ability to run the juku as a successful business were also important.

Just as the juku after 1872 had to compete with the expanding public school system, so the new system can be said to have been in competition with private establishments, which had to be tolerated because public provision lagged behind the demand for education. This demand was, after all, in line with the government’s aim to spread education. Did the traditional kangaku juku help or hinder the government’s plans for establishing a national system? There is evidence that they were at least perceived as a hindrance (Aktia, Ibaraki; Chapter 5). Moreover, in Ōita and other prefectures new juku opened as late as the early twentieth century, while new schools were slow to develop. Did the very success of the old institutions slow down the establishment of new schools, as some local authorities feared?

While this is a possibility, at least for certain places at certain times, the overall picture suggests that the rapid spread of education and development of a national system was possible because of the kangaku juku. They often provided education for young people who otherwise would not have received it, certainly not beyond elementary level. It is difficult to imagine where the resources and especially the qualified teachers for more public schools would have come from. The kangaku scholars constituted a pool of educated people, as often as not with a track record of teaching young people. They enjoyed respect and trust in their local communities. That they often were conservative was the other side of the same coin. But the evidence suggests that those juku that survived longest were the ones where the master made conscious concessions to the changing times, such as offering a broader curriculum than just kangaku, in some cases the same range of subjects as the public
schools. This was the case in many of the new juku in Ōita prefecture, among other places. In some prefectures, like Niigata, juku and new schools seem to have flourished side by side. The example of Akita, on the other hand, where measures against juku were particularly harsh, suggests that juku played a positive role where they were permitted; educational provision and school attendance in Akita lagged throughout the Meiji period.

By being part of the fabric of local communities the kangaku juku may well have strengthened identity in a time of upheavals and change. Even before the Meiji government strove to strengthen the people’s national identity, a kangaku education provided a common cultural heritage, at least for the educated elite.64 Scholars like Ikeda Sōan (Chapter 3) belonged to a national network through the practice of travelling to study (yūgaku), exchange of students, visits and correspondence. Moreover, at a time when there was no standardized national Japanese language,65 they shared a written language, kanbun. If kangaku students really enjoyed the political discussions they were so famous—or infamous—for (Chapter 5), it was presumably the shared kango vocabulary which helped them surmount the regional differences in their speech. The authors from the kangaku canon provided a common reference for their discussions of national issues, which helped develop a national consciousness. Thus kangaku and the juku that transmitted it, as well as the modern national school system, should be credited with fostering national identity. The kangaku juku indirectly supported government efforts.

The role of juku masters as educators in Meiji Japan is emphasized by the fact that their descendants, even if they were not heirs to the juku, often became teachers in the new schools, thus continuing the family tradition. For example the direct descendant of Tsunetō Seisō is a teacher, and several prominent scholars and teachers of Chinese Studies in the twentieth century were descendants of kangaku scholars and juku masters (Chapter 6).

The central government and most local governments had to accept the key role played by the juku in promoting the spread of education. Juku were subject to control and sometimes repressive measures, but it was not direct government intervention that put an end to them. The decline was an indirect result of government policy and the social changes it led to. The modern school system, which had taken shape by the late 1880s privileged those who
had attended public schools that taught a curriculum based on Western knowledge, but also including moral instruction based on Confucian principles. Kangaku had transformed into a series of modern disciplines, which included the literature, philosophy and history of China and involved the application of Western methods.

The demise of the juku coincided roughly with the “new generation” critically examining the modernity created by the Meiji Restoration. It is surely significant that Tokutomi Kenjirō (Roka, 1868–1927) has provided us with an early example of the “juku myth”. The new schools were for many the first place where they confronted modernity in their own lives: sitting on chairs, a teacher with Western clothes, new teaching methods (see the wall charts in Figure 10), books filled with foreign ideas. It is therefore hardly surprising that criticism of modernity included criticism of the modern schools, contrasting them unfavourably with the juku that had until so recently provided an alternative to them.

In fact, already in the late Meiji period and even while the last juku still operated in some rural areas, they had become sufficiently a thing of the past to be used as history is often used, that is, for criticizing and condemning the present.
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CHAPTER TWO
Kangaku Juku in the Meiji Period

THE ASSERTION THAT JUKU PLAYED A KEY ROLE for several years after 1872 is partly based on numbers. They may be hard to establish and to interpret, but they clearly show the general trends. They also show considerable variation from prefecture to prefecture and even within prefectures (this is hardly surprising, since the prefectures cut across the older administrative boundaries and could include fairly diverse districts). Juku attendance is even more difficult to measure, but the evidence suggests that there were different attendance patterns, which shed light on the different functions a juku could have within the emerging modern system.

JUKU AND JUKU ATTENDANCE AFTER 1868

To assess the importance of juku in general is easier than to illustrate it in detail. The problem starts with numbers; the private and informal nature of juku means that statistical data are almost always incomplete, since many juku were not reported. The starting point for any analysis of numbers is the shijuku terakoya charts in volumes 8 and 9 of NihonKyōikushi Shiryō (NKSS) compiled by the Ministry of Education.¹ These tables give —where known— the names of juku and terakoya for each prefecture, the year they were opened and closed, the name of the master, the subjects taught and the number of teachers and students. The following numbers of juku are given in Table 1. The charts were compiled from reports which the prefectures had to submit in 1882–83. In Miyagi prefecture (as in others) the prefecture ordered the local governors to investigate and submit the required information, which they did within two to three months.² Not all prefectures submitted, and the quality of
### Table 1: Numbers of juku

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefecture</th>
<th>Edo period</th>
<th>Since Meiji</th>
<th>Not known</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanagawa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyōgo</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakodate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niigata</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumma</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiba</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tochigi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aichi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizuoka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamanashi</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiga</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagano</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyagi</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aomori</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagata</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akita</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukui</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishikawa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottori</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terakoya. But the regional variations also suggest that it may be all but impossible to generalize about how juku developed nationwide. Thus the numbers above give only a rough idea. Further investigation at prefectural level has usually produced information about additional juku. Moreover, the classification of an institution as juku or terakoya has been revised in some cases, where information about the curriculum suggested this. The distinction between the two is far from clear-cut, and many authors do not attempt it and treat juku and terakoya together. But however difficult it may be to decide in individual cases whether we are dealing with a juku or a terakoya, overall there was a difference between institutions offering only elementary education and those providing the possibility for further study. The difference became more marked when the terakoya were absorbed into the national school system as elementary schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefecture</th>
<th>Juku</th>
<th>Terakoya</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shimane</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okayama</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshima</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamaguchi</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakayama</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokushima</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukuoka</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oita</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumamoto</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyazaki</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagoshima</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,505</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the table in Umihara Tōru, Nihonshi shō hyakka: Gakkō (Tokyo: Kondō shuppansha, 1991), p. 29 in the appendix (based on NKSS).
after 1872, but even then some juku continued to offer elementary education.

Most of the juku listed in NKSS were established during the Tokugawa period and many had ceased to exist by the Meiji period. Only 182 juku are listed as having been opened in the Meiji period, but there may well have been many more. On the other hand, some listed as having opened after 1868 may well have been older, if the master reported the reopening, in accordance with the law of 1872, as the founding date.3

For juku, as for terakoya and domain schools (hankō), the years 1871 to 1873, rather than 1868, constituted a major watershed. The abolition of the domains in 1871 spelled the end of their schools, although many were reopened in some form. Many juku listed in NKSS are listed as having closed in 1871, 1872 or 1872. The Education Law (gakusei) of 1872 stipulated that existing schools were to be closed initially, but in how far this was enforced appears to have varied from prefecture to prefecture. Application could then be made to reopen a juku. In summer 1874 the Ministry of Education ordered that applications to open a private school were all to take the same form; the application was to be for shigaku (a private school) and to be submitted to the regional authority, which passed it on to the Ministry of Education. Thus the category shijuku/kajuku, used in the Education Law of 1872 for a school in the teacher’s home, was no longer recognized and began to disappear from official documents.4 From 1875 until 1879 the statistics of the Ministry of Education record an increase in the number of private middle schools.5 In 1874, 32 middle schools, 21 of them private, were recorded. For 1875, the number is 127, 117 of them private (80 in Tokyo, which had no public middle school). The numbers continued to rise until 1879, when 786 were recorded, 682 of them private.

Many kangaku juku appeared in the statistics as private middle schools. For example, Yasui Sokken’s Sankei juku (Chapter 3) is first listed in 1875 with 31 students; the founding date is given as 1873, although Sokken had run a juku since 1839. Zōshun’en, founded in 1824, and Suisaien, founded in 1835, are first listed in 1879 (with 40 and 20 students); the founding dates 1879 and 1874 are recorded. In contrast, for Seikei shoin, first listed in 1877, the actual date of foundation (1847) is given (60 students).6 Determining the number of kangaku juku from the official statistics is made even more difficult by the fact that juku often
changed categories, becoming private elementary schools one year and middle schools the next. For example, Jōin juku in Tokyo was listed as an elementary school in 1874, middle school in 1875 and 1876, elementary school in 1877 and middle school in 1878 and 1879. From 1880 onwards the number of middle schools dropped to 187, 50 of them private (three schools in Tokyo, one private). By 1883 a mere six private middle schools were recorded. This was because most private schools did not meet the criteria for middle schools laid down in the Education Ordinance of 1879 and consequently became “miscellaneous schools” (kakushu gakkō). In 1880 a total of 433 public and 1,585 private kakushu gakkō were recorded. Among these, schools offering kangaku represented the second largest category among the public schools (after those offering handicrafts) with 126 schools and the largest category among the private ones (673). Another 89 offered kangaku together with other subjects.

In the 1880s many new schools were established, which were in fact kangaku juku, especially outside Tokyo (e.g. Ōita, Aichi). By then the number of children receiving elementary education was rising, and as a result the demand for education beyond elementary level increased. Yet the strict conditions for the establishment of middle schools meant that provision was inadequate. Students would often study at juku before entering mainstream schools in the towns. For those who stayed at home the kangaku curriculum may well have suited their needs better than the Western education offered in the new schools, because the pattern of daily life and the fabric of society had not yet changed significantly in the remoter areas (Chapter 5).

The fact that a juku continued well into the Meiji period does not necessarily mean it was the same institution in the late nineteenth century that it had been several decades earlier. But unless a juku applied for and received the status of a mainstream school, offering a broader curriculum than previously and employing additional teachers, changes are unlikely to be documented. Possibly some inferences can be drawn from changes in attendance patterns and the kinds of students who attended juku.

Juku attendance varied as much as the juku themselves. Among the former samurai population in the castle towns there was a marked continuity from the Edo period. Just as young samurai had attended juku as well as the domain school during the Edo
period, their children now attended both the local public elementary school and the juku of some local Confucian scholar. It was not uncommon for a teacher at a public school to teach privately as well, as it had been for the teachers of the domain schools. In one case at least the local authorities tried to put a stop to this practice, but it was difficult to control.¹¹

In rural areas, apart from functioning as a bridge between elementary school and post-elementary education in a modern school in town, juku were also attended by children from farming families, who could not move to a larger town because they had to combine study with work on the farm.¹²

In Tokyo juku could be anything from a place offering elementary education for families who preferred the old ways (e.g. Hasegawa Nyozekan, see Chapter 5) to continuing education for a busy man already working¹³ to a preparatory school where students studied until they could enter the public school of their choice to a mere boarding house for students attending other schools and juku.¹⁴ For many prospective students from outside Tokyo, a juku was the first point of entry into the world of education in the capital. This pattern can be seen in the education of the 166 men and three women whose biographies were published by the Hōchi Newspaper in 1929.¹⁵ Most of them were born between 1868 and 1875 and they came from the Kantō, Chūbu and Tōhoku regions to Tokyo for study during the first twenty years of Meiji, because provision for education beyond elementary level was insufficient in their home regions. They usually came from samurai families. Of the 132 students who entered a school immediately on arriving in Tokyo, 30 went to a juku, more than to any other type of school, at least temporarily. For such students juku appear to have served as preparatory schools until they could pass the entrance examinations into mainstream schools. This was the beginning of the juku as a cram school. Besides, kangaku was still required in entrance examinations for many public schools, but not all schools prepared their students for this.¹⁶ For example, the famous Keiō gijuku did not offer kangaku.

Juku could provide not only lodgings, but also an income for poor students. They could either take on various jobs in someone else’s juku or they could even start their own. It was said that a student who had completed middle school education in the provinces was good enough to teach kangaku; of course they had often themselves attended kangaku juku.¹⁷
Most of the evidence for patterns of juku attendance is highly individual, glimpsed from biographies or the entrance registers of juku. There is, however, a study by the educational historian Kaigo Tokiomi, made while he was working for the Ministry of Education in 1929–30.\(^{18}\) He examined the careers of 1,020 people who completed questionnaires. They were born between 1868 and 1876 and were living in Sugamo in Tokyo, Hachiōji city and two districts in Ibaraki prefecture. Those in Sugamo had come from all over the country. Most of them had been to elementary school, but over 16 per cent had been to a terakoya or juku and almost 12 per cent had continued to a juku after elementary school where they usually received a Confucian education. Similarly, in Hachiōji, where most of the inhabitants questioned had been educated in Tokyo prefecture, over half had been to an elementary school, but almost 20 per cent to a terakoya or juku. Less than 3 per cent went to a juku after receiving elementary education, but that was still more than those who went to a formal middle school. In the rural districts of Ibaraki, most of those questioned had lived in the same place all their lives and most had received no formal education (68 per cent); about 12 per cent had been to a terakoya or juku, and 4 per cent went on to a juku after elementary education. From these numbers Kaigo estimated that around 20 per cent of the population born at the beginning of Meiji received education in terakoya or juku, their proportion decreasing over the years. This figure, however, would appear to apply to people from the lower strata of society, for whom the juku was the only school they attended, apart from their elementary school or terakoya; if we include other forms of juku attendance, like the ones suggested earlier, the proportion may well be significantly higher.

**JUKU IN TOKYO**

Most research on juku in the Meiji period has concentrated on Tokyo in the early 1870s. The sources are easily accessible in the metropolitan archives, where the reports and applications of 1871–73 are kept.\(^{19}\) A number of prominent scholars taught in Tokyo, about whom there is also a comparatively large amount of information. Moreover, Tokyo was the main centre of education; the greatest number and variety of schools were concentrated there and many young men flocked to Tokyo in continuation of the kokunai yūgaku (travelling for study with in
Japan) of the Edo period. In addition, the population in Tokyo rose from 800,000 in the mid-1870s to 1,000,000 in the 1880s, mainly as a result of migration into Tokyo, and this also increased the demand for schooling.

How many juku were there in Tokyo? NKSS lists 123, but there were probably more. Nakura Eisaburō, analysing the applications up to 1873 in the metropolitan archives, counted 1,141 juku of various types (including terakoya) for 1873 and analysed 1,015 of them (excluding branch schools). Of these, 758 offered elementary education, the others specialist studies, mainly kangaku, Japanese or Western studies or a combination of these.\(^\text{20}\) The kangaku juku formed the second largest group of these specialist juku; 60, compared to 83 for different branches of Western Learning (yōgaku). The following table shows when these kangaku juku were established: many were established after the Restoration; until 1870 their number increased more than academies for Western learning; from 1871 onwards academies for Western learning show the biggest increase.\(^\text{21}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Kangaku</th>
<th>Wa-kangaku</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Meiji (1818–68)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiji 1 (1868)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: 57 in the Tokyo wards, 3 in the districts. Source. See notes 20–22.

Analysis of the chart in NKSS and the submissions made to the Ministry of Education in preparation for it resulted in slightly different figures; of 122 juku, 96 included kangaku as a subject and in 55 cases it was the only subject. Kangaku could be a subject in its own right or part of a preparatory course to be followed by studies in other subjects such as Chinese or Western medicine.
all, Nakura describes 71 institutions as *kangaku juku*. Of these 16 existed only during the Edo period, 34 into the Meiji period and 21 were established in early Meiji.²²

Many of the older *kangaku juku* closed when their principal died, others called themselves private middle schools when the Ministry of Education stopped treating *juku* as a distinct category. Of the 100 *juku* listed in Nakura’s table, 48 are listed as middle schools in 1875–76, 27 of which dated back to the Tokugawa period.²³ Private middle schools in Tokyo increased between 1875 and 1879; those recorded for the first time between 1877 and 1879 had usually been opened during these years, and these included 55 offering *kangaku* only and 181 as one of several subjects. From 1880 onwards most of them were listed as “miscellaneous schools”; 79 of them between 1880 and 1883.²⁴ In 1883, 201 private schools included *kangaku* in their curriculum, according to data collected by the metropolitan government.²⁵ Of these, 91 appeared as private middle schools in the Ministry’s statistics for 1879 and were described as *kangaku juku*. Several of them stipulated that students must be at least 14 or 15 years old at entry, that is, they still regarded themselves as offering education at middle school level. The total number of students at *kakushu gakkō for kanbun* was 8,609; 7,637 males and 972 females, resulting in an average of 42.8 students per *juku*. Since the average reported size of these institutions was 4 or 5 *tsubo* (13.24 to 16.55 square metres) it seems likely that previous patterns of teaching persisted and the students did not all come at the same, regular times.

Who ran a *kangaku juku*? All 106 scholars who applied to run a *kangaku juku* in 1871–72 were former samurai.²⁶ This is to be expected; samurai usually received a *kangaku* education, and after 1868 they lost their privileges and income. If they were not able to pursue a political career, they often turned to education for a livelihood. Moreover, many came from Edo or from former domains of the Tokugawa; in fact, founders of private academies tended to be men formerly associated with the shogunate, or from the domains that sided with the shogunate in the Restoration, men who were unable to make a successful career in politics.²⁷ Some of the founders were well-known scholars of the Edo period; many had studied at the Shōheikō, and some had been employed there after 1868 until its closure in 1870. Their average age was 51, almost 10 years more than that of applicants wishing to open a *juku* for the study of English. Their political affiliations
and their average age tended to be reflected in their conservative outlook. The eminent Confucian scholar Hayashi Kakuryō (1806–78) never gave up his traditional hairstyle, the topknot of the samurai, and expelled the future politicians Inukai Tsuyoshi (1855–1932) and Suematsu Kenchō (1855–1920) for studying Western learning as well as kangaku.

The headmasters of middle schools that were originally kangaku juku (established between 1872 and 1879 and including some of the masters in the above analysis) present a similar picture. They were generally older than those at schools for Western studies, many were in their forties and the oldest was 81; a few were in their late teens. Many were former samurai, but an increasing number were commoners. Five were women (at the schools specialized in kangaku or kangaku and kokugaku). Most came from Tokyo or Shizuoka, though most regions were represented. Some had inherited the juku from their fathers or teachers. The kangaku scholars still included famous names of the Shōheikō era (Yasui Sokken and others), as well as former officials of the shogunate or domains. Unlike the headmasters of schools that specialized in Western Learning, they rarely held a public office simultaneously, although headmasters of juku for both kangaku and kokugaku were sometimes also teachers of the metropolitan elementary schools.28

Since many students in Tokyo came from outside the capital (a trend that continued from the Edo period), juku were usually boarding schools with students living in the houses of their teachers. Student numbers were generally small: 29 on average, seldom more than 50 (academies for Western learning were usually larger, some with over 100 students). Again the figures are unreliable, because there was much fluctuation. Students at kangaku juku tended to be about the same age as those of at other juku, 15 to 26 years old, 19 on average. From the late 1870s onwards students boarding in kangaku juku while studying at another juku or at a state school became common.29

The various investigations, sometimes with conflicting information, nevertheless make it clear that kangaku juku held a significant place among the different educational institutions of the capital until well into the 1880s. The general assumption is that this changed from the mid-1880s when the mainstream education at post-elementary level began to take shape. But when exactly individual juku closed their doors is usually not known. A
few are known to have continued into the twentieth century, and some became schools that still exist today.

**JUKU OUTSIDE TOKYO**

The situation outside Tokyo was different and contained considerable variations between regions, depending on educational provision before Meiji, how government policies were interpreted and executed by the prefectural authorities and how the new education system developed there. A few examples shall be given.  

According to NKSS, Okayama prefecture had the highest number of *juku*. The area of the future Okayama prefecture was generally well-off for educational institutions at the time of the Meiji Restoration.  

The oldest domain school in the country was established in Okayama domain in 1666. Okayama also had the third highest number of *terakoya* after Yamaguchi and Nagano. In fact, commoner education was particularly well developed in Okayama. Perhaps the most famous example of a *gōkō*, a community school established with support from the domain authorities for commoners and lower samurai, was Shizutani gakkō in Okayama domain.  

After the Meiji Restoration, reforms of education were attempted. The domain school was reorganized and Western learning introduced. New schools for commoners were opened, but mostly in the traditional style of *terakoya* or *juku*. The domain schools had to close after the abolition of the domains. Perhaps because commoner education was relatively widespread, Okayama suffered more than its share of rebellions against attempts to introduce modern schooling in the early 1870s. Nevertheless, the number of elementary schools grew, and by 1882 there were 742; from early Meiji, school attendance was above the national average. As in other prefectures, middle schools took longer to develop. In 1899 the sixth of the prestigious “numbered high schools” was established in Okayama, which became an educational centre for the Chūgoku and Shikoku regions of southwest Japan.  

How did these developments affect *juku*? Most of the *juku* listed in NKSS are recorded as having closed in 1872. Only five are listed as having continued for longer, one until 1877, and four that were still operating at the time of the investigation. It seems likely that other *juku* also continued or reopened, but
detailed investigations only exist for a few juku. At any rate, juku were the most important educational institutions for several years. An investigation carried out in 1879 lists 66 juku, 38 of which were recorded as offering secondary education (chūgaku), the others elementary education. Three of the four in operation at the time of the investigation for NKSS were still open; all were formerly listed as kangaku juku. As late as 1887 a kangaku scholar could set himself up as a teacher outside the larger towns, as shown by the example of Ōzawa Kichijūrō (d. 1921) in what is now the small town of Aida in the northeast of the prefecture. There is no evidence in the histories of education in the prefecture of a particularly suppressive policy towards juku, and juku provided most of the education beyond elementary level until regular schools were established.

The fifth-highest number of juku is recorded for Ōita prefecture (92), after Okayama, Nagano (125), Tokyo (123) and Yamaguchi (106). Subsequent research has brought the number up to 166 juku. Of these, nine which opened in the Tokugawa or early Meiji period are recorded to have survived beyond 1873–74. Most of the juku were kangaku juku. Twenty-seven juku opened after 1877, some as late as the early twentieth century; many of them offered several subjects, sometimes described as futsū gakka, indicating that they followed the mainstream curriculum.

Ōita prefecture is the home of the famous Kangien in Hita. It is recorded as having closed 1874. Until then, however, it flourished and had more students than ever during its last years. While the average number or entrants was 58 per year from 1801 to 1871, it was 84 between 1862 and 1871. The last years of Kangien also saw an increase in the proportion of samurai, although they still remained a small minority. Whether it really ceased to operate completely is not certain. Even if it did, it was reopened by Hirose Gōden, and under him and two successors a total of 338 entrants are recorded for the years 1885 to 1897, most of them local and in their late teens and twenties.

Only one private middle school (established in 1878) is recorded in Ōita prefecture before 1879. Ōita therefore appears as an example of a prefecture where new schools, at least at secondary level, were slow to develop, while traditional institutions filled the gap in provision.

The picture in Fukuoka prefecture, which borders on Ōita, is somewhat different. During the Meiji period, Northern Kyūshū with its coal mines became an important industrial region, but in
the early years after 1868 political confusion reigned, with several rebellions against the new government. Modern schools were few, only 131 elementary schools after the proclamation of the Education Law in 1872, and attendance was poor. However, by the end of Meiji there were 614 elementary schools and attendance was at 98.4 per cent, which compared well with other prefectures.

Education beyond elementary level took longer to develop. A public foreign language (English) school was established in 1875. The first normal school for teacher training was set up in 1876 and a middle school was added to it in 1878. By 1881 there were six middle schools with thirteen branch schools, but financial problems made further expansion difficult. From around 1890 education was reorganized and prefectural schools were opened. By the end of Meiji, Fukuoka had schools at all levels, including vocational colleges and the Imperial University of Kyūshū, established in 1910. The prefecture had a reputation for its education and was known as kyōikuken Fukuoka.

While modern schools were lacking, many juku continued to operate, sometimes nominally changing to elementary or middle schools. Table 3, with details of juku in Fukuoka prefecture, gives an idea of the continuity of traditional types of schools. The table is divided into three regions: Chikuzen, Chikugo and Buzen. It shows that a significant number of juku continued to operate after 1868 or were newly established after that date. Of the subjects taught, kangaku, alone or in combination with kokugaku [National Learning], medicine, and sometimes calligraphy or arithmetic, is by far the most frequent. Only for three schools is English named as a subject, in two cases in addition to kangaku. Yōgaku or Western Learning is not mentioned at

**Table 3: Continuity of juku in Fukuoka prefecture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Schools est. in Edo period</th>
<th>Still existing into Meiji</th>
<th>New schools est. in Meiji period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chikuzen</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikugo</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources: Fukuokaken kyōikushi, 689–700, 702–710; Ranbe, Nihon ni okeruchūgakkō, 346.*
all. Some *juku* were registered as private middle schools, like those of Tsunetō Seisai and Murakami Butsusanz (Chapter 3); a total of 23 private middle schools were recorded, all but 2 for 1879. Fukuoka then, despite the relatively low number of *juku* (50) recorded in NKSS, is another example of a prefecture where education flourished before 1872 and where *juku* continued to fill the gap in public provision for a long time.

Shimane is another prefecture where traditional education flourished. NKSS records 73 *juku* (47 *kangaku*), but again subsequent research has increased the number. Only 5 out of these are recorded to have survived beyond 1874 (1 to 1875, 1 to 1881, 3 to 1879). Between 1875 and 1879, 17 private middle schools were recorded, including the *juku* of Uchimura Rōka, named Sōchōsha, and Yamamura Benzai, named Shūbunkan (both 1875). Sōchōsha had 121 to 131 students between 1876 and 1879, Shūbunkan 73 to 80. Most other private middle schools were much smaller, only one (Tokubankō, established 1874), having 110 students in 1876, rising to 270 in 1879. Most of these schools had only one teacher, suggesting that they were run as *juku*. Thus *juku*, mostly centring on *kangaku*, provided post-elementary education until modern schools were established.

Like Shimane (but unlike Ōita and Fukuoka), Aichi prefecture was formed out of former domains close to the shogunate, including Owari (Nagoya), which was ruled by a branch of the Tokugawa family. But the region was not particularly known for its education; there were domain schools and *juku*, but scholars tended to pass through on their way to and from the centres of Tokyo, Kyoto and Osaka. After 1868 efforts concentrated on elementary education with some success, and for several years during the Meiji period school attendance in Aichi was above the national average. As in other prefectures, public middle school education took longer to develop. Efforts concentrated on reviving the former domain schools, but were not very successful. In 1877 a middle school, Aichiken chūgakkō, was established; in the following years the demand for middle school education increased as more people received elementary education, and in the 1880s private middle schools were established in response to this. But when Mori Arinori’s reforms permitted only one public middle school per prefecture, the private middle schools had to close or be content with the status of a higher elementary school.
Meanwhile, *juku* provided education beyond elementary level. Seventeen *juku* are known to have existed before 1870, all but two of them for *kangaku*. Most are recorded as having closed in 1872, except for five, of which at least one, Yūrinsha, reopened. After the closure of Meirindō, the domain school of Nagoya, many former teachers opened their own *juku*. Twenty *juku* were established between 1871 and 1872, most of them in Nagoya and by samurai. Fourteen of them were *kangaku juku*. *Kangaku* education was still in demand, partly because of dissatisfaction with what passed for modern education in the new schools. From 1876 to 1882, 14 new *juku* were opened, 10 of them offering *kangaku*, alone or in combination with other subjects. Over the following years subjects became more varied; of the 14 *juku* opened between 1883 and 1886, only 5 offered *kangaku*. Another tendency was that samurai no longer dominated as founders of *juku*.

Many of the *juku* were long-lived. Of the 65 recorded *juku*, 12 are known to have still existed in 1895, 1 until 1900, 1 until 1906 and 3 until 1908. Another, Yūrinsha, is known to have continued until 1908 or 1909. The most long-lived schools tended to teach more than one subject or be vocational in orientation. Three *juku* became private middle schools. The figures, however unreliable, show clearly the importance of *juku*, including *kangaku juku* for education in Aichi until the early twentieth century.

Hyōgo prefecture, the home of Ikeda Sōan’s *juku*, was composed of distinct regions, of which Tajima was the most isolated. The situation there differed from that in the south of the prefecture, where Awaji and the port town of Köbe were highly developed areas. Where the dates of closure are known, the majority of *juku* do not seem to have survived beyond 1874, as the above table shows.

Most of the *juku* were *kangaku juku*, but in Harima the subjects recorded are reading and arithmetic and/or writing, suggesting that they offered elementary education. The two reported to have survived to 1879 and 1885 offered *kangaku* and *kangaku* with history respectively. Thus it may well be that most *juku* in Settsu, Harima and Tajima provided education at a fairly low level and were soon replaced by the new elementary schools. In Awaji, the situation may have been different. Between 1877 and 1879, 12 private middle schools were listed for Hyōgo prefecture, none of them in Awaji. The three in Settsu (Köbe) were not previously
listed as juku there, nor the three in Tanba or the four in Harima. On the other hand, the two in Tajima were; one is Sōan’s Seikei shoin. The other is Midōkan, run as a juku in another location by Mori Shūichirō, like Sōan a commoner, from 1870 to 1873. The immediate impression is that juku, with the exception of a few prominent ones, were less significant here than in other regions, but more research is needed, taking into account the differences between Tajima, which to this day has few institutions of education beyond compulsory level, and Kōbe, where new schools were introduced early.

In the northern regions, the numbers of juku are smaller, and for Niigata prefecture a relatively low number (27) is recorded. Nevertheless, education in Niigata compared well with other prefectures in the Meiji period, suggesting that reasons other than the strength of educational tradition were important. The participation of commoners since the Edo period is conspicuous. Of 118 community schools for commoners (gōkō) and juku, over half were run by commoners. A few of these are known to have lasted into Meiji, including Seizendō (1879) and Chōzenkan (1912; see Chapter 4). Chōzenkan is reported to have had over 1,000 students from 1833 to 1912 and was singled out for praise in a report by the Ministry of Education in 1889. From 1879 to 1880, 7 private middle schools were opened; in 1879 the prefecture also had 5 public middle schools. The Niigata gakkō, a foreign language school registered as a public middle school in 1879, was among the top ten nationwide with the most students. By 1882 most private middle schools had become kakushu gakkō (9), but there were also 10 public middle schools. The number decreased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Existing in 1874</th>
<th>Closed after 1874</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settsu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harima</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajima</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1; rest no date given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awaji</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(no dates given)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to 9 in 1884, but Niigata ranked second nationwide after Fukuoka. In 1885, with 7 public middle schools, Niigata ranked first, together with Saitama. How long juku played a significant role, is not known. In 1881, 17 were recorded (2 had been recorded as middle schools in 1879), said to have been established between 1876 and 1881, but probably most of them, like Chōzenkan, were older. All were kangakujuku (one also offered National Learning).

Niigata prefecture thus illustrates how both traditional and new institutions of education flourished and contributed to the development of education in the region. Perhaps the high participation of commoners, rather than of samurai associated with the old regime, resulted in relative tolerance toward the old institutions, but this would need further investigation.

The number of juku NKSS lists for Aomori prefecture (8) is one of the lowest, but education in the region, particularly in the caste town of Hirosaki, was well developed in the late Edo and early Meiji periods. Again subsequent research (and reclassification of some terakoya in NKSS as juku) has added to the number of juku recorded: 70 for the whole prefecture. Twenty-three of these were in Hirosaki; several of them list reading and writing as their subjects, suggesting that their level was basic. Two are known to have continued beyond 1874, one until 1876 and one until 1884. The juku in Aomori prefecture were officially abolished in the early 1870s (see Chapter 5), but many continued or reopened, often as private elementary schools, which were tolerated in areas where there was no public provision.

Hirosaki is well-known for Tōō gijuku, a private school at post-elementary level. In 1872 the former domain school of Tsugaru/Hirosaki domain (Keikokan, established in 1796) was reopened as Hirosaki Kan Ei gakkō (school for kangaku and English learning); this school was short-lived but soon reopened as Tōō gijuku. It was founded by an association of men connected with the former domain school, with the support of the former lord. In 1874 it was listed as a private foreign language school, one of two in Hirosaki and three in the entire prefecture; in 1878 it was registered as a private middle school (the only one in Aomori prefecture).

Several juku are known to have existed in Aomori prefecture and especially in Hirosaki until the 1880s. The first regular middle school was established in Hirosaki in 1889, when it was moved there from Aomori. The 1880s saw the appearance of
dōjō ("exercise halls") offering physical education, martial arts and the study of kangaku classics to adults; these were not exactly juku, but they provided an opportunity for personal study with like-minded companions and in that sense replaced the juku. They did not, however, have one master; instead, the older members taught the younger ones. At least six dōjō were established.57 Onewas Meijikan, established in 1887 with around 150 members, including a small number of young students. It was presided over by a doctor and a bank employee, financed with monthly contributions from members and sometimes sponsorship from local leaders. It had its own grounds and buildings, where regular meetings were held. There was a literary section for lectures, debates and reading, a martial arts section and a physical education section. The dōjō was reportedly founded as a measure against the decline of the samurai spirit since the abolition of the domains and to offer a service to society. The establishment of Hokushindō in 1883 was reportedly similarly motivated; it offered the same combination of intellectual and physical training (bunbu), but also mutual support in cases of sickness and bereavement; during the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars this included help for soldiers and their families. It appears, that the dōjō fulfilled the need for education in a wider sense than that offered by schools and for a close-knit community. The conscious link with the samurai tradition reflects Hirosaki’s history as a castle town.

The figures and examples outlined in this chapter, sketchy as they are, show clearly that juku continued to represent an important sector within educational provision after 1872, although their importance varied from region to region. Often they functioned as middle schools until public schools replaced them. The number of juku established in the late 1870s and early 1880s is striking in some cases (Ōita, Aichi), suggesting that there was a rising demand for post-elementary education as a result of more children attending elementary schools.

The statistics do not tell us what the juku were like. The next two chapters will provide examples of different juku and describe some general features of juku education and life.
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BEFORE DISCUSSING JUKU IN GENERAL, the following portraits of individual teachers and their juku will give some idea of the varying patterns the word can describe. Four of the juku portrayed here, run by Yasui Sokken, Ikeda Sōan, Murakami Butsusun and Tsunetō Seisō, were established in the first half of the nineteenth century and continued well into the Meiji period, three of them over several generations. Mishima Chūshū’s juku, Nishō gakusha, established in the late 1870s when many of the older juku were closing, is the only one of its kind to have become a private university. Miwada Masako ran several different kangaku juku before establishing a private girls’ school, which exists to this day. All these juku in some way filled a gap in government provision, whether temporary or long-term. The examples also help explain why most juku eventually disappeared, though others survived, albeit after some transformation.

THE “OLD GUARD”: YASUI SOKKEN

Many juku of the Meiji period were established long before 1868, particularly in Tokyo. As Edo, it had been the political centre, where officials from the shogunate and the domains resided. As a centre of learning it attracted scholars who studied at the Shōheikō, the highest institution of learning at the time, and sometimes made the city their permanent home.

Yasui Sokken (1799–1876) is an example of a former student at the Shōheikō who opened his own juku in Edo and continued to teach well into the Meiji period. After his death the juku was taken over by a disciple, Yamai Kanroku and then by the son of his eldest daughter, Yasui Shōtarō.¹
Sokken came from Ogi domain (now Miyazaki prefecture) from a family of poor samurai who had to farm to make a living. His father was a Confucian scholar, and Sokken studied with him. He was a gifted student and could soon teach his father’s pupils. When around 20 years old, he went to Osaka to study for three years. He had little money and lived in a cheap rented room, cooking for himself and attending the juku of Shinozaki Shōchiku (1781–1851) as a day pupil. Apparently he learnt little directly from his teacher, preferring to borrow his books and study by himself. Since study at a juku was to a large extent self-study, this was perhaps not unusual. In 1821, after his elder brother’s death, he returned home, but in 1824 he travelled to Edo to study at the Shōheikō. His main teachers were Koga Dōan (1788–1847) and Matsuzaki Kōdō (1771–1844). During his time at Shōheikō he made many friends, including Shionoya Tōin (1809–67) and became well-known himself.

Sokken’s, lord Itō Suketomo, appointed him as a personal lecturer (jidoku), and in 1827 Sokken followed him back to his native domain. When a domain school, Shintokudō, was opened in 1831, Sokken’s father became the president and Sokken himself an assistant teacher. In 1833 he spent six months with his lord in Edo, where he lectured to other retainers from his native domain in his lord’s residence.

In 1836 Sokken once again set off to study at the Shōheikō in Edo, spending some time in Kyoto on the way. This time, however, he was less impressed with the Shōheikō and moved in and out of it several times over the next months. He did, however, prefer Edo, where he had many friends and colleagues, to his home domain and in 1838 settled there permanently with his family. He became an independent Confucian scholar (rōnin jusha), although he continued to serve his lord when he was in Edo, and from 1843 held regular group readings of the Analects of Confucius in his lord’s Edo residence. Moreover, he suggested measures to improve the economy of his home domain, including the introduction of silkworm raising and silk reeling as well as the cultivation of tobacco. Sokken took a lively interest in current affairs and wrote several treatises on problems of his day, including Japan’s relations with foreign countries. His outspokenness led to him being appointed to the post of daikan (local governor) of Hanawa in Mutsu province (now in Fukushima prefecture). But his friends intervened and he was relieved from the post on account of his age.
In 1839 Sokken opened his Sankei juku in Kōjimachi. Over the years he had to move several times, and in the beginning he was so poor that he could hardly buy books of his own and had to borrow them from a wealthy merchant. But his fame grew and by the late 1850s he is said to have taught hundreds of students, although only a few of their names are known. Many were talented people from different domains who later became political leaders or educators. Sokken was by then well known among the literati of Edo. Soon after moving there, he organized a literary association, where members would criticize each other’s work over drinks of sake.

In 1862 Sokken’s contribution to learning in the capital was at last officially recognized and he was appointed to the Shōheikō by the shogunate. This was remarkable, because until then the shogunate had only appointed Confucianists of the orthodox school of Zhu Xi and Sokken was an adherent of the kogaku (Ancient learning, pristine Confucianism) school. Only months before his appointment his wife Sayoko died. She had followed him from Obi domain and served him through the years when he was too poor to afford servants. Immortalized in Mori Ōgai’s tale Yasui fujin, she was held up as a model of virtue in middle school textbooks before the Second World War.

During the Restoration wars Sokken left the capital and stayed in a village farmhouse in Saitama prefecture for eight months. He spent his time writing, teaching and observing the hard life of the peasants. He returned to Edo at the end of 1868 and reopened his juku. He was offered a post in the new government, but declined on the grounds of his old age. He also declined when it was suggested that he become lecturer to the Meiji emperor. In the years before his death he suffered from ill health, affecting especially his legs and his eyesight. Many former pupils visited him during his last illness.

The name of Sankei juku is an allusion to a passage in a work (falsely) ascribed to Guan Zhong (d. 645 BC), a chapter in the Guanzi. Sokken explained the name and stated his principles in his “Sankei juku ki” [Record of Sankei juku]:

What does Sankei mean? The total measure of a day of a day is decided in the morning, that of a year in the spring and that of a lifetime in youth. Why does my juku bear this name? I thought of students, who tend to sleep late and indulge in their sexual passions. The students who come to
my juku are generally people determined to follow the Way. Why then do I think of them as sleeping late and indulging in their passions?—Young people can be expected to be pardoned because of their tender age. Their spirit is full and easily moved by things. Because they rely on their tender age and are easily moved, they easily become idle. When they become idle and indolent, then the plan for their whole life is ruined. Among all the creatures on earth, humans are the most worthy, and we are fortunate to be human. Among men, the noble man (shi) is the most worthy, and we have the good fortune to be noble men. Heaven has been good to us. Besides, our ruler and our parents provide for us and cause us to follow the greatest and highest way. Thus we [scholars] are the highest among the warriors. Yet in the end one cannot oneself appear different to the world. To run around aimlessly in idle amusement like dead flesh, believing that one has achieved one’s goal. —How does one differ from lice in a loincloth [i.e. they have chosen the common people’s ways of idleness and greed]. Therefore those who enter my juku must ponder the Three Measures (sankei), drawing methods therefrom. The measure of a life is decided in a year, the measure of a year in a day, and so day by day the heart and habits must be transformed. Look at the people who pass their days in lust and idleness! They are distant and do not connect with their hearts. If one does as I have suggested one can re-compensate heaven and the benevolence of rulers and fathers. And that which makes us noble can be extended. This is the basis of the Three Measures.

Sokken also drew up guidelines on studying at the juku, which were hung in the room used for lectures on the second floor of the building. These rules (Sankei juku gakuki, 1839) are typical of kangaku juku, but the reasons for them are explained in some detail, including statements of principle, which reveal Sokken’s thoughts on education. They are quoted in full here:

1) Rulers and fathers order us to study, because they fervently wish to help the realm and promote the household; it goes without saying that students must take their father’s and ruler’s desire to heart and study with dilligence, and it is vital to revere loyalty and honesty and
not to be careless, and to strive to govern oneself and to bring relief to the people. If there are people [during group discussions] whose attitude differs, this must not be ignored; people must exchange their opinions. That is why the sages defined the five human relations; ruler-subject, father-son, husband-wife and elder and younger brother, to which we add friend-friend, so that together we would improve ourselves and work hard, follow the right way and make the four main relationships all work. Moreover, if we polish our habits, then later, when we attain public office, we will be well able to advise rulers as good subjects and to discuss affairs as colleagues. We must not be careless in our efforts. Those useless ones of you who say things that are clearly wrong two or three times must be reported to me.

2) Confucius’ disciples had four strengths [i.e. virtue, speech, government and scholarship]. Rulers and fathers cannot force the development of talent. Each of us has to work on his strengths and later offer them for the use of the nation, that is the meaning of scholarship; the way of the sages is vast and without boundaries. But because to provide truth/ reason of extreme subtlety is not something that one person can complete alone, it is undesirable that one stubbornly sticks to the teaching of one scholar. However, in view of the fact that the teachings of the various scholars all rely on the canon of classics and guide people along the right way, each should be left to the type of scholarship they prefer, whether old or new. But when group readings (kaidoku) and discussions are held, harmony and peace of heart must be placed above everything, and fairness must be sought. If someone insists on their biased opinion and squashes what for someone else is right, then at the beginning of his studies he is the first to fall in with what is wrong, and thus it becomes a habit and later, when he enters public office, the harm he causes is significant.

3) It is hard to understand the meaning of a text without learning it by heart. Because understanding the meaning of a text promotes reading more than anything else, a free day is to be selected, and once each month a meeting where all read together will be held in the juku.

4) At rinkō [group readings] no one must be absent; if there is an unavoidable reason, advance notice must be given.
5) Although whether a body is strong or weak and the spirit (ki) is full or empty is hard to determine unconditionally, from early morning to late evening everyone must certainly study. For the remainder it depends on [individual] industry what each has to do. However, during the extreme heat of the sixth and the seventh months evening study is left to the student’s own choice.

6) The biggest harm to scholarship comes from drink and licentiousness. This applies not only to debauched conduct; if these two things are harboured in one’s heart one does not pour one’s whole energy into one’s studies and three days of reading do not have one day of effect. Thorough self-control has to be practiced. Especially in view of the fact that feminine charms are the root of calamity, if a person visits a brothel or has indiscrete encounters, the person has to leave the juku the following day. Even if an atmosphere of telling tales is undesirable, in this matter there have recently been not a few people who have destroyed them selves, ruined their families and brought sorrow to their ruler and father. Before it grows violent, we will deal with it strictly, administering small punishment for a big warning, this being the good fortune of the small-minded people who are warned in time; in view of this, if anyone hears something as mentioned above, then without objection it should be reported to me quickly. If anyone learns about it and covers it up, he will be dealt with as having been involved. You must all keep this in mind.

7) Although alcohol is not entirely forbidden, the rule should be observed as far as possible to avoid excessive drinking. If drink later results in violent disturbances and taking up swords and suchlike, the result will be expulsion the following day.

8) In the case of leaving the premises, students must bathe and arrange their hair and in addition make a report both on leaving and on returning. Of course, even if a student does not go on a long journey, even at night he must not leave without wearing a hakama [a type of divided skirt worn on formal occasions]. Because the gate closes at 5 o’clock, care must be taken not to be late. In the case of a long journey or some other reason, prior notice has to be given and a report made.
9) Students must on no account stay the night elsewhere; if someone is taken ill at their destination or if something occurs concerning their next of kin which makes it hard to leave and the student stays one night, he has to report this from his destination. Also, if there is some doubt, the circumstances will be investigated and directions given. If it has been reported in advance that the student will stay the night, these limitations do not apply.

10) Within the juku the use of alcohol is strictly banned. Apart from that it is not allowed to urge others to go out together to drink and buy women.

11) It goes without saying that crowding together was something the sages were concerned about; students must always restrain themselves with regard to obscene talk, vulgar songs and other things. Also it is inconsiderate to discuss in loud voices and throughout the night the meaning of the classics, political measures, military strategy and other affairs. The above paragraphs have to be agreed to on entering the juku.9

Students had considerable freedom to pursue their own studies and were not bound by any particular school of Confucianism, previous masters or Sokken’s own views.10 They were encouraged to voice their own ideas. It appears that Sokken’s own experience of study influenced the way he ran his juku; he himself had been largely self-taught before he went to the Shōheikō. The running of the juku was also informal, no jukutō [prefect] was appointed; four or five suitable students were chosen to keep things in order.

Little is known about the early years of the juku, including students. Lists of students exist from 1859, when Sokken drew up records of his associates and his disciples from memory. His biographer states that they include about 60 or 70 per cent of the students;11 of 188 names of students listed, 59 are for the year 1859. They came from all over Japan and included men who later became famous, like Nakamura Masanao (1832–90) and Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827–1910). Sometimes information on the students’ background is included, such as vassal of a domain, physician, merchant or official of the shogunate. Most of them appear to have been samurai, and a significant number came from Sokken’s home district. For 1860–61, 119 students are listed, for 1862 the number is 52. For 1863 only 14 names are listed and for
1864, 30. For 1865–67 the number is 152 and for 1868–71 320. After that there are no more entries in Sokken’s handwriting. An addition for the years 1872 to 1874 lists 88 names and for 1875–76, the names of 53 boarders are listed.

One of Sokken’s students was was Tani Kanjō (1837–1911), a samurai from Edo who became a military leader and politician in the Meiji period. He came to Edo and entered Sankei juku in 1856, and his writings, with parts of his diary, record information about his life at juku, daily studies and errands in town. At this time Sokken had a good reputation for his scholarship. There were about 25 students in the juku and conditions were crowded. Lessons consisted of hyōkai, group readings at which Sokken was present and discussions were somewhat restrained, and naikai, group readings in which six or seven students held discussions; these were livelier than those with Sokken present. Students were encouraged to reach their own conclusions. Questions they could not solve were put to Sokken. There were also lectures and special lectures on the Elementary Learning for the younger pupils. Attendance at lectures was not compulsory, but students had to attend the group discussions. According to Tani Kanjō, Sokken was severe and the juku generally strict, and everyone studied hard.

Like many scholars, Sokken left the capital during the Restoration wars. This was not just because of the general unrest caused by the fighting, but also because among the students attending Sankei juku, some supported the shogunate while others sided with the new government, causing conflict within the juku. After his return to the capital, Sokken reopened his juku in the residence of the lord of Hikone, moving back to Kōjimachi after the abolition of the domains. 1869 seems to have been a peak year, with 100 students enrolled. By 1871 the numbers were down to 40.

In 1872 Sokken submitted a report and in 1873 an application for his juku to the metropolitan government, according to the new regulations. The number of students is reported as 14, of which 5 were aged fourteen to sixteen, 3 aged seventeen to nineteen and 6 were older. Sokken stated that he was the only teacher. Fees were due on entering and leaving and on certain dates twice a year. Boarders paid 1 yen 25 sen plus costs for their food, day pupils paid 50 sen twice a year. The following is said about teaching arrangements:
For each shitsumon, rindoku, kaidoku, chōkō [question and answer, group reading and lecture sessions], the time is set for the afternoon from two to four or five hours, depending on how difficult or easy the readings are; the exact duration is not fixed. As for the remaining time, there is directed self-study of the Confucian classics, histories and ancient texts according to students’ ability, level of learning and age. Composition of poetry and prose is always supervised. The topic is left to people’s preference. However, sodoku [simple reading] is not thus limited.

In the report of 1872 some titles of the curriculum are given: Book of Odes, Book of Changes, Spring and Autumn Annals, Santaishi, Sanden (commentaries on the Spring and Autumn Annals), The Classic of Filial Piety, The Analects. In addition, Sokken states that histories, works of the sages, specialized works and Western works on astronomy and geography could be read depending on the students. The regulations cited in the application of 1873 are brief:

It goes without saying that the assigned subjects are to be studied hard; attention must be paid to words and actions, so as not to offend others. It is forbidden to go into drinking houses and tea houses and other indecent places.

Although Sankei juku appears to have catered for advanced students, it was officially registered as a private elementary school in 1874. From 1875 to 1879 it was registered as a private middle school. After Sokken’s death it was taken over by his disciple, Yamai Kanroku, who is registered as its owner in 1878. Later, Sokken’s grandson, Yasui Shōtarō or Bokusdō (1858–1938), took over. He was born in Sokken’s home to the master’s eldest daughter, Sumako. Bokusdō’s father was politically active and died in jail in 1861. Between 1865 and 1871 his family lived in Obi, but then returned to Tokyo. From 1876 Bokusdō attended the juku of Shimada Kōson (1838–98), whose eldest daughter he married in 1885, and from 1878 the juku of Kusaba Sensan in Kyoto, the heir of the Confucian scholar Kusaba Haisan (1787–1867). In 1882 he entered the Department of Classics (Koten kōshūka) at the Imperial University of Tokyo. He taught at Gakushūin, at the First High School and Tokyo Higher Normal
School and Daitō bunka gakuin, as well as at the private institutions Tetsugakkan, Nishō gakusha and Komazawa University. From 1902 to 1907 he taught in Beijing as an invited professor. He also played an important role in the Confucian association Shibun gakkai and taught at the association’s school. He was a respected scholar of *kangaku* in his time.

Given his busy career one wonders how much time he devoted to Sankei *juku*. It may well be that by his time the *juku* was very small and informal; a few students living with him and occasionally receiving private instruction while they attended other schools. While Bokudō taught at Gakushūin, many students from there are said to have attended his *juku*.16

Many of Sokken’s disciples felt a strong sense of community. Around 1868 some of them held a gathering in Kyoto, calling themselves “association of Yasui’s disciples” (Anmonkai). At this time one disciple was asked about his connection with another disciple from Yonezawa and suspected of siding with Aizu domain, which was still hostile to the new government. The disciple told them that his connection stemmed from their attendance at Sankei *juku* and if this was a cause for concern, then all the thousands of disciples must be regarded as suspect. In 1902 a more formal Anmonkai was established as a literary society, similar to one Sokken himself had presided over from the 1830s. It was still active in 1913.17

Sankei *juku* appears to have been typical of a traditional *kangakujuku* in the capital in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji periods. It had a small number of advanced students, most of whom were probably samurai. At the centre of it was the personal charisma and scholarship of Yasui Sokken, and although the *juku* continued in some form after his death, it declined after its founder’s demise. This was the fate of most *juku*.

THE MODERN SUCCESS STORY: MISHIMA CHŪSHŪ

Mishima Chūshū’s *juku* is exceptional. It is the only *kangaku juku* to have become a major private university. Unlike Sankei *juku*, it was established in the 1870s when some of the older *juku* were beginning to disappear, but in its early years it was similar to other *kangaku juku*.

Mishima Chūshū (1830–1919) was regarded as one of the “three great literary men of Meiji”. He came from Matsuyama domain,
from a family of village headmen; his father died when he was eight and was brought up by his mother. He was educated in his home and at a terakoya in his village at first, then, when about eleven, he learnt to read the Confucian classics in the juku of a Confucian scholar in a neighbouring village. In 1843 he entered the juku of Yamada Hōkoku (1805–77), who was then the head of the domain school in Matsuyama. Hōkoku was an adherent of yōmeigaku, the teachings of the Ming philosopher Wang Yangming (1472–1528), but he taught according to the principles of the Zhu Xi school of neo-Confucianism (shusigaku), and while Chūshū studied with him he read most of the Confucian canon. He became the prefect (jukuchō) in 1848 and had most of the responsibility for running the juku while his teacher was engaged in domain affairs.

Chūshū was ambitious and wished to further his studies by travelling to study with other great scholars of his time. Since Edo was a long way off he settled for the domain of Tsu in Ise, then renowned for its scholarship. There Chūshū studied with Saitō Setsudō (1797–1865), an adherent of the Eclectic School (setchūgaku), from 1852 to 1856. During this time he met with young scholars from other domains, including Yoshida Shōin, and travelled extensively. In 1854, when Commodore Perry appeared in the Bay of Edo for the second time, Chūshū travelled to Edo.

In 1857 Chūshū was employed by Matsuyama domain, but he was able to continue his travels to study. In 1858 and 1859 he spent several months studying in Edo at the Shōheikō, meeting with many famous Confucian scholars of his time. After returning to Matsuyama he became very busy with the affairs of his domain, including the domain school. Nevertheless, he began to run his own kangaku juku on land given to him by the domain. Little is know about his juku, but it appears to have been a success, since new buildings were added to accommodate the increasing numbers of students. He continued to travel in the service of his domain. During the ten years he served his domain, Chūshū benefitted from the advice and guidance of his teacher, Yamada Hōkoku, and like his teacher became an adherent of the Yōmeigaku school.

In 1872, the year after the abolition of the domains, Chūshū was employed by the Ministry of Justice, first at the Tokyo law courts, then from 1873 to 1875 at the newly established court of Niihari in Tsuchiura (Ibaraki prefecture). The two years outside
the capital were for him a time of comparative leisure after a period of duties that had allowed little time for study. In 1875 he returned to the Tokyo court and in 1876 he was appointed to the new Supreme Court. Much of his time in the service of the Meiji government was spent studying French law. In 1877 his post was abolished and he resigned from government. Thereafter, he devoted himself to education, although he held another appointment at the Supreme Court in 1888. Not only did he establish his own juku, Nishō gakusha, but he also taught at the Tōkyō Normal School (Tōkyō shihan gakkō) and at Tokyo University. In 1896 he was employed by the imperial court, becoming a lecturer to the emperor the following year.

Nishō gakusha began as a small, informal organization named Keikoku bunsha, founded in September 1877. In October 1877 Chūshū renamed it Nishō gakusha and put in a formal application. An announcement in the Chōya newspaper stated, “Even if Western studies are flourishing at present, if one does not realize their meaning through kanbun, they cannot serve the ordering of the state. But kanbun has a method, and if one does not study it, one cannot realize their meaning […]”. According to a letter Chūshū wrote to Shibuzawa Eiichi in his later years, he founded his juku to make a living, but also to stop the decline of kangaku in a climate of Westernization. Kangaku is named as the only subject. The number of students is given as 50. The school rules begin with a list of the texts to be studied: the Four Books and Five Classics, histories of China, collections of models for writing, histories of Japan (Nihon shi, Nihongaishi, Kokushiryaku) and “histories of all the Western countries”, as well as “translations of texts on economics, law and so forth”. The school regulations continue: “This school makes training kanbun its main aim, but since it is impossible to compose texts without being well read, we will, in addition to meetings for writing and discussing compositions, prescribe time for the Japanese, Chinese and Western texts mentioned above and teach them by means of lectures (kōshaku), group reading (kaidoku), giving opportunities for questions (shitsumon) and simple reading (sodoku)”.

Next follow the school regulations. Entry was from fifteen years upwards, and entrants needed a guarantor resident in Tokyo who had to submit an application in the prescribed format. If a student wanted to leave the school, the guarantor had to notify the school. Students who broke the rules three times or were lazy and misbehaved could be asked to leave after the
matter had been referred to the guarantor. Temporary absences due to illness or accident also had to be notified by the guarantor, and the secretary (kanji) had to be informed. Students were forbidden to borrow or lend money or to read aloud between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. They were allowed to take walks outside the juku between 5 and 8 p.m. Holidays were from 25 December to 7 January, from 20 July to 20 August, the 3 setsu festivals (5 May, 9 September, 21 December) as well as Saturday afternoon and Sundays.

In November 1877 an application for a branch school, named Nishō gakusha gaijuku, was made. The subjects were to be Shinagaku (Chinese studies) and the study of translated texts on economics, law and other topics. The juku was opened in the residence of a former samurai from Okayama, who was also the juku’s main teacher and administrator. The number of students was given as 20, and for the time being there were no boarders. Teaching regulations and textbooks were similar to those of Nishō gakusha. Not much is known about the branch school beyond the application, and it merged with the main school in May 1879.22

Together with the application for the branch school an application to introduce yōsan (Western arithmetic) as an additional subject was made, taught by a young man who had studied at juku for Western learning in Tokyo. It appears that Chūshū aspired to the status of “middle school with modified regulations” (hensoku chūgakkō) from the start, and the addition of yōsan was part of meeting the demands for this.

Not much is known about the early years of Nishō gakusha. Between October and December 1877 it had 32 students, 12 to 25 years old. Nominally, Chūshū was the only teacher, although in fact he had assistants; lesson times were not specifically fixed, but started at six in the morning and each lesson lasted from one to one-and-a-half hours. The school’s regulations were written by Chūshū himself and hung in the entrance and the lecture hall.23

In 1879 new regulations were printed.24 They include a statement on the aims of Nisho gakusha, entitled Kangaku tai’i [The Main Purpose of Chinese Learning] with the following text:

The aim of kangaku is to cultivate oneself, to govern other people and to become a person who will be useful in their lifetime; it is not to become merely a Confucian scholar whose learning and literary skills are without practical
application. Therefore, the foundations have to be laid by
justice and humanity and morality. This is the reason for
lessons in the Confucian classics. Furthermore, it is
necessary to know the changes of the times (jisei) and the
development of institutions and laws and to excel in the
talent of adapting to the changing environment. This is the
reason for lessons in history. But in order to put this
learning into practice it is necessary to employ writing to
expand and cultivate learning. Also, even if one cannot put
it into practice because it is not suited to the times, that
learning can be transmitted by writing and made available
for future generations. Therefore, since writing becomes a
tool to activate what has been learnt, that is not dependent
on circumstances, it must certainly be studied. This is the
reason for lessons in writing. To learn them it is necessary
to employ old and new models. This is the reason for lessons
to study the sages and the collections of model writings. To
include poetry may not be necessary, but nevertheless this
is a part of composition, and since it has a use for
expressing one’s will, these lessons must not be dispensed
with.

Thus we offer the subjects Confucian classics, history,
collections of the sages and poetry, and it is our purpose to
produce people who are useful to the world, who read
books, but do not fall into investigating texts to the smallest
detail and pick out individual phrases, who compose poetry
but do not get carried away into whittling away at every
word. Moreover, although the overabundance of Chinese
works cannot be exhausted with the few works we read in
our lessons, in this age yōgaku [Western Learning] is widely
practiced, and kangaku does not extend to reach the
minuteness of yōgaku’s final truths, laws, technology and so
forth. At least those who want to study learning that is of
practical use have to study Western works as well. That is
why we make the kangaku lessons simple, and just leave
space to study Western writings. If people wish to make
kangaku their sole object of study and hope from the start to
read widely, that is a reason for setting up the opportunity
for questions. We hope that all who enter this school to
study will understand this “Main Purpose” and then study
the lessons one by one and become useful in their lifetime.
Evidently, Chūshū read the signs of the times. His approach was pragmatic. He did not offer anything but *kangaku* in his school, but realized that his students needed to become proficient in Western learning as well and provided space for them to acquire it.

The regulations of 1879 also defined the tasks of the *juku*’s employees. The teaching staff (*kyōin*) were expected to adhere to the appointed lesson times and teach conscientiously. The administrator (*kanji*) was to act as the master’s representative, to deal with reports and applications to the metropolitan government and with the finances, to receive any visitors and to supervise the servants (*jukuboku*). The prefect (*jukuchō*) had to supervise *juku* affairs, to make sure students observed the rules and report them if they did not. Room prefects (*bōchō*) were appointed to supervise each dormitory and to meet daily with the new students and the students of the lower ranks to hear their questions. The prefects were chosen from the graduates by the head or, if none were suitable, from the older students.

The curriculum given in the regulations is among the most comprehensive for a *kangaku juku* and includes nearly all the works mentioned in other curricula. It was divided into four ranks, of which the fourth was subdivided into two courses, the rest into four. Twenty-three works are listed, beginning with the *Four Books* and the *Five Classics*. Most of them are Chinese, but some Japanese works in *kanbun* are included, such as the *Nihon gaishi* by Rai Sanyō, which was widely read, and the *Dainihonshi*, which was more unusual. Teaching methods are also mentioned: reading (*sodoku*), translating classical Japanese back into classical Chinese in class, descriptive compositions in class and composing argument and poetry in class.

The regulations stated that apart from the texts named, anything in Japanese, Chinese or translations from Western works could be read that did not do damage to good conduct or contradict national prohibitions. Moreover, students who were older, perhaps already pursuing a career or studying elsewhere and not able to follow the regular curriculum, could, if they provided an explanation from their guarantor, study whatever they chose.

According to the regulations, assignment to a rank was decided by general performance and performance in the examinations, held twice yearly, at the end of April and the beginning of November, or in February and July for late entrants.
Certificates were awarded as a result of the examinations. Students who had not yet sat the examinations were classified as kyūzen (not yet ranked).

Lessons, in the form of lectures, group readings and discussions (rinkō, kaigi shitsumon) or simple reading (sodoku) were held every morning from 7 to 9 a.m., although the exact time varied with the length of the days. On the fifth of each month poetry meetings (shibun kai) were held in the evenings from 7 to 10 p.m., and students had to hand in work for correction. No lessons were held on national holidays, on kigensetsu (Empire day) and tenchōsetsu (Emperor’s birthday), on Sundays or between 26 December and 7 January and 21 July and 20 August, as well as for five days after the examinations and on the last Saturday of each month. In addition, provisional holidays could be announced.

Entering or leaving the juku was permitted on the first and fifteenth of the month. New entrants had to be accompanied by their guarantor, who submitted an application for them. The entrance fee for boarders was 1 yen and for day students 50 sen. Monthly tuition fees were 50 sen to be paid in advance on the 25th of the preceding month; boarding fees were 2 yen. Juku fees were 10 sen for boarders and 5 sen for day students. On entry students also had to pay 1 sen for their eating utensils. Students taking part in evening meetings had to pay 2 sen for oil each time. On 12 July, 5 sen were collected from each student to be given to the cook.

The printed regulations governing daily life at the juku were more numerous than the ones in the application of 1877. They began by saying that students must above all observe correct practice and associate with each other with loyalty and courtesy; the more advanced should induct the less advanced, the less advanced should follow the more advanced and all should be diligent in their studies. There was a fixed seating order during lessons, determined each season by the opinion of the prefect and the administrator or by lottery. Students were expected to wear formal clothing (hakama) for lessons. They were expected to keep their rooms tidy and look after tatami mats and fixtures and respect other people’s belongings. Lending and borrowing, discussions in groups of three or more, urinating anywhere except in the toilets, letting the junk man in to sell things to him and eating and drinking in the rooms as well as going out as a group leaving the rooms unattended were
forbidden. Bedtime was between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m., during which time reading aloud was forbidden. The doors were shut at 10 p.m. or at 11 a.m. on holidays. The room prefect had to be notified if a student went to bed early because of illness. In the case of temporary absence the administrator had to be informed and personal belongings had to be put in order and given to the room prefect or a comrade for safe keeping. Punishment for minor infringements was confinement or points deducted in the examinations, for major ones, expulsion.

The curriculum and regulations were revised from time to time, mainly in order to comply with new laws issued by the Ministry of Education. Some of the provisions may well have existed only on paper. Shōda Yōjirō, who attended Nishō gakusha in 1882, claims that this was the case with the ranks, examinations and graduation. Education, he claims, was quite free, with plenty of time for self-study and attendance at classes not monitored. The following curriculum applied from 1879 to 1882; it mentioned 39 works, more than the previous curriculum, but omitted some works included previously. It is quoted here as an example of one of the most comprehensive kangaku curricula:

3rd rank

COURSE 3: Nihon gaishi [The Extra History of Japan], Nihon seiki [A Record of Japanese Government], Jūhatsu shiryaku [Chinese Shiba shilue; Outlines of the Eighteen Histories], Kokushiryaku [Outline of our National History], Shōgaku [Xiao xue; Elementary Learning].

COURSE 2: Seiken igon, Mōgyū (Mengqiu), Bunsho kihan (Wengzhangguifan).

COURSE 1: Tōshisen [Tang shi xuan; Selection of Poetry from the Tang Dynasty], Kōchō shiryaku [Historical Outline of Japan], Kobun shimpō(Guwen zhenbao), Fukubun (Fuwen).

2nd rank

COURSE 3: Mōshi (Meng zi; Mencius), Shiki [Shiji; Historical Records by Sima Qian], Bunsho kihan, Santaishi (San ti shi), Rongo [Lun yu; Analects].

COURSE 2: Rongo, Tōsō hatsukabun (Tang-Song ba da jia wen), Zenkōkansho [Qianhou Han shū; History of the Han Dynasty].

Over the years, details changed, but the essence remained the same. Mishima aimed to provide an education in the Chinese classics and in Chinese and Japanese history, while at the same time making concessions to the fact that most of his students would not be devoting all their time to kangaku. Moreover, he aimed to fill a gap in educational provision by the government and to adapt to government regulations. He envisaged middle school status for Nishō gakusha. In 1877, when he opened Nishō gakusha, there were only 31 public middle schools throughout Japan, not one of them in Tokyo, where the first one only opened in 1879. Nishō gakusha had the status of an “irregular” middle school (hensoku chūgakkō), but Mishima aimed to make it a regular middle school (seisoku chūgakkō).

In 1879, however, the government tightened the regulations for middle schools, and schools offering only a limited range of subjects became “miscellaneous schools” (kakushu gakkō). Still, there were only three regular middle schools in Tokyo and thus little pressure for private schools to conform. Nishō gakusha continued to provide specialized education in kangaku in the best juku tradition. Western studies, although recognized as important, were left for students to study in their free time. Mishima aimed to educate future statesmen and bureaucrats. Here Chūshū’s connections with the Ministry of Justice played a significant role. In 1876 the Ministry of Justice opened a law
school and admitted over 100 students. The entrance examination included *kanbun*, for it was thought that the students should not be confronted by Western learning without a good grounding in the learning of their own country. Once admitted, the students had no lessons in *kangaku*, but studied only French and French law. Consequently, many aspiring law students came to Nishō gakusha to prepare for the ministry’s entrance examination or for entry into the law school attached to the ministry. Others prepared for entry into the army’s school. When in 1882 the University of Tokyo established a department of Chinese and Japanese classics (*koten kōshūka*), many students from Nishō gakusha went there.

Mishima was obviously successful in filling a niche in provision. When it was established, Nishō gakusha had 32 students; by the end of the year, 42. The following year saw an increase to about 250 students. The Ministry of Education listed it among the 9 private middle schools with over 200 students. By 1881 student numbers had increased to 300.

The documents submitted to the metropolitan government state that Nishō gakusha had only one teacher. But in fact Chūshū, who had other commitments, gave his morning lectures and led the group readings (*rinkō*) in the evenings, while other classes were given by assistant teachers and prefects. In 1883 Nishō gakusha reported twelve teachers. Among those involved in teaching and running the school were Chūshū’s sons. His eldest son, Katsura, is even named as master of the *juku* (*jukushū*) in the early documents and up to 1887, although in 1877 he was only nine years old. From 1894 his second son, Hiroshi, is named as *jukushū*. He and Chūshū’s third son, Mata, also taught, and Mata took Chūshū’s place when he became too old to teach. He died in his forties, however, and was succeeded by Yamada Jun, a former student of Chūshū’s, in 1926.

The rapid growth of Nishō gakusha meant that it was soon no longer the typical *juku*, with no more than thirty students in the house or the grounds of the founder and teacher. The school buildings erected on the grounds of Chūshū’s residence in December 1877 soon became too small, and former samurai residences in the neighbourhood were used to house the students. The additional boarding houses were known as *gaijuku* (outer *juku*) and at first simply numbered. In January 1880 the first of these was rebuilt and named the Yanagi [Willow] *juku* after a willow tree on the premises. The following month Chūshū
moved his home to the grounds adjoining it, to make more room for the “main juku” (honjuku), as the original juku was now named. A new lecture hall was added. Additions were also made to the buildings of the other juku. In 1881 new ground was bought and the Ume [plum] juku, named after a plum tree on the grounds, established. By 1883, Nishō gakusha had 1,199 tsubo (c. 3956.7 square metres) of ground and 323 tsubo (c. 1065.9 square metres) of buildings, according to material in the Metropolitan Archives.31

At the time of its establishment, Nishō gakusha benefited from the conservative reaction to excessive Westernization, but the 1880s nevertheless saw a decline in numbers, probably as a result of government measures to control private education, economic depression (which caused student numbers to drop everywhere) and the ascendance of Western studies. Reminiscences of students who attended the juku in the middle and late 1880s give the impression that students interested in kangaku were in the minority and speak of lectures in the dilapidated lecture hall with grass growing between the tatami mats. In the late 1880s candidates preparing for the army and the navy schools reportedly even hired their own teachers and used the lecture hall as their own preparatory school.32 This may have been an exception, but apparently even in the early years of Nishō gakusha many students studied mainly elsewhere, using Nishō gakusha as a boarding house, since it had a reputation for being cheap. For example, Kano Jigorō (1860–1938), educator and founder of Kōdōkan jūdō, boarded at Nishō gakusha while studying politics and economics at Tokyo University.33 Mishima probably needed such students to make his school financially viable, but he did insist that they at least come to his morning lectures.

However, in the more favourable economic climate after the Sino-Japanese War, student numbers increased again to around 200. Even when the state school system became fully established and restrictions for private schools increased, Mishima managed to secure a niche for his juku, catering for students preparing for exams requiring kanbun. In 1900 a course in Japanese was established, partly in response to the Ministry of Education’s qualifying examination for teachers. In 1901 courses were divided into the main course and the course for preparing for examinations (honka, jūkenka). For the time being, Nishō gakusha remained a kakushu gakkō. Adapting to changing regulations, it
offered a preparatory course for candidates wishing to take the examination for middle school teachers. However, further changes in the state education system posed a potential threat to Nishō gakusha. In 1900 kanbun as a separate subject was abolished in middle schools. Kangaku scholars protested, and members of Nishō gaku submitted a petition, but the changes went ahead anyway. The increasing influence of Western civilization also contributed to the school’s difficulties. Student numbers in the early twentieth century fluctuated, but were usually well below 200. Financial difficulties persisted.

Mishima, however, could rely on alumni support. In 1886 some of his former students established the gakuyūkai (association of friends of the school). In 1903 alumni established the Nishō gikai to help their former school and collected money to support it. In 1909 the society applied for and received foundation status (zaidan hōjin) for Nishō gakusha. In 1919, just after Mishima’s death, the school itself became a foundation with the goal of making Nishō gakusha permanent and preserving and extending Eastern morals and letters. Thus the transition from a juku to a school was completed, and Nishō gakusha’s existence beyond the lifetime of its founder was secured. The financial support Nishō gikai was able to obtain from its members, as well as from leading businessmen and from the imperial household, helped secure the financial basis of the school. In 1910 the school had 200 pupils. It became a senmon gakkō (specialist school) in 1926 and attained university status after 1945.

Nishō gakusha began as a typical kangaku juku. What enabled it to survive and prosper while most of the other juku dwindled away? Several reasons can be given for Mishima’s success. He devoted most of his time to education and his dedication impressed his students. Many of the reminiscences mention his daily lectures, which he never missed however busy, and which apparently were always popular. He is reported to have shown much warmth towards his students even after they had left Nishō gakusha. But such characteristics are attributed to other teachers whose juku did not outlast them. What distinguished Mishima Chūshū may well have been that from the beginning he aimed to establish something for the long term. His timing was right. Mishima founded his juku in a climate favourable to kangaku. By the late 1870s reaction against the excesses of Westernization had set in, and attempts were made to revive Japanese traditions, including kangaku. The value of
Confucianism for moral education was recognized. Nishō gakusha fitted well into the general trend. The fact that some of the most prominent kangaku scholars of the previous generation died around 1877 (Hayashi Kakuryō, Yasui Sokken) may also have benefited Nishō gakusha. Moreover, Chūshū endeavored to fill a gap in the provision of education and strove to adapt the education he offered to the changing times. He benefited from his connections with the imperial house, the government and his alumni. Among his acquaintances were such influential men as the entrepreneur Shibusawa Eiichi (1841–1920), who became president of Nishō gakusha in 1919. By the 1930s Nishō gakusha had secured its position within the education system as a specialized school; its graduates were licensed to teach kanbun (1931) or kokugo (Japanese language, 1935) at middle schools without passing the public examination.

A WOMAN CHANGING WITH THE TIMES:
MIWADA MASAKO

Kangaku was traditionally a male domain and girls were not encouraged to study the Chinese classics. There were, however, exceptions even before the Meiji period. During the late Edo period, the number of female literati increased. Often they were the daughters of kangaku scholars. This is true of several women who were active as educators during the Meiji period, including Hio Naoko (1829–97), Tanahashi Ayako (1839–1939), Miwada Masako (1843–1927), Atomi Kakei (1840–1926) and Shimoda Utako (1854–1936).

Miwada Masako was the only child of a Confucian scholar, who gave her the same education he would have given a son. She was a gifted child and by 1855 she was already lecturing at his juku. Masako also studied with her father’s teacher, Yanagawa Seigan (1789–1858), and his wife, Kōran (1804–1879). In addition to kangaku she also studied National Learning. In 1866 she became a house tutor for Iwakura Tomomi, for whom her father had lectured. By then she was already well past the age at which a woman of her class was expected to marry and apparently she hoped to spend her life as a scholar and educator. But in 1869 she married Miwada Mototsuna (1826–79), son of the chief priest of the Hachiman Shrine in Matsuyama, and soon followed him to Tokyo, where he had a post in the new government. Mototsuna was one of those ardent loyalists during the final years of the
shogunate who quickly faded into obscurity once the new order was established. He soon left the government because of disagreements with Iwakura Tomomi and in 1872 opened a private academy for kangaku in order to make a living. Two or three years later his health declined, and besides caring for him Masako probably assumed an increasingly important role in his juku. In 1878 the Miwadas returned to Mototsuna’s home in Matsuyama, where he died the following year, leaving Masako penniless and with a small boy.

Masako refused to live with Mototsuna’s family or remarry, the usual solutions for a woman in her situation. Instead she opened a kangaku juku in Matsuyama in 1880. In this castle town there was plenty of competition from kangaku scholars associated with the former domain school. Moreover, Masako started off in a rented room with no money for books. Nevertheless she was successful. According to her own reminiscences, Masako based her teaching on the books her students brought with them, giving each student individual attention. The juku was open to girls, but at first only boys attended. They were over twelve years old and had graduated from elementary school. Apparently they practised martial arts at the juku as well, although they would not have been taught them by Masako. After only a year Masako was able to pay back her father’s loan and move to larger premises. From this time she named her juku Meirin gakusha. Together with her pupils she celebrated the academy’s first anniversary.

In 1882 Masako submitted an application to run a school to the prefectural authorities. According to this document, the aim of the school was to study texts (dokusho gakuka). The course lasted three years and was divided into six levels. The books to be studied are given for each level:

6 (lowest level): Four books, Five Classics, Kōchō shiryaku.
5: Kokushiryaku, Nihon gaishi, Nihon seiki, Jūhatsu shiryaku.
4: Ekichiroku, Mōshi (Meng zi, Mencius), Shiki.
3: Analects, Greater Learning, Book of Rites, Bunsho kihan.
2: Spring and Autumn Annals, Sashiden [Zuo shi zhuan; Zuo shi’s commentary on Spring and Autumn Annals], Book of Odes, Hatsu taika dokuhon.
1: Book of Changes, Book of Documents, Doctrine of the Mean.
Lessons took place on 290 days of the year, twelve hours each day, divided into 6 hours from 5 to 11 a.m. for the boarders and six hours from 3 to 9 p.m. for the day pupils. The traditional methods of lecture, group readings and group discussions were used. Examinations were held each month and at the end of each session. Prospective pupils had to be over 15 years old and to have mastered the *Nihon gaishi*. To attend the *juku* they had to be registered by a guarantor who would also notify the academy if the pupil wanted to leave. Regulations for pupils were similar to those of other *juku*; they were forbidden to leave the premises except during their free time; the gates closed at nine p.m.; punishable offences were damaging buildings and objects within the school, hurting fellow students, quarreling and creating disturbance. Punishments were admonition, notifying the guarantor, compensation payments, cleaning the school grounds, confinement or expulsion. These regulations are similar to those given in applications by male scholars.

Fees were 20 sen per month for boarders and 10 sen for day pupils. Masako paid 1 yen 60 sen rent per month and 50 sen for various costs. At the time the document was submitted, the *juku* had over 70 male and 3 female students. The rent was fairly high for the time, though the school fees were comparatively low.40

Masako was the only woman to run a *kangaku juku* in Ehime prefecture; two other women ran *terakoya*-type schools in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji periods, in contrast to Tokyo, where about half of the *terakoya* were run by women. The low status of women is shown by the fact that Masako’s application was signed by two male witnesses; her own son, who was only seven at the time, and her brother-in-law. The early 1880s were a good time for opening a new school in Ehime. The central government was increasing its efforts to spread education, but Ehime still had few schools beyond elementary level.

At the same time the government attempted to control private schools. When Masako’s application, having been accepted by the prefectoral authorities, was passed on to the Ministry of Education in 1883, the ministry disapproved of it on the grounds that no lessons in moral instruction appeared in the curriculum. In October 1884 Masako submitted a new application.41 This time the courses were divided into only two levels, each eighteen months long. The books were almost the same, with a few additions. A quarter of the weekly lessons were allocated to moral instruction.
From the new application it is apparent that Masako had moved her *juku* to another part of town. She gives her yearly income as 100 yen, her running costs as 25 yen and her own salary as 75 yen. If we assume that the rent for the new premises was about the same as before, around 20 yen per year, 5 yen would have been for other running costs. Masako’s income was low compared to that of teachers at the prefectural normal and middle school and about the same as the lowest salary a policeman drew.\(^{42}\)

By 1884 Masako had attracted the interest of the prefectural governor. He visited the school in 1883, sent his own children there and employed her to teach *kangaku* at the elementary school attached to the prefectural teacher training college in 1884 and at the teacher training college itself in 1885. Masako was the first woman to teach at the college. Among her mostly male pupils were two young women who later played a leading role in promoting women’s education in Ehime prefecture, Funada Misao and Shimizu Hide.\(^{43}\) Hide later also attended Masako’s *juku* Suishō gakusha, in Tokyo. Of the men Masako taught during her eight years in Matsuyama, several are said to have made themselves a career in the army, in the navy, in politics or as scholars.

Masako closed Meirin gakusha when her own son reached middle school age and she wanted to offer him better educational opportunities than Matsuyama could provide at the time. She moved to Tokyo in March 1887. There she opened a new *juku*, Suishō gakusha. The application is dated June 1887,\(^{44}\) and the stated purpose of her *juku* was to teach mainly English, *kangaku* and arithmetic. Thus Masako made concessions to the changing times. There was a stream for boys and one for girls; the girls were also taught etiquette, sewing, knitting, music, singing and *wabun* (writing in Japanese). There was a night school, and students could elect to study only one subject. Regular students entered at age twelve after graduation from elementary school, and the course ran for three years. Each year was divided into two semesters. Holidays were from 1 August to 31 August and from 26 December to 7 January, as well as Sundays and national holidays. Lessons lasted from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. for day pupils and from 7 p.m. to 10 p.m. for night school pupils. Examinations took place at the end of each month and at the end of each semester, and advancement into the next class depended on passing the examinations.
Although kangaku was still an important part of the curriculum, fewer weekly hours were devoted to it than to English, which claimed a total of 78 hours over the three years of the course, in contrast to kangaku and Japanese (wabun) with a total of 60 hours. English lessons included writing, spelling, reading, translation, grammar and conversation. A further 6 hours per week (from semester 2) were devoted to arithmetic, and 2 (year one) or 3 to moral instruction. Textbooks included various English primers and readers and Western histories.

The kangaku curriculum was much reduced:

Year 1, semester 1: Kokushi gaiyō
Year 1, semester 2: Kokushi ryaku, Nihon gaishi
Year 2, semester 1: Spring and Autumn Annals, Sashiden
Year 2, semester 2: Genmei shiryaku, Spring and Autumn Annals, Sashiden, Bunshō kihan
Year 3, semester 1: Analects, Hatsukabun, Shiki
Year 3, semester 2: (as semester 1)

Suishō gakusha was thus not strictly a kangaku juku, since a variety of subjects was taught, of which kangaku was only one, yet it still constituted a significant proportion of teaching at Suishō gakusha.

The number of teachers is given as seven in the application. Most were young men, whom Masako had taught in Matsuyama. The number of students is given as 50 each for the day and the night school. Students could enter at any time; a guarantor had to submit a formal written application, and an entrance fee of 1 yen had to be paid. School fees were 80 sen per month (half if a student entered after the 15th of the month), and half the amount for students electing to study only one to three subjects. Entrance fees and school fees for night classes were 50 sen each. There was no provision for boarders in the application; perhaps that is why there were fewer regulations for students. The application also included Masako’s running costs. According to her statement, her yearly income was 855 yen, 780 yen from school fees and 75 yen from entrance fees. Her expenditure was 855 yen, 615 yen for teachers’ salaries, 130 yen for accommodation and 100 yen for various expenses (sic!).

Suishō gakusha existed for less than three years; in January 1890 Masako closed her school because of other commitments. For the next few years, Masako taught at government schools, the
new music school in Ueno and the Prefectural Girls’ Higher School. In 1901 she joined the faculty of Naruse Jinzō’s Japan Women’s College. During this time, a few girls remained, some living with her, and studied *kangaku*. Once again Masako had a traditional *juku*, small, informal and devoted to only one subject. Aikawa Miho, who became one of the first teachers when Masako founded her girls’ school, recorded some of her memories:

Around 1897, the *juku* was in Kanda and there were 14 or 15 girls on the first floor of a house in Nishiki-chō [part of Kanda], which can be called the predecessor of the present girls’ school. At this time I came from the foot of Mount Fuji as a country girl with my father to ask for entry, and from then on I was close to her day and night. For several years she would wash rice and do the cooking on cold winter mornings with only one maid for company. Once the cooking was finished, she would make her preparations and then leave for work at the girls’ school, then near Kandabashi. I remember feeling that it was a pity to see her off at the entrance. At around three in the afternoon she would return, and without taking the time for a short rest would lecture to us. While hearing her patiently giving moral instruction based on the *Analects* of Confucius, the *Historical Records* (Shiki) of Sima Qian and other classics, the unappreciative young women, after sitting for a while, felt their feet hurt and go numb. We would rub dust from the tatami mats against our foreheads as a magic charm to keep our feet from going numb, and when you looked behind you, people were beginning to nod off. Young people today cannot imagine this kind of situation, and when I think of the valuable lectures I regret our rudeness. The people who were at the *juku* then will surely remember. The present headmaster was still a student, and the pupils of the *juku* all called him the young teacher. He was gifted in all respects, which shows that real talent blossoms from an early age. He often helped his mother look after her pupils. Now he is beyond doubt mature and in speaking and writing he is perfect. The present flourishing of the school is no coincidence.⁴⁶
Masako wrote several essays on women’s education and participated in women’s organizations: the Japan Women’s Educational Society and the Women’s Patriotic Association (Aikoku Fujinkai). She was also a member of the Japanese Society for the Expansion of the Way (Nippon kōdōkai), founded by Nishimura Shigeki. Most of Masako’s essays on women’s education appeared after the closure of Suishō gakusha and before she opened Miwada Girls’ School. At that time several works on women’s education were published, but most of them were written by men. Masako’s writings were informed by both her book learning and her personal experience as a woman, a wife, a mother and a teacher of boys and girls.47

In 1902 Masako founded a new school, Miwada Girls’ School, which became Miwada Girls’ High School the following year. She was supported by Yamashita Tomigorō (1870–1965), who had been her student in Matsuyama and whom she had adopted in 1893, three years after the death of her son. In 1894 Yamashita changed his name to Miwada Motomichi. He had intended to pursue a career in law and studied at Igirisu Hōgakkō, the predecessor of Chūō University, but changed his career and graduated from Tokyo Imperial University in 1901. After Masako’s death he took over the school.48

By the time Masako founded her own school, girls’ education had grown in importance.49 School attendance, which lagged behind that of boys, at last rose to over 50 per cent and in 1902 reached 87 per cent. The number of girls’ schools rose from 15 nationwide in 1895 to 80 in 1902. Most of them were public schools, but in 1901 Tsuda Ume and Naruse Jinzō had established private high schools for girls. With the increasing provision of girls came more controls and restrictions for private schools. However, many of them did not attempt to gain official recognition, because for girls gaining formal qualifications was still not seen as a priority. Masako, however, aimed for government recognition from the start. She established it as a girls’ school, but organized it to conform with the revised Girls’ High School Ordinance of 1899 and applied for high school status in 1903.

Masako did not expect public support for her school, but financed it out of her own savings, the proceeds from the sale of her house and gifts from parents of girls she had taught. Nevertheless, Masako had at least ideological support from leading members of society. Guests at the opening ceremony included the governor of Tokyo as well as Ōkuma Shigenobu,
statesman and founder of what is now Waseda University, and Naruse Jinzō. Ōkuma was also present at the first graduation ceremony in 1904, where he made a speech.

The application of 1903 emphasized the importance of girls’ education for the nation and stated that the aim of education was the provision of “good wives and wise mothers” (ryōsai kenbo). A guide to girls’ education in 1906 stated that the school was most suitable for girls from the upper classes, such as government officials and army officers. Masako catered mainly for the elite, but given that relatively few girls attended school after elementary level, this is hardly surprising. The school prospered; the number of pupils rose continuously and by 1925 there were 970. Masako acted as head of her school until her death in 1927. Miwada Masako was one of the small but significant number of women with a kangaku background who promoted women’s education in the Meiji period. She started her teaching career at her father’s and then her husband’s juku before founding her own. Although both her juku were short-lived, the school she established was intended to be permanent and to provide education for girls at a time when the government was just beginning to devote more attention to girls. Miwada gakuen has its roots in the tradition of kangaku juku, yet still flourishes today as a private middle and high school for girls.

THE RECLUSE: IKEDA SŌAN

Ikeda Sōan (1813–78) was a respected scholar, who spent most of his life in his home province of Tajima (now part of Hyōgo prefecture), a remote region with few educational opportunities. Sōan established Seikei Shōin in 1847, after having taught three years in Kyoto and four in his home region. Most of his students came from the surrounding area, but many came from further afield. His death spelt the end of his juku, but the buildings still exist and Sōan is well remembered, thanks to the efforts of Sōan’s former students and heirs.

Ikeda Sōan was born in 1813 as the third son of a wealthy farmer in the village of Shukunami in Yabu district. At the time of his birth, Shukunami belonged to Izushi domain, but in 1836 that domain was reduced in size by the bakufu, and an area including Shukunami came under direct control of the Shogunate, administered by the daikan (local governor) of Ikuno.
Sōan lost his parents as a child and was sent to a temple in a neighbouring village to be brought up as a priest. There he was taught systematically for the first time by the monk Kōjitsu Jōjin, who is said to have treated him as a son. Sōan could not read or write properly when he came to the temple, but he soon excelled at his studies. In 1830 the Confucian scholar Sōma Kyūhō (1801–79) came from Takamatsu (Shikoku) to teach in the village for a while, and Sōan was encouraged to attend. This became a turning point in his life; he decided to give up the study of Buddhism for that of Confucianism. When Sōma left for Kyoto 1831, Sōan followed him against the will of Kōjitsu. In Kyoto he had to work for his education and upkeep by becoming Sōma’s student helper (gakuboku) and assistant teacher; later he became the principal student (jukutō). During his time at Sōma’s juku he met the scholar Kasuga Sen’an (1811–78), who became his mentor and friend.

In 1835 Sōan left Sōma’s juku and continued to study privately in Kyoto, earning his living by teaching. From 1836 to 1840 he lived in Matsuo on the Western outskirts of Kyoto, devoting himself solely to his studies. He went home briefly at the end of 1837 and when he returned he took his nephew Morinosuke with him. In 1840 he was invited to lecture to the lord of Toyooka.
domain. He returned to Kyoto in the summer and opened a juku where he taught up to 10 pupils. As his fame grew, the people of his native district asked him to come home to teach there and promised their support. Apparently Sōan had intended to spend his entire life as a teacher and scholar in Kyoto, but several reasons may have motivated his return to Tajima. It may have been difficult to make a living as a teacher in Kyoto at the time, since more and more scholars were settling there and competition was stiff. Sōan’s health was not good. Besides, his long stay in

Figure 2: Portrait of Ikeda Sōan and copy of his Record of Seikei shoin (on display in the buildings of the former juku). Photograph: the author
Matso and his subsequent life and writings suggest that he was not averse to the life of a recluse, and yearned for quieter surroundings.

In the spring of 1843 Sōan returned to Tajima and took over a building in the village of Yōka, where the local scholar Nishimura Sendō had taught in the tradition of Ishida Baigan until his death. The building was called Risseisha. Sōan started with 15 students, the number increasing to 35 in his first year. Soon Sōan had so many students that in 1845 he had to have another building erected. Sōan seems to have been content with life in Tajima; he did, however, miss the intercourse with other scholars, and when he sent his nephew Morinosuke to study with Kasuga Sen’an in 1844, it was as much for his own sake as for his nephew’s.

The number of students continued to grow, and Sōan acquired his own premises in his native village and built Seikei shoin in 1847. Here he continued to teach for the next three decades until his death. For some years he lectured at the domain schools of the neighbouring domains of Toyooka and Fukuchiyama, but he always returned to Shukunami. He declined an invitation to an official post in Utsunomiya domain in 1852. His fame grew and

Figure 3: Reading stand used by Ikeda Sōan (on display in the museum). Photograph: the author
pupils came to study from further and further afield. Soon Seikei shoin too had to be extended. A new boarding house built in 1858 was named Shōgiryō, and in 1863 a new extension named Seigiryō was built.

Occasionally, Sōan took his nephew and a few students on lengthy trips to visit other scholars. In 1845 they went to Shikoku to meet the scholars Hayashi Ryōsai (1807–49) and Kondō Tokuzan (1766–1846) and others, as well as to Kyoto to meet his old scholar friends. In 1851 they travelled to Edo to study with Satō Issai (1772–1859). The meeting was somewhat disappointing, but Sōan had the chance to meet with other scholars, including Ōhashi Totsuan (1816–62), and to copy rare books from the Shōheikō. In early 1858 Sōan took two pupils to Kyoto and Osaka.  

In the last years of his life Sōan was beset by misfortune. His nephew and prospective heir had already died in 1852, at only 26 years of age. Now he lost his two brothers, his eldest daughter and his eldest son. in 1877 he became ill himself and travelled first to Kyoto, then to Tokyo for treatment. In Tokyo he was treated by the German doctor Erwin Bälz. In May 1878, feeling slightly better, he returned home, but died in September.

Ikeda Sōan’s scholarship was derived from yōmeigaku, that is the scholarship based on the philosophy of Wang Yangming (1472–1528), which emphasized the unity of knowledge and action and the role of the human heart (kokoro) in understanding. But his ideas developed from a mixture of different schools. His first teacher in kangaku, Sōma Kyūhō, was a disciple of Ōgyū Sorai, one of the foremost representatives of the kogaku school that aimed to return to the original texts of Confucius and Mencius and to define fundamental Confucian terms. Besides yōmeigaku, Sōan studied shushigaku, the school based on the philosophy of Zhu Xi, during his studies in Kyoto. During his lifetime Sōan published a commentary on the Greater Learning. His commentaries on the Doctrine of the Mean and the Book of Changes were published posthumously.

One strand of yōmeigaku emphasized political action and several of its adherents became well known, such as Yoshida Shōin and Saigō Takamori. Sōan’s friend Kasuga Sen’an was another representative of this branch of yōmeigaku. He became involved with the sonnō jōi movement in Kyoto and was arrested during the Ansei purges. Sōan, however, represented the contemplative strand. One reason may have been his birth;
unlike his scholar-friends, he came from a family of farmers and he was deeply conscious of his station (bun). His Buddhist training may also have led him to favour the more contemplative strands of Confucianism. Sōan did not encourage political activism in his pupils either. When some of them wanted to take part in the Ikuno rising in 1863, he dissuaded them but, when unsuccessful, he expelled one student and cautioned the others. He then assembled all his other students and warned them not to be swayed by the events of the times.

Sōan’s penchant for contemplation and introspection is reflected in journals, entitled Sansō kōka and Igyō yokō. Sansō kōka is a kind of study journal, begun in 1847. Apparently Sōan felt he had not achieved much in the previous ten years. The journal was intended as a daily reflection on his diligence (or otherwise) in his studies, teaching and actions, for his own encouragement. Sōan recorded what he read, taught, the time he spent in silent meditation, events and visitors. The record shows that Sōan studied whenever possible. Inevitably, events such as the birth of his children, illness in the family, visitors or errands requiring that he leave the house interfered with his studies, and he regarded days when he failed to read as wasted.

Igyō yokō is a collection of maxims Sōan recorded between 1860 and 1877. They are a mixture of general observations and personal reflections. Many stress the importance of study, especially of reading the classics and the histories (keishi; e.g. nos. 1, 104, 166) and of following the Way without being swayed by the ways of the world. Others speak of the merits of a contemplative life in seclusion, devoted to study, meditation and self-improvement (nos. 39, 40, 343, 488, 490, etc). In more personal reflections he states that he must be a disappointment to his parents (57) or speaks of the loss of his daughter (368, 369). A few deal with teaching; for example he stresses the responsibility of both teacher and student for learning (63) and of making students do domestic tasks (94), because “in this way a weak spirit will be rectified, fooling around will be prevented, the body and mind will be kept healthy and the muscles hardened”, and students will be made fit to deal with responsibilities and hardships in later life. Sōan would dictate one of his maxims to his students once or twice a month for their writing practice.

Sōan’s teaching flowed from his own study and pursuit of self-improvement. He attached great importance to training in self-discipline and moral education as well as observance of correct
forms. The day began and ended with a short ceremony in which the pupils, after tidying their persons and putting their writing utensils in order, would sit lined up according to age to greet their teacher. Lessons themselves were informal. There were no desks, so pupils could not hide behind them and fool about; the texts were spread on fans. There were no formal ranks; pupils were grouped together roughly by ability, so group sizes varied. The older pupils taught the younger ones after being thoroughly briefed by Sōan. Lectures based on the Confucian classics were held in the morning and in the afternoon. There was not much teaching of composition and none of poetry. Sōan sometimes gave special lessons to slow or to exceptionally enthusiastic students.

There was no formal curriculum until 1871, when the ministry of education demanded it. The list of texts prepared for submission then contains the usual Confucian classics, grouped in order of priority:

- Outlines of the Eighteen Histories, Spring and Autumn Annals, Sashiden.
- Bunsho kihan (Wenzhang guifan), Tōsō hatsukabun.59

Other texts were used according to students’ needs.

Outside lessons, pupils were encouraged to exercise and made to work in the fields. They also took turns helping with household duties, according to their age; the oldest pupils were responsible for finances, supervising the younger ones and appointing people for different tasks. Some days, when there were no lectures were designated cleaning days. Sōan considered taking part in the daily chores as part of the education.

There were few rules; Sōan placed trust in his pupils. As with the curriculum, rules were only written down in answer to official demand, probably in 1871. Even then there were only six of them, which can be summarized as follows:

1) All were to sleep and rise together, unless a pupil felt sick.
2) Eating and drinking in the dormitories was prohibited.
3) The rooms were to be kept tidy.
4) The teacher or the head student was to be told of any comings and goings.
5) Behaviour outside the juku was to be based on the general rules.
6) Questions about the education in general were to be addressed to the ryōsekichō [highest ranking student in the dormitory], questions relating to the juku to the sekichō [highest ranking student].

Those whom Sōan deemed suitable were given responsibility for maintaining discipline. Sōan dealt with delinquents by talking to them and making them sit in silent meditation to reflect upon their misdeeds. If they offended a second time he notified the parents and if they offended a third time they had to leave; this happened rarely.

Not much is known about tuition fees. It appears that some kind of payment was offered at mid-year and at the end of the year. In autumn 1873, in answer to government orders, Sōan reluctantly submitted a formal application to run a juku. In a memorandum drawn up at the same time he laments the fact that he is forced to take this step (see Chapter 4). The issue of fees in particular disturbed him, since for him teaching was not something one did for the money. The application stated that entrance fees were left to the discretion of the students and that monthly fees were 6 gō (1.08 liters) of white rice and 1 sen 7 ri in money. Teaching was described as consisting of lectures and individual reading and texts named were the Four Books and Five Classics and the Elementary learning; others ranged from the Kinshi roku to the collections of writers from the Song to the Ming as well ancient and modern Chinese and Japanese histories and European and Korean texts. The only juku regulation mentioned in the application is that seating order was to be independent of rank or ability, solely according to age, with the exception of students from the nobility, who were to be seated at the top of the class. Apparently Sōan insisted on this, although in 1871, when for the first time a member of the court nobility and the son of a feudal lord had entered the juku, Sōan’s decision to seat them apart from the others had led to opposition from students of the samurai class, who themselves were not treated differently from commoners.
Who were Sōan’s students? A total of 673 names are recorded in the student register from the time of Sōan’s return to Tajima to the end of his life. In the first five years, while he was teaching at Risseisha, Sōan taught a total of 62 pupils, most of whom came from Tajima and many from the surrounding Yabu district. Local students continued to be in the majority; 390 or 58 per cent from the register were from Tajima province. But the years 1865 to 1872 saw an increase in the number of students from outside Tajima. The overall number of entrants varied from year to year, but rose significantly from the 1860s. The highest number of 46 students is recorded for 1868 and after 1868 the number of entrants was between twenty and forty, except for 1873 (10) and 1878, the year of Sōan’s death (12). Apart from Tajima, many pupils came from neighbouring provinces, such as Inaba, Harima, Tanba and Tango, places where Sōan had personal connections. A significant number also came from Sanuki, including Tadotsu domain, where Sōan had visited Hayashi. Some came from as far afield as Hizen and Shimotsuke, including Utsunomiya domain, which had invited Sōan to an official post. The increase of students from outside Tajima after 1868 contrasts with the juku of Seisō and Butsusan in northern Kyūshū (see following section). It included students from regions that had not been represented at Seikei shoin before, such as Hitachi, with two from Mito domain entering in 1871, and Kaga, with two pupils from Kanazawa domain entering in 1870 and one in 1871. Often several students from one province would come from the same district, suggesting that Sōan’s name became known among a group of people, perhaps after one pupil had gone to Seikei shoin. Most students were commoners, but many, especially among those that came from other regions, were samurai. In the years 1868 and 1869 the majority of entrants were samurai. Overall, out of the 673 named in the registers, 174 were samurai, 445 commoners, 8 physicians, 3 Shintō priests, 3 Buddhist priests and 2 members of the nobility.

The registers only tells us when a pupil entered, not how long he stayed, so it cannot be said precisely how many pupils were there at any one time. Moreover, many students came from local farming families and their attendance would have varied with the seasons. In 1862 Sōan notes that he had 30 boarders and 8 to 9 day pupils. In 1868 the number sank to around 10, but the same year saw a record number of entrants, and the buildings had to be extended. In 1869 he noted that he had about 50 in his juku.
At times up to 60 pupils are said to have lived in the juku, in two boarding houses of two floors each. The surviving building, situated on the side of a hill, is reached by a flight of stone steps built in 1856. The lower storey has a kitchen and six rooms of different sizes. The upper storey also has six rooms. The two back rooms on the lower floor were added later. On the ground floor much of the original materials can still be seen. The students slept on the second floor. Students cooked their own meals, buying their own rice, salt, firewood and coal, fetching water and using vegetables grown in the fields nearby. Sōan ate with his students. The students also did their own cleaning and prepared their bath six times a month.66

The numbers show that Seikei shoin thrived even after the introduction of the Education Law in 1872. The number of entrants remained high until 1877, the year before Sōan’s death, and many entrants came from outside Tajima. The isolation of the region and the lack of alternatives may well be the main reason, but the high number of students from other regions suggests that Sōan’s person and teaching attracted students and contributed to the enduring success of Seikei shoin.

After Sōan’s death there was no one to take over Seikei shoin, so it ceased to exist as a juku. Sōan’s second son had died young, in 1896, his eldest daughter had died childless and his second daughter’s son also died young. So in 1900, Shionoya Kumejirō was adopted into the Ikeda family. He taught kanbun at Toyooka middle school. Meanwhile, Sōan’s students had begun activities to keep the school’s memory alive.67 In 1880 a memorial to Ikeda Sōan was erected with Chō Sanshū providing the writing. In 1887 a group of former students formed the Society to Preserve Seikei shoin (Seikei shoin hozon kai), which became a foundation (zaidan hōjin) in 1910, and from 1917, when he retired from teaching, Sōan’s heir ran it. In 1907 preparations began for celebrating the 30th anniversary of Sōan’s death, and Toyoda Shōhachirō, a former pupil and now headmaster of Toyooka middle school, wrote a biography entitled Tajima Seijin [The Sage of Tajima]. Two years later, in 1909, the publications of Sōan’s works, under the title Seikeizenshū, began. It was completed in 1929 with support from Hyōgo prefecture. In 1932 Kumejirō died. His eldest son Kumerō (Shisei) was a journalist in Tottori at the time. He returned to Tajima in 1944 and has written a biography of Ikeda Sōan.
Efforts to commemorate Ikeda Sōan and Seikei shoin continue to this day (Chapter 6). Thus it appears that Ikeda’s desire to be remembered by posterity, even though he lead a quiet and secluded life, has been granted.

**THE COUNTRY SCHOLARS: TSUNETŌ SEISŌ AND MURAKAMI BUTSUSAN**

If *kangaku juku* continued to be important in Tokyo, where most of the new schools for Western education were concentrated, they played an even greater role in rural areas, where educational provision lagged behind for a long time. Fukuoka prefecture is a good example.

One of the most enduring *juku* was Zōshun’en, established in 1824 in Buzen by Tsunetō Seisō (1803–61). Born into a family of Confucian scholars, many of them doctors, he is said to have loved books and poetry from an early age. In 1819 he entered Hirose Tansō’s Kangien, where he studied for five years and became prefect (*jukuchō*). Even after he left he continued to keep in touch with his teacher. Seisō travelled to Nagasaki, where he lived with Takashima Shūhan. He continued to travel after he had established his *juku*.

Seisō modelled his *juku*, at first named Jienkan, after Kangien. Even the layout of the buildings followed that of Kangien. The Tsunetō living quarters were in the middle of the grounds, with a separate study. Next to the study was the schoolroom and behind it a two-storey building with dormitories. Behind these was a lecture hall and more dormitories. Opposite the study, shielded by a mud wall built by students, was a kitchen for the students. Outside the compound a three-storey building served for receiving guests and holding poetry parties. The living quarters and study still remain (see Figures 4 and 5).

The organization of the *juku* also owed much to Kangien. Students were divided into groups according to their ability and regular tests were held. There were ten groups, the tenth being for newcomers whose level of knowledge was unclear. The other nine were divided into a lower rank (*gekaisei*; groups 9, 8), middle (*chūkaisei*, 7, 6) and upper rank (*jōkaisei*, 5 and above) for lessons. The curriculum was narrower than at Kangien, consisting mainly of the Confucian classics and works on Japanese history, as the following list of texts used shows:
Figure 4: Building of the former study at Zōshun’en. The building has been restored and is part of the Tsunetō home. *Photograph: the author*

Figure 5: Plan of Zōshun’en, with lecture hall at the top left and dormitory at the top right and Tsunetō residence in the centre. The study is just above the lake at the bottom of the picture. *Photograph: the author*
Lower rank


Reading groups: Kokushiryaku, Nihon gaishi, Nihon seiki, Jūhatsu shiryaku, Genmei shiryaku, Mōgyū.

Lectures: Classic of Filial Piety, Four Books, Five Classics, Shoshi [writings of the sages].

Reading groups: Shiki, Shunju gaiden (kokugo), Sengokusaku, Kanpishi, Kansho, Hatsukabun, Bunsho kihan etc.

Upper rank

Lectures: Five Classics.

Reading groups: Soji, Bunsen, 3 commentaries on the Spring and Autumn Annals, Zukan kōmoku.

Teaching methods were the usual ones at the time; simple reading (sodoku), group reading (rinkō), lectures (kōgi), discussions (dokukenkai, tōronkai) and lessons in composition and Chinese poetry. Students were expected to study by themselves and present the results in the discussion groups.

Details about the organization of juku can be glimpsed from a surviving proclamation of 22 rules and points of organization drawn up by Seisō himself. The first point treats the tasks of the prefect, various officers, including three responsible for the different buildings of the juku, one for visitors and one for new students; they are all urged to work diligently in place of Seisō himself. This was important since he was often absent. The second point stressed the importance of making pupils feel at home. Seisō states that parents sending their sons to the juku surely expect them to stay there for six to twelve months; if new students claim to have business at home, it means that they have not become used to the place, and all efforts must be made to make them feel at home. The third point is a general admonition; students should not resent having a low rank in the juku to begin with, but work hard in order to rise to the top. Students were expected to study by themselves between 4 and 10 p.m. and then to keep quiet.

Most other points deal with daily life in the juku. The room prefects were expected to keep records about the students’ daily activities. Students took it in turns to clean the dormitories and place waste paper into bins outside the house twice daily, to help at mealtimes and to keep watch at night. Students unable or
unwilling to do these tasks themselves when their turn came were permitted to pay the poorer students to do them. The poorer students were allowed to cook for themselves, while everyone else was expected to eat with the others in the refectory, except on certain days when students were allowed to make their own arrangements and to drink sake. These days were the 5th, the 15th, the 25th and the sekku holidays. On the 16th of each month and on holidays a general cleaning of the juku and the garden would be held and students took it in turns to help. Not much is said in the way of regulating students’ behaviour. Students had to pay if they damaged the tatami mats and the sliding doors. They were forbidden to lend or borrow money and urged to look after their money or give it to the head for safekeeping. They had to report any temporary absence and wear formal dress if they went out. If they fell ill they had to consult a doctor and receive medicine; suspected malingerers were closely examined by the responsible officer and reported.

Punishments are not recorded in this document, but are said to have consisted of chastisement at the front of the lecture hall or standing in front of the teacher holding a pot filled with water for smaller offences like stealing fruit from the neighbours’ gardens. For graver offences students had to spend two or three days copying texts in front of the teacher, who would correct their errors. This was considered a particularly harsh punishment.\(^{72}\)

During the time of the Tempō famine, in 1837, Seisō made a temporary proclamation.\(^{73}\) He stated that in his experience poor students progressed well in their studies while rich ones did not. He extolled the virtues of simplicity and frugality and urged the rich to learn from the poor. Seisō then referred to the present times; apparently some students were still eating and buying at a time when other people were starving.

Students are likely to have been about 14 or 15 years old on entry, having acquired literacy and simple kanbun at a terakoya. Many stayed for three or four years, but there was no fixed term. Some would then move on to other juku to continue their studies. Several entrance registers (monjinchō) exist, but they are far from complete. For the years from 1825 (the year after Seisō established his juku) to 1871 records exist for only 25 years. For the years 1872 to 1877, the records are even more incomplete.\(^{74}\) The registers list a total of 475 students. Most of them came from the surrounding region; others came from neighbouring regions, Bungo (Ōita prefecture), Hizen (Saga, Nagasaki), Higo (Kumamoto). A
substantial proportion came from further afield; Chōshū (Yamaguchi), Suō (Yamaguchi), Aki (Hiroshima), Harima (Hyōgo), Iwami (Shimane), Sanuki (Kagawa), that is, chiefly from southwest Honshū and Shikoku, occasionally from the Kinki region around Kyoto. Many students came from temples.

The records, incomplete as they are, suggest that the number of entrants was particularly high in the 1830s and 1840s: 20 in 1834 and in 1837; 17 in 1838; 19 in 1840; and 24 in 1846. The records for the 1860s are especially confusing, perhaps mainly because Seisō died in 1861 and his son did not take over until 1864, or possibly because of the political upheavals. The lists for 1864 include 18 names, for the following year, 23. In the early Meiji years student numbers appear to have been high again, with 23 in 1868, 35 in 1869,16 in 1870 and 33 in 1871. Records for the later years seem less than reliable, but as late as 1880, 20 entrants are recorded, and the last record in 1886 lists five students. It appears that after 1868 most students were local, with fewer from temples; no names of temples are recorded after 1871.

Seisō was succeeded by his eldest son Seisai (1842–95). Seisai’s intellectual background differed from his father’s. His teachers were a Confucian scholar in the employment of Nakatsu domain and a scholar from Kumamoto, who traced his intellectual ancestry to Yamazaki Anzai. In 1859 Seisai accompanied his father to Kyoto where he studied while Seisō lectured at the Nishi honganji temple. Seisai may well have left much of the running of the juku to others; he did not take over until three years after his father’s death, after he had studied in Kumamoto.75 Much of his time was spent teaching elsewhere, such as the domain school in Kokura where he became a Confucian scholar for the feudal lord in 1868. From 1892 to 1895 he taught at the Nishi honganji in Kyoto. In 1884 he was honoured by the Ministry of Education for his contributions to education.76 After his death his students at Zōshun’en honoured him with a commemorative stone (1912), the text for which was drawn up by Suematsu Kenchō, a student of Murakami Butsusun, whom Seisō and Seisai had been acquainted with.77

A list of “Seisai’s disciples” includes 119 names,78 There is some overlap, though not much, with the list of entrants. It is likely that these were students from the last years of the juku, and usually only their former post is given. Most of them were local businessmen (34) or in local or prefectural government (24); the
next largest group are members of temples (18) and teachers (11). Others were in national government and the military or worked as doctors or lawyers. From this sample it would seem that students typically became leading members of the local community, with some rising to leading positions on a national level.

In 1878 the juku was renamed Shiritsu (private) Zōshun gakkō. It may have closed shortly after 1886, the year we have the last student register. However, members of the Tsunetō family continued to be involved in education; Saisō’s eldest son, Baison (1869–1955), was a prominent teacher and educator, and his grandson, Tsunetō Toshisuke, who resides in the juku buildings, now designated a cultural asset, is a high school teacher.

Not far from Zōshun’en, in the village of Hieda, now part of the town of Yukuhashi, lies Suisaien, perhaps the most famous juku in Kyūshū after Kangien. Suisaien was established by the Confucian scholar and kantshi poet Murakami Butsusun (1810–79) in 1835. Suisaien usually had more students than Zōshun’en from the 1840s onwards, especially after 1868, when attendance levels peaked. After Butsusun’s death, Suisaien was taken over by his nephew, whom he had adopted, and continued until 1884, when it had to close. By then Hieda had its own public school.

Butsusun came from a family of country samurai (gōshi). He received his first schooling in 1818 from a local Shintō priest who ran a terakoya-type school. In 1823 he went to a priest in a neighbouring village, but studied with him for less than a year. In 1824 he left his home for the castle town of Akitsuki to study in the juku of Hara Kosho (1764–1827), who was famous for his poetry. However, Kosho died while Butsusun was there and he returned home. His mother took him to Kyoto, Nara, Yamato and Yoshino, where he met various scholars. After their return, Butsusun lived in his home village. At this time Kosho’s son and daughter, both poets in their own right, were staying in a nearby village. Butsusun studied with Hara Hakukei (1789–1828) and his sister Saihin (1798–1859) until Hakukei died and his sister returned home. For the rest of his life Butsusun regarded Kosho and Hakukei as his most important teachers; although over the next few years he travelled widely and visited several scholars and juku, he never spent more than a few months in them.

In 1835, Butsusun received land from his brother to set up a separate household and settled in his home village. After that he
did not travel outside the region. Like many scholars of his time, who were unable or unwilling to obtain an official position in a castle town, he set up a *juku* in his village, partly because he loved learning and partly to supplement the income from his small holding of land. He started with two sons of relatives, but the entry register records 20 names for the year 1835 and 16 for each of the following two years. If students stayed for at least two or three years, Suisaien would have had about 30 to 40 students most of the time, but we cannot be sure how long they stayed. To accommodate his students, Butsusan had new living quarters built for his family in 1840; the old ones became school buildings. They were later extended.

No syllabus or regulations survive for Suisaien, so most information about what was taught and how life was organized is indirect, chiefly from Butsusan’s diary. The local historian Koga Takeo has examined the diary to find what texts are most frequently mentioned and has come up with the following: *Kobun* (24 times), *Greater Learning* (22), *Mōgyū* (15), *Shiki* (10), *Mōshi* (8), *Elementary Learning* (7), *Nihon gaishi* (5); several others are mentioned one to three times. The *Kobun* (*Guwen zhenbao*) is a famous collection of Chinese *kanshi*. Most of the titles mentioned once are also collections of *kanshi*. Only half of the titles mentioned are Confucian texts, and the *Analects* are not mentioned once.\(^\text{80}\) However, it is questionable whether the mention or otherwise of a work in Butsusan’s diary can tell us conclusively what was read at Suisaien. Students may well have begun with the *Four Books* and *Five Classics*, as was the case at most *kangaku juku*. Butsusan’s library would provide further clues, but only 98 titles have been preserved intact, together with several damaged copies. Butsusan’s biographer concludes that this is about one third of the original library.\(^\text{81}\)

We can assume that education at Suisaien consisted mainly of *kanbungaku*, that is, the study of Chinese and Sino-Japanese literature, with special attention paid to the study and writing of Chinese poetry (*kanshi*). Confucian morals would have been included as a matter of course. Lectures were given by Butsusan himself in his home to the higher ranking students and by his prefects (*jukuchō* or *fuku-jukuchō*) to the other students. Suisaien had a system of ranks and monthly exams similar to that of Kangien, although not as strict. This was still a novel idea at the time, and most *juku* had nothing of the kind.
Apart from book learning, the participation in rituals appears to have been an important element of his educational programme.\textsuperscript{82} Once a month all the students would assemble in Butsusan’s house for a formal greeting ceremony. The 15th of each month was a general cleaning day, in which everyone participated. In addition, the following rituals took place every year (according to the old calendar):\textsuperscript{83}

1st month 17th day: first lecture meeting of the year.
23rd: Commemoration of Hara Kosho’s death.
2nd month, 19th day: \textit{matsue} (Pine Festival; Shūgendō ceremony) at Tōkakuji temple in Miyako-gun.
29th: Pine Festival on Kyūbotttema Gokoku Temple in Buzen.
3rd month, 12th day: Examination of religious affiliation (measure of the Tokugawa government to suppress Christianity); holiday.
middle of the month: Cherry blossom viewing at Kubo Temple in Kubo village.
30th: end of spring poetry party.
middle of the 4th month: firefly viewing party.
early in the 5th month: hunting to protect the rice shoots; holiday.
6th month, 5th day: commemoration of Hara Hakukei’s death.
14th: Imai gion festival (Susa Shrine in Yukuhashi); holiday.
7th month, 6th: Tanabata (Star Festival) party.
13th to 15th: \textit{urabon} festival (to commemorate the dead); holiday.
16th: moon viewing party.
19th: festival of the Hieda deity; holiday.
29th: commemoration of the death of Fujii Shūkō (or Kankichi; \textit{kanshi}-poet and friend of Butsusan’s, who died young).\textsuperscript{84}
8th month, 15th day: moon viewing party.
9th month 9th day: party to ascend Mount Umagatake (Miyako-gun).
15th: moon viewing party.
early in the 10th month: Chrysanthemum viewing party or maple leaf viewing party in Kawara.
15th: moon viewing party in Tōha.
early in the 12th month: winter solstice poetry party.
12th month 13th day: maids’ and servants’ day off; holiday.
23rd: most students return home for New Year.
27th: making ricecakes for the New Year.
last day of the year: staying up all night on New Year’s Eve.

According to the above calendar, a ritual or celebration took place at least once a month. Some were local festivals connected with the agricultural year, others were peculiar to the juku, such as the days to commemorate Butsusan’s teachers. In addition, the diary mentions other rural festivals and school rituals. A large number of Butsusan’s students came from temples, which may explain the significance of the Buddhist rituals. Butsusan himself was a devout Buddhist and his diary and “record of conduct” (gyōjōroku) record his regular visits to ancestral temples and graves and conduct of Buddhist rituals to commemorate his ancestors and teachers.85

Many of the celebrations were occasions for composing poetry. To poetry parties Butsusan’s family would be invited, and his mother would be treated as a guest of honour. If former students happened to be in the area they would also attend. Butsusan appears to have been very fond of drink as well as poetry, and there were many occasions for drinking parties. For example, students who advanced to a higher rank or completed the study of a book would invite their fellow students and Butsusan to a drinking party.86

The different celebrations and ceremonies suggest a mixture of recreational and educational activities, of participation in rites as part of moral and character training and of occasions for simply having fun together. Poetry and rites served the cultivation of aesthetic sensitivity (jōsō kyōiku) and of the ability to express emotions (kanjō kyōiku). Although poetry seems to have played a particularly important part in the education at Suisaien, and Butsusan’s fame was mainly due to his poetry (his first collection of kanshi, Bustusandō shishō, was published in 1852), the importance of poetry was characteristic of other juku at the time, including Kangien and Zōshun’en. Hirose Tansō emphasized the importance of poetry for the cultivation of sentiment (jō), the quality that distinguished humans from animals.87
The overall impression of education at Suisaïen is that the emphasis was on the cultivation of moral behaviour and of aesthetic sentiment and not so much on book learning, although the study of Chinese and Sino-Japanese classics would certainly have formed a central part of the daily routine. Apart from Butsusan’s own preferences, this type of education may well have suited the students who came to him. Most of them were from local families, commoners and lower samurai and unlikely to have aspired to official posts in the government of the domain, much less in the Shogunate. Many of his students, sometimes up to half or more of the entrants, were from temples. From the 1840s onwards an increasing number came from outside Buzen, especially from Hizen, Chōshū, Sūō, Aki, Nagato and other provinces mainly in the south west of Japan; mostly from the same sort of areas as the students at Zōshun’en. However, the great majority of students were still from Buzen and the neighbouring regions. The number of entrants varied from year to year. Peak years before 1868 were 1840 (24 entrants), 1845 (25), 1849 (25), 1854 (30), 1856 (24), 1860 (26), 1863 (28), 1865 (24), 1867 (36). Years with low numbers were 1839 (5), 1851 (8), 1857 (6). From 1868 onwards the numbers were generally much higher: the proportion of students from outside the region dropped after 1868, as did that of students from temples. The rise in student numbers after 1868 may reflect the lifting of class restrictions and the increasing demand for education in general.

The records list a total of 1,120 students in Butsusan’s time and a further 148 after Seisō took over. Tomoishi assumes that together with day pupils this brings the number up to 3,000 students who studied at Suisaïen, but he cites no evidence for this figure.

Students were usually between 10 and 20 years old, although they could be in their 30s and 40s. Three, possibly four females are known to have studied at Suisaïen; one who entered in 1839
was probably a nun. Another female, from Chikuzen, entered in 1865. It is hard to imagine that these girls or young women would have shared the boarding house life of their fellow students; perhaps they lived with a family nearby or in the Butsusan household.  

The influx into the village of a large number of young people from outside who did not work the land occasionally led to conflicts; on one occasion young men from the village entered the juku at night and a priest and the village headman had to mediate. Mediation by people outside the juku was also sometimes used by students who got into trouble and were threatened with expulsion from Suisaien. They would ask Butsusan’s friends to intervene for them.

How did students live and study at Suisaien? The information we have comes from the testimony of a former student, Yamada, who stayed at Suisaien for a few months in the year after Butsusan’s death. He describes the juku buildings in his time, including a sketch (see title page illustration), of which only a copy appears to survive, that does not entirely fit Yamada’s description. The grounds were entered by a gateway with a room over it, where some of the older students lived. In a small building to the left of the gateway lived Butsusan’s second wife, having vacated the main house for Butsusan’s heir. To the right was a larger building where most of the students lived and studied, using the same rooms for sleeping, eating, studying, lectures and socializing. Nearby were the students’ kitchen and lavatories. The living quarters of the Murakami family and the study were situated towards the back of the grounds, opposite the gate (see Figure 6).

Students had two meals a day consisting of rice, which they each provided themselves and took in turns to cook, and vegetables which each student supplied for himself, sometimes supplementing them with food bought from a shop nearby. Although there were no fixed examinations, students studied hard, using small oil lanterns after dark. In the evenings they would read aloud, recite poetry or engage in sumō wrestling. They did not play other competitive games or sing vulgar songs. Yamada, himself a teacher, concludes his letter with some general observations, which say more about his own times than about Suisaien. Now, he claims, educators criticize the extremes of self-study as not helping those students who are not naturally able, but at Suisaien such students got help from the older students
and there was sufficient teaching for everybody to make progress. Apparently with an axe to grind, he adds that parents in those days would not blame the teacher if a pupil was stupid or judge the headmaster by how many of his students went on to higher schools; nor did students yell at their teachers, who were free to promote character training (*seishin kyoiku*).

Several former students of Suisaien became prominent public figures, at least at a local or regional level. A significant number became educators.\(^9\) Possibly the most famous student of Butsusan’s was Suematsu Kenchō (1855–1920), journalist, politician, scholar, translator, poet, reformer of Japanese theatre, *waka* poetry, painting and of the written language. Suematsu Kenchō entered Suisaien in 1865 and was one of the few students who remained after Butsusan had been ordered to close his *juku* during the Ogasawara unrests in 1865–66, during which Suematsu’s family lost their home.

Suematsu Kenchō visited Butsusan when he returned to Kyūshū during the Satsuma rebellion. When in 1879 Butsusan’s former students decided to erect a monument in honour of their teacher, it may be

---

*Figure 6:* Former study of Suisaien. Like that of Zōshun’en, it shows that originally a *juku* was indistinguishable from a traditional home. 
*Photograph: the author*
partly due to Suematsu’s connections in the capital that Butsusan received congratulations from leading statesmen and literati from all over the country, and that Itō Hirobumi, Kenchō’s patron and later father-in-law, wrote part of the inscription. Butsusan died shortly after the celebration, for which several hundred students and friends assembled. Of Butsusan’s children, only one daughter survived him, and his first adopted heir had also died.

After Butsusan’s own death, Suisaien was taken over by Seisō (or Sekijirō), the third son of Butsusan’s younger brother, adopted by Butsusan. Seisō studied at the juku of Butsusan’s friend, Kusaba Senzan (1819–87), and married first Butsusan’s second daughter, then, after her death, his third daughter, who had lost her first husband. In 1876 he went to study in Kyoto, possibly because Senzan opened a new juku there. After the closure of Suisaien in 1884, Seisō taught in Kyoto at the school of Honganji (predecessor of Ryūkoku University) from 1887 until his death in 1903. Two months after his death a ceremony to commemorate him and Butsusan was held at the Butsusan home in Hieda with over 100 former students attending.

Nevertheless Seisō did not achieve the fame of his uncle Butsusan. Although Butsusan did not travel much after
establishing Suisaien, he corresponded with several famous scholars, including Saitō Setsudō and Mishima Chūshū, and many came to visit him. Twelve years after his death, in 1891, observances were held in Tokyo by leading kangaku literati of the time, including Shigeno Yasutsugu. In 1916 Butsusan was honoured with a court rank (upper 5th) in recognition for his contributions to education. That year Suematsu Kenchō edited his collected works. In 1936 Murakami Ryōichi, with the help of former students and local people, constructed a building to house Butsusan’s library and other objects associated with him, which can be viewed today. Otherwise Butsusan’s study remains, although it was rebuilt after being damaged by floods in 1979. The premises of Suisaien are still the home of the Murakami family.

Zōshun’en and Suisaien appear to have been typical for many rural juku run by scholars who had no chance of an official appointment and who catered mainly for the local elite. They did not survive for as long as other juku of this type often did, perhaps because the heirs lacked the determination to continue and there were accepted alternatives.

NOTES

2 The main biographical sources on Yasui Sokken are Wakayama Kōzō, Yasui Sokken sensei (Miyazaki-ken Miyazaki-gun Miyazaki-chō: Zōroku shobō, 1913) and Kuroe Ichirō, Yasui Sokken (Hyūga bunko kenkōkai 1982; originally 1953). See also Machida Saburō, “Notes on Yasui Sokken”, Tōhōgaku 72 (1986):111–126.
3 Wakayama, 184.
4 Wakayama, 139.
5 Kuroe, 17–18.
6 Kuroe, 90; Ōgai’s story closely follows Wakayama’s biography of Sokken; see Inagaki Tatsurō, “Yasui fujin’ nōto”, Kokubungaku 4 (1951):23–35.
7 Kuroe, 13–14.
8 Quoted in Wakayama, 50.
10 Wakayama, 56–57.
The following information about students is from Wakayama, 150–157, 160–162, 167–168, 206–211, 272, 278–280.

12 Tani Kanjō ikō (Seikensha, 1912), vol.1.

13 Wakayama, 217.


16 Reminiscences of Hattori Unokichi in the commemorative issue of Shibun; 30.7 (1938):31–32.

17 Wakayama, 281.

18 The principal sources for Mishima Chūshū’s biography are Yamaguchi Kakuyō, Mishima Chūshū: nishō gakusha no sōritsusha (Nishō gakusha, 1977); Yamada Taku, Ishikawa Umejirō, Yamada Hōkoku/Mishima Chūshū (SōshoNihon no shisōka 41), (Meitoku shuppansha, 1977); Nishō gakusha hyakunenshi (Nishōgakusha, 1977); on his thought see also Nakata Masaru, MishimaChūshū (Shiriizu Yōmeigaku 34), (Meitoku shuppansha, 1990).

19 Printed in Tōkyō kyōikushi shiryō taikei 3, 248–249.

20 Chōga shinbun, 20 October 1877; quoted in Meiji nyūsū jiten (vol. 1, Mainichi communications shuppanbu, 1983), 543.

21 Quoted in Hyakunenshi, 73.


23 Hyakunenshi, 90.

24 Nishō gakusha shasoku, Nishō gakusha, 1879 (Meiji Microfilms BEJOO68/393–400).

25 Hyakunenshi, 256.

26 Hyakunenshi, 124–126.

27 Seiken igen: by Asami Keisai, 1689; collection of final sayings by famous Chinese heroes with biographical notes and Japanese loyalists’ acts. Mōgyū: 746, textbook for beginners; collection of sayings and anecdotes from the ancients with four- character phrases as titles; used in Japan since the Heian period. Bunshō kihon: thirteenth century; for preparing for examinations; models for essays; widely read in Japan since the mid-Edo period.

28 By Kiyohara Natsuno, 833; official commentary on the Yōrō Code of 718.

29 Hyakunenshi, 71–72.

30 Hyakunenshi 212–216; different posts, including teachers listed up to 1902; Hirano’s reminiscences.

31 Hyakunenshi, 120. Plans of the honjuku, Yanagi juku and Ume juku on pp.117, 119 and 120.
33 Hirano in *Hyakunenshi*, 218–222
34 Text in *Hyakunenshi*, 207–209.
35 *Hyakunenshi*, 387.
40 Watanabe, “Meiji ishinki”, 41:36.
44 Printed in *Miwada gakuen hyakunenshi*, 366–371. See also 42–44.
45 Details in *Miwada gakuen hyakunenshi*, 44–45.
47 More about Masako’s writings on women’s education in Mehl, “Women Educators”.
49 On the history of the school see *Miwada gakuen Hyakunenshi*.
50 *Miwada gakuen hyakunenshi*, 479.
72 Oku, 176–177.
73 Oku, 38–40.
74 The lists from the registers printed in Tsunetō, 128–141.
75 According to Tsunetō, 58–59, Seisai studied there for three years from 1861; on Seisai’s studies see also Oku, 16; 185–229.
76 Tsunetō, 163.
77 He visited Seisō in 1859; Tsunetō, 162; see also Oku, 159.
78 Tsunetō, 141–144.
79 Butsusan, the literary name he took when he was 23, is the name by which he is usually known. The most detailed biography of Butsusan and his juku, based on primary sources (mainly his diaries and poetry), is Tomoishi Takayuki, Murakami Butsusan: aru eijin no shōgai (Fukuoka: Miyako bunka konwakai, 1955).
81 List in Tomoishi, 241–3.
82 Tomoishi, 37–41.
83 Tomoishi, 39–40.
84 Tomoishi, 19.
85 Tomoishi, 43–44.
86 Tomoishi, 36–37; Koga, 291–298.
87 Tomoishi, 50–53.
88 Tomoishi, 34.
90 Koga, 152–155; he mentions two other incidents. Butsusan does not record what exactly happened.
92 For a description of the premises today see Kyōiku shisetsu no kenchikutekikenkyū, 44; the plan there is very similar to that of Zōshun’en.
93 Tomoishi, 67.
WHAT WAS LIFE AND STUDY AT A JUKU ACTUALLY LIKE? Studying individual examples gives us some idea, but sources on individual juku tend to centre on the biography of the founder. To obtain a general picture, several juku have to be examined. Looking at details of juku life can tell us how they differed from modern schools. Moreover, we can compare the picture presented by contemporary sources and first hand accounts to that painted by later generations, who held up the juku as a shining example of what education ideally should be like (Chapter 6). For instance, circumstances may have necessitated characteristics of juku life that later appeared in the explicit educational concept of a latter-day educational “master”. The importance of certain rituals, for example, may have resulted from the absence of a purpose-built classroom, which made it necessary to demarcate the space for lessons by ritualized behaviour.

Few pedagogical treatises by the juku masters exist, yet we can glimpse something of their views on education by studying the regulations they drew up for their students; a number of them are cited in full for this reason. Here we can hear the master speaking to his students.

THE MASTERS

Central to the juku was the teacher and his relationship with his students. He was usually referred to as jukushu, the master of the juku, and was its founder or his heir. The master ran the establishment and generally presided over the household of which it was a part. There were usually boarders, and the master shared his life with them all day, every day. Thus he was far
more than a modern teacher; he combined in his person the roles of headteacher, housemaster, advisor of studies, substitute parent and counsellor. Ties between him (and very occasionally her) and his students could be very close and last a lifetime.

We often know more about the master than about his juku and more about his scholarship than his views on education. This may be because a juku was defined by its master; the person was more important than the institution. Moreover, although the Confucian scholar can be cited as an example of an early profession, where education and skills counted rather than birth, teaching in itself was not a recognized profession; it was just part of what a scholar did.

Who were the masters? By the nineteenth century kangaku was no longer the monopoly of the nobility and samurai (bushi) class. Nevertheless, samurai dominated as masters, especially in the castle towns, as has already been shown for Tokyo. In what is now Okayama city, 41 of the 43 juku recorded in NKSS were run by samurai and two by merchants. In the entire prefecture, 89 of 144 juku were run by samurai, 4 by merchants, 19 by commoners (heimin; presumably these were juku formally opened after the abolition of the class system), 12 by physicians, 10 by farmers, 7 by religious officials, 1 by a rōnin (masterless samurai) and 2 are not specified. Other examples are Hirosaki, Akita, Nagoya, Matsue, Hiroshima and Ōita (see Table 5).

Table 5: Occupations of juku masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hirosaki*</th>
<th>Akita</th>
<th>Nagoya</th>
<th>Matsue</th>
<th>Hiroshima</th>
<th>Ōita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bushi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priest*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heimin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no info</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (*) Old town only.  
(#{}) Includes one rōnin (masterless samurai).  
(+) Shintō or Buddhist.  
Sources: See note 2.
If the entire prefecture is taken into account rather than just the major castle town, samurai still predominated of samurai. In Akita prefecture 75 out of 85 juku were run by samurai; in Nagasaki prefecture 31 out of 51 juku (9 of them in the town of Nagasaki) were run by samurai. In other prefectures the tendency is less pronounced, but the samurai are usually the largest group; 24 out of 43 in Aichi prefecture, 23 out of 73 in Shimane, 77 (includes 3 rōnin) out of 166 in Ōita prefecture. The second largest group is often the physicians (19 in Shimane, 16 in Ōita) and/or the priests (8 in Shimane, 22 in Ōita). Physicians came from all classes.

In more rural regions the proportions could differ. In Gifu prefecture the largest number (9 out of 28) were run by commoners (heimin), followed by samurai (8), physicians and farmers (4 each) and priests (3). Nagano prefecture, because of its preponderance of rural areas, had a high proportion of farmers (56 per cent) running juku and terakoya. In Tajima (the remoter part of Hyōgo prefecture), the home of Ikeda Sōan, 5 juku each out of 11 were run by samurai and heimin (Sōan’s juku being included in the latter) and one by a priest.

The kangaku juku was most often an establishment run by a samurai in a castle town. Usually the master had travelled to study with different teachers before settling in his home town, or in the town where he had studied. For example, Yamamura Benzai (1836–1907) came from a family of kangaku scholars in the service of Hirose domain (a branch of Matsue domain), his grandfather and father taught at the domain school in the castle town of Hirose before him. He entered the school at age six, then continued his studies at the domain school of Matsue, but returned after a year to teach at Hirose. In 1863 he went to Edo and studied with Shionoya Tōin and Ōnuma Chinzan, but was ordered home at the time of the Chōshū rebellion. He spent the next years in the service of his domain, taught at the domain school in Hirose until it was closed in 1872 and became a teacher at the new elementary school when it opened the following year. In 1874 he opened his juku Shūbunkan in order to provide education beyond elementary level after the demise of the domain school. He continued to teach at public schools, and in 1896 was invited to teach at the Shimane prefectural teacher training college in Matsue.

Another example is Kunitomo Koshōken (1832–84), who came from a family of vassals of the Hosokawa and studied first in the
castle town of Kumamoto, then in Edo under Shionoya Tōin. After his return, he followed in his father’s footsteps and taught at the Jishūkan domain school. During the last years of the Shogunate and around the time of the Restoration he travelled to Edo and Kyoto in the service of his lord. When the domain school was closed in 1870, he retired from public life and devoted himself to his studies. He started teaching in his own home, and when student numbers increased he rented an additional building. But during the war of 1877 both burnt down and he moved to Ikura in Tamana district (now Tamana city). When he opened Ronseidō there, he had only two students, but the number soon increased to over 70. Most of them came from nearby, but some came from Saga and Kurume.

Other well-respected masters came from more humble backgrounds. Uchimura Rokō (1821–1901) from Matsue was the third son of an oil merchant and during his teenage years he studied by night against the will of his parents while helping with the business during the day. After his father’s death he studied in Osaka, and in 1851 he even entered the Shōheikō in Edo, although commoners were not normally admitted. In 1864 he was employed by the school of his domain. He opened his juku, Sōchōsha, in 1874, after the domain school had been abolished, and also taught at new public schools during the following years.

Fujisawa Tōgai (1794–1864) came from a family of farmers in Takamatsu domain (now Kagawa prefecture), but was allowed to study in Osaka by his feudal lord. He became a disciple of Nakayama Jōsan, a scholar in the tradition of Ōgyū Sorai (1666–1728). From the age of 25 he studied in Nagasaki for three years. He settled in Osaka in 1824 and began to teach there. The following year he established Hakuen shoin in Awajichō. Tōgai also lectured at the Gansuido (in Hiranogōchō, Osaka) and became a retainer of Takamatsu domain, while continuing to live in Osaka. His son Nangaku (1842–1920) inherited his father’s position and duties. After the Restoration he took part in domain reforms and was supervisor (tokugaku) of the domain school. In 1872 he reopened Hakuen shoin and from then on devoted himself to private teaching and scholarship.

Even when a scholar came from a samurai family, it was often from the lower ranks of samurai. Yasui Sokken’s family was so poor that they had to work as farmers despite their samurai origins. Shigeno Yasutsugu’s family had only received the status of a country samurai (gōshi) in his father’s generation. Yamada
Hōkoku’s family had been samurai, but had become impoverished and turned to farming. Hōkoku (1805–77) studied in Kyoto and Edo, and on his return in 1836 he became the head of the domain school Yūshūkan. While teaching at the domain school, he opened his own juku, Gyūrokusha, in 1838. Itakura Katsukiyō, who became lord of the domain in 1849, was one of his students. Itakura put Hōkoku in charge of the domain finances, a spectacular rise in the society of his time. Hōkoku introduced reforms to promote the economic development of the domain and promoted learning. Hōkoku’s expertise concerning the finances of Matsuyama is said to have been admired years later by Ōkubo Toshimichi when he was interior minister in the Meij government.

Itakura was a supporter of the shogunate, and Hōkoku continued in his service until after 1868. Then he devoted himself entirely to teaching at his juku in Nagase. In 1870 Hōkoku moved to Osakabe, 20 kilometres north of Nagase, to revive his mother’s family line. Most of his students followed him there. He taught there until his death in 1877. These examples show that even in within the social order of the Edo period, men with talent and determination could occasionally rise from humble origins and gain official recognition.

Before the abolition of the domains and with them the domain schools in 1871, many scholars ran a juku while teaching at the school. After 1871, they often continued to teach privately. Like Yamada Hōkoku, best known for his reforms in the service of the lord of Matsuyama domain, juku masters had other official posts besides teaching or opened their juku after leaving official employment. This was also true of Hayashi Kakuryō (1806–78). He came from an undistinguished background, but managed to make a name for himself while studying in Tokyo and embarked on a career in the service of the shogunate. He is said to have had a juku at the same time, but to have left the teaching to his disciple, Nakai Toranosuke (who later became Fujita Chūzō). Some of his official positions took him out of Edo. In 1846 Kakuryō became principal (gakuto) of the Kōfu bitenkan, a branch school of the Shōheikō, for a year. In 1852 he received an administrative post at the Shōheikō, but in 1853 a new appointment took him out of Edo again. This time he was made governor of Nakaizumi (now Iwata in Shizuoka prefecture), where he remained until 1858. During this time he initiated many measures to relieve the lot of the people in his district. In 1858 he became governor of Shibahashi (now Sagae in Yamagata
prefectured). He was called back to Edo in 1862, where he held various official positions until 1868. Kakuryō prided himself on having been one of the first to call for revering the emperor and expelling the barbarians, but his loyalty was with the shogunate, not with the leaders of the Restoration who adopted this slogan. Herefused to accept any public office in the new government and devoted all his time to his juku. He was one of many former shogunate and domain officials who ended their public lives after the Restoration and became full-time private teachers.

Others combined official appointments with running a juku. Oka Senjin (1833–1914) from Sendai opened a kangaku juku in Tokyo in the early years after the Restoration. He served his feudal lord before 1868, but also travelled extensively and opened short-lived juku in Osaka and in Sendai. In March 1870 Senjin went to Tokyo as an official of the reopened Shōheikō, now named daigaku (university). At the same time he opened a juku named Suiyūdō in the former residence of Sendai domain. The daigaku was soon closed down, and Senjin became a teacher at the new metropolitan middle school, where he taught kangaku and introductory courses to various fields, including international law. This school, however, was also short-lived, and in 1871 Senjin again lost his post; instead he became an official in the new Ministry of Education. He also became a member of the Council of State and of the Department of History and subsequent Office of Historiography until it was scaled down in 1877. For the next three years he was a director of the metropolitan library (Tōkyō fu shosekikan) established by the Ministry of Education. After losing this post in 1880 he held no more official appointments and devoted his life to teaching, writing and extensive travels throughout Japan and, in 1884, to China. From the late 1880s until around 1900 Senjin appears to have spent as much time travelling throughout Japan as at his home in Tokyo.

Senjin’s contemporary, Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827–1910), a leading kangaku scholar (but better known as one of the founders of modern historical scholarship in Japan), also taught privately while holding official posts. Shigeno had been employed by his domain (Satsuma) before the Restoration. In 1869 he opened a juku in Osaka, which he soon transferred to Tokyo. In 1871 he became an official in the Ministry of Education and in 1872 in the Council of State. In 1875 he was appointed to the Office of Historiography, becoming its director in 1881. When the office
was transferred to the Imperial University he became one of the first professors of Japanese history. He had to resign in 1893, but was reappointed as a professor of Chinese studies in 1898. Shigeno was also employed in the Imperial Household Ministry and the Ministry of Education. In the Metropolitan Archives in Tokyo there are two applications to open juku by Shigeno, dated 1873 and 1888. Apparently neither of these was long-lived, but he continued to lecture regularly on the Confucian classics in his own home.

These examples suggest that the master’s involvement in the day-to-day running of the juku varied and may have been minimal in some cases. Looking at the busy lives and careers of Hayashi Kakuryō, Oka Senjin and Shigeno Yasutsugu, one wonders that they had any time to teach privately at all. It may well be that their input was limited to a few lectures and that when the students were not studying by themselves, most of the day-to-day teaching was done by head students.

Other masters devoted all or most of their time to their juku, having either retired from official appointments or never held any in the first place. Murakami Butsusen was one of the many country samurai who never had the chance of a public appointment Ikeda Sōan was a commoner who devoted all his life to private study and teaching, although he did lecture occasionally at nearby domain schools. Inukai Shōsō (Hirosi, Gensaburō; 1816–93) also spent most of his life as a private scholar; he regarded farming as his main occupation. He came from a farming family in Yamaki, now part of Kurashiki city. Apparently urged by his mother, he studied with local kangaku scholars and then for ten years at the Meirinkan in Kurashiki (gōgaku, established by the domain in 1834), where he met prominent scholars, including Mishima Chūshū and Kawada Ōkō. Inukai was a great believer in self-study and acquired much of his knowledge on his own. At the same time he believed that practical work came before the study of books. He turned down invitations from feudal lords. San’yō juku, founded in 1856, was part of Inukai’s efforts to improve the lot of the poor farmers in his area at a time when educational opportunities for commoners in the villages were few. From 1868 he also taught at the Meirinkan in Kurashiki and lectured at the Seishūkan in Tenjō. In 1882 he was invited by the prefectoral governor to teach at the Okayama teacher training college.
Running a *juku* in a remote rural area, where the master had little opportunity to enjoy the company of people whose learning was equal to his, must at times have been a lonely occupation. Some scholars travelled to visit friends, but others had to rely on letters or the occasional visit. Ties between scholars from different regions often went back to their student days. Oka Senjin, Shigeno Yasutsugu, Uchimura Rokō and others knew each other from their time at the Shōheikō. Ikeda Sōan and Yamamura Benzai corresponded widely, as did Murakami Butsusan. Other evidence of ties between scholars their epitaphs, although the fact that a prominent scholar wrote one for a colleague does not necessarily mean that they knew each other personally.

*Kangaku* was essentially a male-dominated field of studies and, unlike *terakoya* (at least in the towns), *juku* were seldom run by women and probably did not offer very advanced studies. However, as the case of Miwada Masako has shown, there were exceptions. Like her, women schooled in *kangaku* usually came from families with a tradition of scholarship. They took over the family *juku* because no male heir was available. Hio Naoko, for example, was a daughter of the Confucian and scholar of National Learning, Hio Keizan (1789–1859), who taught her. After his death she took over his private academy with the support of her stepmother, Kuniko (1815–85), who was also highly educated. Twenty-four Little is known about the school. The application to the metropolitan government records its name as Shiseidō, the subjects taught as *kōkokugaku* and *shinagaku* and the number of pupils as 17.

While Hio Naoko’s *juku* probably ended with her death, Atomi Kakei (1840–1926), like Miwada Masako, established a school that still exists today. Twenty-six Kakei started teaching from an early age, although she initially regarded herself as an artist rather than a teacher. Her family had fallen on hard times and her father ran a *juku* to make a living. Kakei’s mother and Kakei herself helped him. From 1857 Kakei studied in Kyoto for two years. Then she returned to teach in her father’s *juku*, which he had moved to the centre of Osaka. Soon she was running the *juku*, which had 40 to 50 pupils, by herself, because her father, who had links with the imperial court, had secured employment with the Anenokōji family in Kyoto as a servant of Anenokōji Kintomo.

In 1866 the whole family moved to Kyoto, where they ran a *juku*. The pupils came from good families, often connected with the imperial court; it is said that there were over a hundred
students of all ages. In addition they also taught members of the
nobility in their homes. In 1870 Kakei’s father accompanied the
Anenokōji family to Tokyo. Kakei followed her father later that
year. Until then she had been teaching both boys and girls, but
soon she began to take a special interest in girls’ education. Kakei
opened a new juku in the Anenokōji residence. She did not have
to advertise; her family was by then well known and many
families from the upper classes sent their children to be
educated, especially families from Kyoto, to whom the capital
was unfamiliar and who distrusted the schools there. Soon she
had to move to larger premises, and in 1875 she formally opened
a new girls’ school there. It was not strictly a kangaku juku, since a
variety of subjects were taught, but kangaku was an important
part of the curriculum and for the first few years the school
retained the flavour of a juku. In 1889 the school moved to its
present location in Koishikawa, and during the following years
the organization became more and more formal. Evidently
Atomi Kakei strove for official recognition so that her work
would outlast her. She continued as head of the school until
1919, when her adopted daughter Momoko took over.

What motivated the founder of a juku, apart from teaching
being a recognized part of a Confucian scholar’s role, and (for
those who did not receive a stipend as a samurai) the necessity to
make a living? The juku was independent and the master was the
only one in charge, so he had plenty of scope to develop his
individual style. But he did not necessarily compose detailed
statements about his views on education and his aims for the
juku. The names of juku, often allusions to passages in the
Chinese classics, could represent a motto. Murakami Butsusan
named his Suisaien after a passage from Mencius, praising the
calmness and steadiness of flowing water as something to be
cultivated by students.

Sometimes the name is accompanied by a programmatic
statement entitled (name of the juku) juku ki Yasui Sokken’s
Sankei juku ki, quoted in Chapter 3, is an example. Inukai Shōsō
named his juku after a heading in the textbook Mōgyū (Men qiu),
based on a saying in the Records of the Three Kingdoms (Sankokushi,
Ch. San guo chi), where it is said (by Dong Yu) that reading
should be done in the “three periods of spare time” (san’yo) when
one is not working the land: in the evening, in the winter and
when it is dark and rainy. Shōsō’s San’yo juku ki tells us
something about his views:
In the autumn of the year Ansei 3 [1856] I started a juku in a building to the left side of the gate of my residence. There are a door and two windows there; I spread out ten mats and stored a number of books and lectured to five to six pupils in my little spare time. By day I would take up the plough and take it to the western fields and farm the land with them. On returning, I would wash my feet in the crystal spring, hang a lamp high up and give a class. When we become tired, we roast potatoes, drink bitter tea and thus ban sleep. When the lesson is done and time is up, we all go to sleep. This is the usual routine. If, in free time after the 4th hour [10 p.m.] and on rainy days, good friends take up their books and come to see me, the sound of voices reading can be heard without ceasing and we do not leave our desks until the end of the day. I lecture on the classics (kyō) or speak about the histories. If by chance there is inspiration, I make a Chinese-style poem and recite it and all actively respond to this. The sound of wind in the pine trees and the rain on the bamboo respond loudly. Talk of gain and loss or use and harm certainly does not enter and disturb this; to enjoy in tranquility—what can be compared to this! Ah, I am only a stupid member of this village, who knows and can read a few books. I do not possess teaching which transmits the Way and dispels errors, studying widely and acting on the basis of propriety and promoting what is good. I am as Han Yu said [in his Discourse on Teachers], a teacher who only gives a child a book and teaches him to punctuate and read. The pupils come one after the other. They only obey their elders; they know how to express themselves formally in writing and not to rebel and to live in peace, and that is all. A poor and lonely region is naturally poor in teachers and friends to study with. But how should I therefore give up the trouble to try to enlighten people? So eventually I founded a juku. Really it is as Tōgu (Dong Yu) said. Therefore I named my juku San’yo juku.

Ikeda Sōan named Seikei shoin after its surroundings. He describes them in Seikei shoin no ki (1857), which begins, “Seikei shoin is Ikeda Shū’s place of study”. In it Sōan also states his ideal of the recluse who overcomes the world and stays in the mountain, but whose name becomes known to posterity. 30
The transformation of education during the Meiji period may have caused some teachers of kangaku to reflect on their position as they felt themselves pushed into the defensive. Mishima Chūshū’s programmatic statement for Nishō gakusha includes a careful justification for the different branches of kangaku taught at his juku. Ikeda Sōan composed a memorandum lamenting the increasing regulation of juku in 1873.

Ikeda Sōan left us more records on his thoughts about teaching than most juku masters, but speculation about the theory of education does not seem to have preoccupied the masters a great deal, at least not apart from their general philosophy. Just as there was no separation between studying and living together, so pedagogy was not a specialized field apart from life as a whole. The relationship between a jukushū and those that entered through his “gate” (monjin or monkasei) was in its ideal form “a daily, lived association”, akin to that found in the master-disciple tradition in Eastern religions and to a lesser degree in the system of apprenticeship in pre-modern Europe. The personality of the master rather than his theories and methods was what made its impression on the students and what they remembered him for. The close relationship between master and student is perceived as one of the most outstanding characteristics of the juku (Chapter 6). And yet, here too there must have been considerable variations. If the master was often absent or otherwise engaged, if the students came from a long way off and did not stay long, how close was the relationship really? On the other end of the scale we have the local master who knew not only the students but also their families, possibly because elder brothers, fathers and uncles had also studied with him. In such a setting Yamamura Benzai could advise the father of Inagaki Saburō that his son was more suited to the army than to follow in his father’s footsteps as a physician, or tell the father of his most gifted day pupil, Ōkamura Ōnitarō, that he should be allowed to continue his studies even if he was expected to learn a trade.

Some masters are reported to have taken an interest in their students long after they had left. Yamada Hōkoku spent much of his last years travelling to lecture at schools his pupils were involved with. They included Meishinkan, established by one of his students with the support of Tsuyama domain in 1870, Chihonkan, established in 1872 or 1873, Onchikan, established in 1874, and Chishinkan, established around 1870. When he died, a few of his students strove to preserve his memory by
establishing a new *kangaku juku*, Keishikan, near his home, and two students taught there until 1879. Mishima Chūshū liked to travel around the country visiting his former students, according to Yamada Jun; Jun was adopted into the family of Hōkoku, Chūshū’s teacher, and in 1926 became head of Nishō gakusha. Ties between families of *kangaku* scholars over generations were not uncommon; in his article commemorating Yasui Sokken’s heir, Bokudō, Shionoya On (1878–1962)—a descendant of the scholar Shionoya Tōin—stresses the friendly relations between the two families. Of course the scholars in the towns had more possibilities for maintaining relationships, but even masters with *juku* in remote rural areas did not exist in isolation; contacts with other scholars they knew from their own period of study were maintained through letters, the travels of their students and the occasional visit when they travelled themselves.

Through the sometimes lifelong ties with their students (especially if they became scholars and teachers in their own right), as well as with other scholars of their own generation, the masters formed a nationwide scholarly community bound together by the *kangaku* heritage.

**TEACHING METHODS AND CURRICULUM**

Study at a *juku* was above all self-study. In Aoyama Enju’s *juku* in Mito, students spent a considerable part of their day practising reading and writing by themselves, while Enju went out to work for the domain or worked in his study, ringing a bell when his students became too noisy. Enju’s *juku* provided mainly elementary teaching; more advanced students presumably spent even more time reading alone. Fukuzawa Yukichi, in his autobiography, describes how he and the other students spent much time reading by themselves at Ogata Kōan’s Tekijuku. This was a *juku* for Western studies, but the pattern was similar in *kangaku juku*, especially in those catering for older students. Kōda Rohan reports that students at the *juku* he attended spent much of their time reading alone, often choosing what they wanted to read and only asking their teacher if they were really stuck. Shōda Yōjirō, who entered Nishō gakusha in 1882, reported that free self-study predominated and lecture attendance was not monitored. There was a daily question time (*shitsumon*), when students could ask the teacher about a passage they were reading.
Thus personal (silent) reading \((dokusho)\), first slowly, then faster, was a central activity. Reading was learnt and practised in different ways. By the second half of the Edo period certain forms of teaching had been established, which continued to be used, albeit with some modifications. Students began by reading aloud works from the canon of Chinese classics without being expected to understand them. The practice was known as \(sodoku\) (simple reading) and involved reading the Chinese text in a Japanese fashion, that is, with Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese characters and Japanese syntax. Chinese syntax differs substantially from Japanese, so the result amounts to a translation into (literary) Japanese. Just as there are several ways of translating a text, there were several styles of reading the Chinese text. Tokutomi Sohō, in his autobiography, reports that he first learnt an \(inaka\) (rustic) style from an uncle, which he had to correct after moving to a \(juku\) in the castle town of Kumamoto. At Kangien the first three of nine levels of study were largely devoted to \(sodoku\).

Often the youngest students, about eight or nine years old, would be taught the basics by older students; this is reported by a student of Suisaien and of Kunitomo’s \(juku\) Ronseidō and others. The report on Kimigabukuro’s juku in former Sendai domain, drawn up for the Ministry of Education in 1883, states in the section “number of teachers”: “Although [teaching] is the responsibility of the one master, he has 4 or 5 students who excel, called \(shuritsu\) or \(hittō\) [head student or first student], to help with lessons”. A similar statement is in the report on the juku of Nakazawa Keisai, also in former Sendai domain. Yamada Hōkoku, on the other hand, made a point of doing all the teaching himself. It is said that he got up as early as four in the morning and did not rest until ten at night. One author, who could still talk to old men who had studied with Hōkoku, heard that once older pupils offered to take over the teaching of the youngest ones, a practice common in \(juku\). Hōkoku, however, after thanking them, declined on the grounds that his students had come to him to be taught by him personally.

Once students had mastered the basics they would meet regularly for group readings, with or without the master being present. For \(rindoku\), or reading a work by turns, 5 to 8 students would read one after the other, either for the master or his representative. \(Kaidoku\) [meeting for reading and discussing texts together] and \(rinkō\) [reading and explaining in turns] were
similar. They generally involved reading a text together, students
taking turns to explain given passages and discussing them. The
different terms used for this kind of activity may well describe a
variety of practices, and we cannot be sure what exactly is
meant in every case. The group readings illustrate another
characteristic of study at a juku; students were to encourage each
other and learn from others. This was described as sessa takuma,
which means both to work assiduously at one’s studies and moral
improvement and to do this together with others for mutual
admonition and encouragement. Occasionally this could result in
aggressive rivalry, as Kōda Rohan reports (See section “The
students” in this chapter).

The master really came into his own in the lectures
(kōshaku,kōgi), which often took the form of expounding on a
text. Here he could display his learning and his personal
interpretation of the classics. He could also develop his personal
lecturing style, for which he was sometimes remembered by his
students long after they had left the juku. For example, Šassa
Tomofusa later recalled that Kunitomo gave a weekly lecture, to
which people from the neighbourhood came as well:

Sensei was not a particularly distinguished scholar of his
time, but his way of teaching his pupils hit the mark. When
he expounded on the Confucian classics, he did not spend
time explaining single terms, but completed his lectures in a
straightforward way, with examples from the histories or
by relating his own experiences. In this way he explained
the classics in a concrete way and made them easy to
understand.48

Mishima Chūshū was remembered for his lectures by many, as the
collected reminiscences show. Kokubun Tozō, who was at Nishō
gakusha from 1881 to 1883, recalled:

I remember that works like the Analects, Mencius and
Bunsho kihan were his main themes. Sensei would come
walking up the slope from his residence, quietly push open
the door, place his books on the slanted, small book-rest at
the front; then he took out his golden watch and put it on
the watch-rack at the side, glance over his glasses at the
assembly and with a gentle voice he would earnestly
expound back and forth. His gentle appearance and his earnest words even now remain fresh in my eyes and ears.⁴⁹

Yamada Jun, who entered Nishō gakusha in 1883, recalled:

Sensei lectured on *Bunsho kihan*, first drawing out the general meaning, then dividing it into large and small paragraphs and sections and explain the meaning of each of them, then he would explain key words and the context by analysing each paragraph in detail. That was his way of lecturing.⁵⁰

Other teachers, like Oka Senjin, were praised for not going into too much detail. Senjin’s teaching emphasized the understanding of a work as a whole, rather than in detail. Senjin himself emphasized the importance of studying the classics, but warned against wasting words in idle explanations and discussions.⁵¹

Such teaching as there was at a *juku* may well have varied considerably in its methods, but some mix of lectures and group readings appears to have been common. The applications to open a *juku* or the reports about *juku* made to the Ministry of Education in the 1880s sometimes outline the teaching methods used. Of course we cannot be sure to what extent the reports reflected reality; it may well be that teaching was much less formal than the descriptions in the reports suggest. Oka Senjin’s application of 1872 states that Senjin taught group reading (*kaidoku*) from 5 to 8 a.m., calligraphy from 8 to 12 a.m., reading (*sodoku*) from 1 to 3 p.m. and group reading again from 6 to 9 p.m.⁵²

The application to open Seishōkan in Osaka, submitted in 1882, states that lectures and group readings took place on alternate days at 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. and again at 6 p.m.⁵³ The report on Kimigabukuro’s *juku* in Sendai states that lesson time was from 6 a.m. to 4 p.m., and similar times are given in the reports for other *juku* in Sendai, but without details on what happened during this time, so some of it might have been spent in individual study. Suzuki Tekiken’s poem with the schedule for Chōzenkan (See “Organization and rules”) provides a schedule regulating every hour of the day, and since it was drawn up in this form for the benefit of the students rather the authorities, it may well reflect
the reality of life at Chōzenkan. But the detailed daily schedule reported for Hirose Tansō’s Kangien, providing for formal teaching or testing for most of the day between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m., may well have been the exception rather than the rule.  

On the other hand, methods may have become more formalized in the course of the Meiji period, reflecting the influence of education at the modern schools. As some kangaku juku broadened their curriculum to suit the changing times (see below), they may have adopted more formal teaching as well.

What was read in kangaku juku? The curriculum of Nishō gakusha presented in Chapter 1 probably represented one of the most comprehensive kangaku curricula taught at a juku. In general the curriculum broadened from the late Edo into the Meiji period. More diverse Chinese texts were read and Japanese kanbun texts, especially histories, were included. Rai Sanyō’s Nihon gaishi became one of the most commonly studied texts. Having said that, most juku reported fewer texts than Nishō gakusha, and even where a broad range of texts is reported in the applications to open a juku, we cannot be sure that they were really all read. In the applications made in Tokyo in 1872, all kangaku juku named the Four Books and Five Classics. Also widely used were the Saden commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals (17 out of 27 applications listing textbooks), the Classic of Filial Piety (11), the Outlines of the Eighteen Histories (11), Conversations of the States (11), Shiki [Shi ji; Records of the Historian] (10), Kokushiryaku [Outline of our National History] (11), Nihon gaishi (11).

At Oka Senjin’s juku, the following textbooks were used, according to his application in 1872:

– Beginners: Kokushiryaku, Kōchō shiryaku [Historical Outline of Japan], Nihon gaishi, Outlines of the Eighteen Histories, Mōgyū (Mengqiu), Bunshokihan (Wenzhang guifan), Kōkan ekichiroku, Shiki, Hatsu taika doku hon and Seiyō jijō [Conditions in the West].
– 2nd rank: Kokushi, Kiji honmatsu, Nihon seiki, Tsuishi, Shinsaku tsūgi, Conversations of the States, Saden, Kansho, Mei Shin shoka bunshō, Chikyū ryakusetsu, Chiri zenshi, Hakubutsu shin hen
– 3rd rank: Dainihonshi [History of Great Japan], Book of Odes, Book of Documents, Sanrai, Tsugan seidoku, Bunken tsūkō, various translations of Western works.
The list includes many of the usual works from the Confucian canon as well as some that were less commonly read. More unusual is the inclusion of Fukuzawa Yukichi’s Seiyō jijō and other works relating to the West. The translations would have been in kanbun. Senjin himself collaborated in the translation of Western books into kanbun.

The same titles, especially the Four Books and Five Classics, are named in the curricula of other juku throughout Japan. At Senshindō in the former domain of Sendai, the following books are reported to have been read:


Students started with simple reading (sodoku) of the Four Books and Five Classics.57 For Seibikan, in the former domain of Nobeoka (Ōita prefecture), a juku said to have flourished particularly in the 1860s, the following curriculum is given:

Entry level (shokyū): Three Character Classic (Sanjikyō), Classic of Filial Piety, Greater Learning, Doctrine of the Mean.

Level 1: Analects, Mencius (for simple reading), Elementary Learning, Kokushiryaku, Nihon gaishi, Outlines of the Eighteen Histories (lectures).

Level 2: Five Classics, Hachikabun (simple reading), Saden, Kokugo, writings by the sages (group readings).

Level 3: lectures and group readings on the Book of Odes and the Book of Changes.58

Sometimes students read whatever text of their own they brought along.59 Most of the kangaku juku included in this study did not include the study of Western texts (exception: Shijodō; Chapter 5), since I have defined kangaku juku fairly narrowly. However, juku that started as kangaku juku often diversified, including other subjects besides kangaku, usually imitating the curriculum of mainstream schools. Yūrinsha, established around
1760, was one of the most long-lived juku in Aichi. An around 1895 it was taken over by the heir, Washizu Kōun (b.1870), who graduated from Keiō gijuku that year. In 1897 he submitted an application to open a private school to the prefecture, and his curriculum vitae stated that he had no public or private office. Kōun applied to open a school for people who had studied up to the lower level of the higher elementary school and wished to enter middle or higher schools or prepare for employment. The curriculum included texts from the kangaku canon, but also Japanese language, foreign and English studies and mathematics. Up to 100 pupils would be accepted for a four-year course with regular examinations. The application was turned down, but the following year Kōun was granted a licence to teach kanbun at private schools.

After the death of Suzuki Bundai, founder of Chōzenkan in Niigata prefecture, his adopted son-in-law, Tekiken (1836–96) took over. Tekiken and his successors introduced changes to suit the changing times. Tekiken added the study of Japanese history, especially the Nihon gaishi, to the curriculum. The rules introduced in 1879 included arithmetic as a subject of instruction, but two years later only kangaku is mentioned, perhaps because there was no one to teach the new subject. Tekiken had sent his son Shien (1861–87) to Tokyo to study in 1877, perhaps with a view to letting him reform education at Chōzenkan after his return. He introduced new rules in 1885; English and mathematics were added to the curriculum. The rules of 1892 show that English studies (eigaku) had a prominent role, being part of a five-year course. By then the former kangaku juku had become like a mainstream middle school, although kangaku was still an important part of the curriculum. Textbooks included Samuel Smiles’s Self Help, J.S.Mill (?) and Emerson. Regular examinations were held.

However, one of the attractions of kangaku juku was precisely that they offered a traditional curriculum. The curriculum in the public schools was largely imported and far removed from traditional culture or, more significantly, from people’s everyday experiences. For many students, especially far from the big towns, the kangaku curriculum may well have seemed more relevant to their daily lives.

Although reading was central to studying at a kangaku juku, writing and composition of prose and poetry were also taught. How important a part they played varied from juku to juku.
Suisaien has already been cited as a *juku* where poetry was particularly highly regarded. For prose composition, students would commonly be given assignments to be completed within a certain time. They were then corrected by the master or by senior students. Even for writing, reading was often seen as the basis. Hayashi Kakuryō reportedly said:

The excellence of writing lies in what cannot be expressed in words. He also said that in writing composition there is no other secret than to make the writings of the ancients our own; to master well to any degree the old writing, you have to read carefully and savour them and follow their methods and understand them. That is why in first studying composition it is essential to start from there. There is no merit in arbitrarily reading a lot of works. (...) 62

Formal examinations do not appear to have been a feature of all *juku*. The much-cited example of Kangien, where constant testing took place, probably stands out because it was exceptional. *Juku* were small and the master would have known how his students were doing. Besides, as long as the *juku* were not part of a hierarchic system of schools with progression from one school to the next strictly regulated, there was little need for formal examinations. Shōda Yōjirō claimed that the system of ranks and examinations at Nishō gakusha only existed on paper, presumably for the benefit of the Ministry of Education.63 We do not usually know how long students stayed at a *juku*, and this may well have varied considerably. Three-year courses seem to be common in applications in the Meiji period, but this may be the influence of the modern system. Students would leave the *juku* when they were required to help with the family farm or business, to travel to another *juku*, or, in the Meiji period, to enter one of the new schools.

**ORGANIZATION AND RULES**

Not only was self-study important, but the students’ lives were also to some extent determined by self-government, with older students taking a share in the running of the *juku*. Indeed, there are examples of the master being absent for long periods, begging the question: what happened to his *juku* in the meantime? In
Tokyo his students could easily have gone to other *juku*, but it may well be that his oldest students, perhaps in their twenties, kept the *juku* going in the master’s absence.

For some *juku* we have information about different offices held by students. The most important was *jukitō*, or *gakutō*, the student teacher. This would be an older student who had studied with the master for several years and had his confidence. He himself taught and was responsible for enforcing the regulations regarding teaching and learning. He would have been in charge of the teaching when the master was absent and in some cases he would become the master’s heir.

At Nishō gakusha students held several posts. Yamada Jun, a student of Nishō gakusha who became head of the school in 1926, reports that these posts enabled students to earn their tuition if they could not afford to pay and also taught them to take responsibility. Smaller *juku* than Nishō gakusha could function with a less elaborate system of offices. In Yamamura Benzai’s *juku* in Hirose, the prefect (*jukuchō*) and his deputy corrected students’ behaviour and encouraged them in their studies, clarified their questions and taught reading. They were also in charge of food, clothing, daily actions and coming and going (which had to be reported to them) and thus had far-reaching responsibilities. The teaching supervisor (*kanko*) and his deputy were mainly responsible for teaching reading but were also expected to promote correct behaviour. Yamamura relied on his helpers to support him in his ill health. Some tasks, especially those connected with keeping order and cleaning up, were performed by students taking turns.

Much about the day-to-day running of the *juku* can be glimpsed from the regulations which survive for a number of *juku*. They were commonly included in the applications and reports to the local government, sometimes, but by no means always, divided into *kyōsoku*, regulations for lessons, and *jukusoku*, regulations for boarding house life. These regulations varied in length and scope, but some rules were common to most *juku*. Students were urged to study hard and attend all lessons. Failure to attend could result in expulsion. Students were not allowed to leave the grounds, except with permission in certain, specified circumstances. Alcohol was forbidden; so was chattering, especially political discussions. Punishments ranged from performing additional tasks (household or writing) and confinement to expulsion. Corporal punishment also existed.
Possibly the demand to submit these applications led to regulations being codified where they had not been before. In smaller juku written rules may well have been unnecessary, if the teacher was in close daily contact with his students.

Some masters drew up regulations long before Meiji. An early set of rules for Chōzenkan in Niigata prefecture is believed to have been drawn up by Suzuki Bundai in 1854. It can be summarized as follows: 1) The time for entry is on the first of each month, for leaving on the tenth day of the seventh month or of the twelfth month. 2) Students who wish to return home for a period have to ask for permission. 3) Students must not be noisy and uncontrolled in their words and behaviour (they must look after their own books and utensils and clothes and not wilfully borrow other people’s). 4) They must clean up. 5) They must treat their things with care. The next five points detail what is to be studied. Then the following prohibitions are listed: idleness; gossip; over-familiarity.

Bundai noted more rules in his diary in the third month of 1854, which can be summarized as following: 1) Students must rise early; evening lessons last until 10 p.m. except for the younger ones. 2) The mouth and hands are to be cleaned before lessons. 3) In the morning a hakama (formal divided skirt) must be worn. 4) After the morning reading (sodoku) there is a rest for the time it takes to burn a joss stick. 5) After lunch there is a rest for the period of half a joss stick and at 3 p.m. a rest of one joss stick. 6) After the poetry meetings on the first, eleventh and twenty-first of the month, students are to take a bath.

The next five items deal with teaching. Then the following prohibitions are recorded: 1) mistreating books 2) quarrels and noisy talk 3) drinking and privately going out for amusement 4) impermissible words and behaviour which cause trouble for others 5) buying unnecessary implements, other than writing materials 6) wilfully borrowing other people’s hats, shoes and clothes 7) when visitors arrive, those not receiving them must return to their business after greeting them, unless they have a long-standing relationship with them. Bundai also lists the tasks students were expected to perform in turns: cleaning up in the morning and evening; serving tea after breakfast, cleaning and lighting the lamps and cleaning the yard and verandas.

Bundai’s rules may well have remained much the same over the years. Bundai’s heir, Tekiken, who took over in 1870, submitted a report to the authorities that year. It does not contain any
regulations of *juku* life, but part of the wording in the section on textbooks is the same as Bundai’s in 1854. In 1878 Tekiken drew up a “Composition to present the timetable of the classroom” in the form of a modern-style poem (*shintaishi*). After an introduction full of literary phrases stressing the value of time, the transience of life and the short period available for study, the following timetable is presented:

You wake up at 6 o’clock in the morning; wash your face, tidy you hair and perform the ceremonial greeting. /At 7 o’clock you clean up and have breakfast; 8 o’clock *shitsumon*, 9 o’clock *sodoku*. /At 10 o’clock *rinkō* and *rindoku*; at 11 o’clock it is *shūji* [writing practice]. /At 12 o’clock lunch, from 1 o’clock the afternoon’s *sodoku* with a new subject. /At 2 o’clock *sakubun* [composition], and *rinkō* is scheduled on alternate days. /At 3 o’clock it is the same; *sanjutsu* [arithmetic] and *mondō* [question and answer session] on alternate days. /At 4 o’clock *onshū* [revision], from 5 o’clock cleaning, and when it is finished, you have your evening meal. /The time for a walk is 6 o’clock; from 7 o’clock to 9 o’clock */yoka* [additional lessons] are organized for reading the hundred sages and histories; each as they wish will read and translate. /And the constraints of the daytime will be relaxed slightly. /By 10 o’clock, when the clappers sound, all must go to rest.

The poem ends with more general exhortations, reminding the students that by following this routine diligently the seeds planted in youth will flower later in life, for the benefit of the country and their personal relationships. Thus the prosperity of all nations will be supported and their names will find entry into the history books. Finally the brief spell of time available is again stressed and at the end students are told, “Read continuously without inattention; to study assiduously is wise”.

The importance of the moral training as an inseparable part of study at a *juku* was and is often invoked by those singing its praises. Tekiken’s poem illustrates this idea; lofty statements of principle are combined with down-to-earth regulations concerning study and daily life. A similar combination characterizes the stated aims and regulations of Kunitomo Koshōken’s *juku*, Ronseidō, in what is now Tamana city in
Kumamoto prefecture. In the registration of the *juku* in 1880 Koshōken stated the following aims:70

In this *juku* the basis of moral training of the person and of the nation’s government is examined through the study of national and Chinese texts, and the following three things make our goal:

1) To preserve honour and sincerity on the basis of ethics.
2) To revere the national polity and to clarify the relations of sovereign and subjects (*taigi meibun*).
3) To cultivate knowledge and to examine the principles behind war and peace, as well as prosperity and decline.

Life in the *juku* was regulated in the following way:

1) All students are to be content with their status and to preserve simplicity in their clothes, food and work utensils; also to respect (*kei shi*) the older students and be affectionate (*ai shi*) towards the younger ones. Amity (*shinboku*) is to characterize their dealings with one another, not flattery and thoughtless imitation. Students should study assiduously together (*essa*), not fight each other. Even during leisurely talk in the mornings and evenings, the meaning of martial arts and scholarly learning (*bunbu*) must never be forgotten, and even during free time it is not permitted to indulge in an atmosphere of licentiousness and weakness of spirit and to give in to alcohol, lust, excesses and villainy.

2) All shall rise at six o’clock in the morning and the one whose turn it is shall open the shutters and clean the room. It is forbidden to go out wilfully at night. Even if someone who has gone out for some reason is not back, the one in charge shall shut the gate at 10 p.m.

3) For the study of the Confucian classics and the reading of the histories a plan shall be drawn up for each day, and not one moment must be spent in idleness. It is forbidden to miss meetings without reason; only if you are working on a composition does this not apply. Except in case of sickness, it is forbidden to lie down during the day; the weeks of extreme heat during the summer are excepted.71
Koshōken appears to have given his students much freedom. Yamamura Benzai, on the other hand, issued more detailed regulations and often displayed notices with exhortations to his students. Benzai is said to have run Shūbunkan in the spirit of the domain school with similar regulations, and it is assumed that the regulations drawn up for the domain school in 1867, possibly by Benzai himself, applied to his juku as well. They ran as follows:

1) When sitting at your desk you must without fail first sit correctly and make your appearance formal and only then apply yourself to your studies. This means that you follow directly the example of the sages.

2) If you ask your elders something, you must soften your voice to a tone of respect, direct yourself to the lowest-ranking seat and deeply bow twice; if you ask about one word then he becomes your teacher for this one word and you must not forget your manners.

3) During periods free from study, you may discuss scholarly and military pursuits (bunbu) or even the beauties of nature. But indecent and aggressive talk is not allowed. Of course, you do not fight with your elders, but you must also not play idle tricks.

4) Students must first of all be quiet and correct as well as full of reverence in their actions. When you talk to your fellow students, respect must always be the foundation; it is forbidden to imitate the ways of man-servants when calling to each other. You must know that the sages despised casual relations.

5) The elder students must not tell stories without any foundation to the younger ones. You must talk of things such as the ancient lord Katō or the early modern loyal retainer Ōishi and make sure such things are first in the young people’s minds. In this way the basis for demanding good deeds and encouraging a loyal heart will be formed.

6) It is forbidden to spy at the fence of the neighbouring house or to open the window and make contact with people outside the gate. You must not make some bad young person do it.

7) If people who fight too much to the extreme of attacking each other physically, then both parties will be expelled without discussing the rights and wrongs. Even if
there is a small issue of right and wrong here, it is like the (insignificant) difference between those who flee fifty and those who flee a hundred \(bu\) [in battle; 1 \(bu\) equals c. 1.82 or 2.63 metres].

8) The sword is a samurai’s protection; it must not be thrown around or trodden on. Clothes are a person’s outward expression and they must be kept in order. Restraint must be practiced in one’s daily actions. Whether it is taking off one’s shoes and ascending into the lecture hall, opening the door and sitting down at one’s desk, even little things should not be done lightly. If you make mistakes in small things you will also go wrong in big things.

9) Relying on someone else’s desk, bringing disorder into other people’s books and notes, wilfully going through their bookcases, this is like the bud of wickedness and is strictly forbidden. That you must not discover other people’s private writings is clearly laid down in the scriptures and commentaries.

10) Old paper is the place where the words of the saints and sages are and must not be thrown out arbitrarily. This is something the sages of old warn about.

11) When the day’s work has ended, the desks must be tidied away and the braziers stored away, and afterwards the dirt must be swept away. Let us remember that cleaning up is a task of elementary study.\(^{73}\)

Relationships between the students and maintaining orderly and decorous behaviour are the main themes of this set of rules, themes that occur in the regulations of other \(juku\). For example, the rules for Yōsei \(juku\), also in Shimane prefecture, state that younger students are to respect \((kei shi)\) the older ones and older ones to be affectionate \((ai shi)\) towards the younger ones, that younger students may consult older ones and the older students must not despise them; they should all be like brothers and encourage each other in brotherly affection. In discussions priority should be given to mutual encouragement. Students should not indulge in useless chatter during their studies.\(^{74}\) Benzai’s regulations for Shūbunkan may therefore have been similar if not identical to those of the domain school.

Other regulations for Benzai’s \(juku\) are recorded in a manuscript dating from 1880.\(^{75}\) They mainly cover entering and leaving the \(juku\):
1) Prospective entrants should consult with the prefect or an older student; this applies both to boarders and day pupils.

2) Students who want to return home should consult with the prefect and ask for permission in writing.

3) Students who have returned home and whose return is unavoidably delayed should ask for permission again by post.

4) Students who stay away for more than thirty days without notification will be regarded as having left the juku.

5) Students who apply to be away for more than three days must settle their fees and return borrowed books.

6) The postage for letters notifying juku matters during his return home has to be paid by the student.

7) Students always have to ask permission if they leave the premises.

The above rules apply to boarders.

8) Students who visit tea houses or drinking establishments on the way to and from school will not be permitted to be day pupils.

9) Students who disobey the juku rules and misbehave are to be publicly named, even if the offence is small.

This applies to boarders and day pupils.

At a time when communications were not what they are today, Benzai must have found it hard to keep track of the young people in his charge and to be sure whether a student who left intended to come back or not. It must have caused him considerable anxiety if someone left without notifying him. An announcement to his students in April 1883 illustrates this. Two students had absconded, and after referring to the common endeavours of teachers and students, Benzai condemns their action, telling his students they must speak out if they are dissatisfied with something, rather than just disappear:

If you suffer in some way, must you hide away like a mouse or a dog? Perhaps they [the fugitives] would say, “If we do, he will report to our family at home and we cannot do what we like”. Whereupon my juku becomes a nest for fugitives. Ah, this is unbearable. Moreover, is it not so, that when you come here to study you do so at the courtesy of your families? But through my slowness, this is violated in a
moment. From now on I cannot face your families with my honour intact […]\textsuperscript{76}

One can imagine how heavily the responsibility for his boarders weighed on a conscientious master; unlike at a large boarding school, he bore that responsibility alone.

Benzai often drew up rules and admonitions and displayed them on the walls, sometimes in response to a particular occurrence like the one just cited, or to a more general event like the change of season. The following announcement, dated the fifth month 1877, shows how a special regime was implemented to cope with the summer heat. It was displayed again in 1885 (and perhaps in other years).\textsuperscript{77} The schedule was based on the methods of Benzai’s own master, Shiyonoya Tōin, and was to be adopted until further notice. An exercise in reading aloud was to take place twice a day at 10 a.m. and at 3 p.m. for one hour each. Benzai described the procedure as follows:

\begin{quote}
The order of seating must not be disturbed. You sit correctly by your desk. The shoulders and back must rise straight, the navel and nostrils must be correctly positioned. Do not question the difficulty of the text; just work on reviewing the ancient writings. Do not engage in details, do not indulge in a great amount; do not allow your hands to shake or your legs to move. Do not wield a fan. Do not scratch yourself, stand or fidget, yawn or stretch yourself. Do not ask questions and distract your neighbour. You must not query the words of the text nor glue yourself to the paper, bending the head and contemplating. Do not become like mosquitos buzzing faintly at the bottom of a jar. Do not become like drunkards or fools with unhealthy voices and flushed faces. Read clearly and resonantly as if you are mining gold or pulling a brocade rope without raising or lowering your voice. If the mind is glad and the spirit relaxed, if worries and melancholy are dispelled, how can you not win over the sprouting evil. […]\end{quote}

In the rainy season in 1879, Benzai displayed another notice intended to help his students; this time he gave advice on hygiene on the basis of Western medicine.\textsuperscript{78} Other notices were more general, like the one he displayed in 1885, when he was
busy looking after his sick mother and wanted to encourage them to study independently: “Study is one’s own affair. It is not that of other people. Whether you study or not will only benefit or harm yourself; the effort you make is only for yourself.” He praises his students for studying even when they are not being watched.\textsuperscript{79}

A notice displayed in 1885 stressed the importance of adhering to rules. Students who broke them, wrote Benzai, showed a lack of will to study, a contempt for their teacher and should not be at the juku, wasting time and money. At the same time Benzai did not wish to be repressive to the point of stifling his students’ expression. A notice in summer 1885 said:

If I ask you, you will know why I ordinarily take you to task. But even if you say that I am stupid, I am not without feelings. Do you think I do not know what makes people happy or not, what makes them worry or otherwise? Of course you like congratulations, hate punishment, desire praise, abhor blame; that is the way people usually feel. To like and dislike, desire and abhor in this way is always reflected in the face. Why would even I want to be shown this frequently? Only, the relationship between me and you is not like the association of a brief drinking party. I have received you on trust and am always concerned that I must not injure other people’s children. You must not pity me in my old age and regard this as tea gossip. If you have just grounds for criticism, you may criticize as much as you wish. […]\textsuperscript{80}

In 1885 Benzai displayed a poem in \textit{kanbun} of sixty-two stanzas of five characters each. Because it is much more difficult than Tekiken’s composition, we must assume that it was for the benefit of older and more learned students. It displayed a similar combination of general moral exhortations and down to earth ones:

The students all enter the school together; we bring out our sharp intellect/Bright and early we rise and at night we go to sleep; determined to study we pledge ourselves/In the field of scholarship there are many joyful places; how should we then cease to wield our ink brushes and cultivate
them? Work hard during daylight and continue at night, by the light of the oil lamp. We love the ancient in earnest; strive to become like the sages. How sharp is the blade of your will! It should be like the lance of a strong fighter. Even simple matters like cleaning and ordinary conversation should be practised with sincerity. Always write characters correctly, with regular and clear character strokes. When you read aloud, let there be no hitch; let your voice be steady and resonant. When you recite poems or compose prose, let every phrase be full of beauty. Do not presume that you are already industrious enough, but fear that at a later day your will may wane. Like rice on this good field, cultivation makes the grain grow bravely. Maintain good relations as comrades, even as in the intimate friendship between brothers. Ask each other when you have questions and difficulties. We witness the competition of wise men. They love and help each other with insatiable enthusiasm. In our hearts we consider each other good, so when we want to we can let our thoughts roam freely. You need a wide heart; do not be content with small results. People who give up half way, how can they wield a great name? Do you not see the flowers in the garden, shining in the morning light? Some can be compared with the pines by the rice paddy ledge by the river; the rightfulness of a thousand years flourishing. In ancient times there was Guan Youan [Guan Ning]. He despised wealth and honour as things of no consequence. He regarded good and bad fortune as originating with himself and never asked the fortuneteller Yan Junping. He saw that many cling to the world’s perversity and tether themselves to worldly things. While the poet Zhao Mengneng highly valued his freedom, the long-lived Zhuang Zi feared to see his freedom sacrificed under excessive honours. Resisting speech is the strategy for great deeds; the path of the world is a steep mountain. For example, like a horse that kicks and bites; suddenly the bit is in its mouth and it is surprised into submission. To control oneself is especially hard. How could devotion to the kingly way be easy? To study the summits and practise orders, that is the fortress of self-protection. The many saints and wise men in the writings welcomed and saw off their days heartily. We comment on rise and fall,
peace and unrest, praise and blame/Wrap your scholarship
up and store it secretly; let it go and spread its fruits over the
whole land/What I ask and wish to say to you all together;
that you adhere to your daily lessons dilligently/All things
have a beginning; I only expect that the end will not be
lacking.  

Diligent study, perseverance, self-cultivation, good relationships
with others, not letting oneself be swayed by worldly affairs and
following the examples of the great men mentioned in the
classics, these were values Benzai wanted to pass on to his
students. Moral education was accorded as much importance as
scholarship. Indeed, the two were not regarded as separate and
relegated to lessons and activities after hours respectively, but
treated as one. Without maintaining proper relationships and
order in one’s surroundings there could be no real learning, and
the purpose of learning was to promote moral behaviour. As the
rules of Yōsei juku stated, scholarship must result in action;
otherwise the scholar was no different than the uneducated
people and would be condemned by them. Reading was like
consulting dead senpai, that is, older (and wiser) men, in order to
learn how to conduct one’s life. The rules thus express an ideal
of a comprehensive or (to use a modern term) holisitc education;
morality is inseparable from the external forms of behaviour. The
humdrum of daily life at the juku was an integral part of this
education.

At the same time regulating mundane things as well as studies
was a necessity, since both study and daily life were confined to
the same premises, sometimes the same room.

BOARDING HOUSE LIFE

The rules cited in the previous section tell us something about
daily life at the juku, even if they represent the norm rather than
the reality. Some suggest the difficulties that could occur with
many boys living together in a confined space, for example rules
forbidding borrowing and lending. Exhortations about how to
treat younger students or behave towards older ones reflect a
concern with how boys as young as six to eight and young men
in their late teens or early twenties could live together in
harmony. Moreover, students in some cases came from all over
the country. In Tokyo, students from the country were confronted with the temptations of the big city. Yasui Sokken’s warnings about the dangers of sex and sake and the strict curfews set out in the regulations of other juku in Tokyo reflect this. The reverse scenario of students from many parts of the country descending on a small village or town could also lead to problems, as the example of Butsusan’s Suisaien shows. The rule of Matsue domain school about going straight home may have been a precaution to avoid “town and gown” troubles.

We can learn more about juku life by looking at the material culture. Very few buildings of former juku remain, among them Seikei shoin in Hyōgo and Chōzenkan in Niigata. An important characteristic of the juku was that it was part of the master’s residence. As such, a juku was not substantially different from any other home, at least at first. Traditionally, Japanese houses had little furniture and were thus very versatile. Rooms were not set aside for a certain purpose, but used as they were needed.\(^{83}\) For a juku this meant that a large room could be used as a dormitory at night; in the morning the futon would be stored away and the students could study in the same room, generally at individual little desks.

As student numbers increased, the buildings were often extended by adding another storey or new buildings were erected, sometimes purpose-built. There were four main types of buildings: 1) the juku was essentially part of a family home, with some space set aside for teaching; 2) more of the house was used as teaching space and an additional storey built as a dormitory (e.g. Seikei shoin); 3) the house or a lecture hall became the centre, with dormitory, refectory, library etc. built around it (Kangien, Zōshun’en); 4) the juku was purpose-built and the master’s house was not part of it (Shōka sonjuku).\(^{84}\)

Of course, a juku could go through several of these stages in its development. Chōzenkan in Yoshida (Niigata prefecture) existed from 1833 to 1912, during which time it underwent several changes.\(^{85}\) It was established by Suzuki Bundai (1796–1870). After studying in Edo for three years, he started teaching around 1833 and the juku received its name in 1841. At first he taught in his father’s home. In 1835 he became independent with his own land and a two-room house, which was gradually enlarged. In 1845 the buildings were enlarged to take up to 40 students. His study became a Confucian temple (seidō) with a statue of Confucius. In 1854 the buildings were again extended. Eventually
the juku became separate from the residence. A refectory was built at an uncertain time. In 1874 a library was added. In 1881 a new main building was erected.

Essentially, however, a juku remained an extension of the master’s residence. This lack of separation between house and school, living quarters and classroom, presented its own problems. Fukuzawa Yukichi’s descriptions of life at Tekijuku (a juku for Western learning, though kangaku juku were probably similar) may be extreme, but it shows what could happen if a group of youths lived and studied together in the confines of a private residence. Tokutomi Kenjirō’s description of Nakanishi Seizan’s juku gives another vivid picture:

The school building had originally been an ordinary farmer’s house, as I have said, so there was no division into classrooms, dining rooms and dormitory, only one large all-purpose room. Our “classroom” was simply the area where the floormats were a little cleaner than elsewhere, our “dining room” the noticeably dirtier part, while we slept anywhere, out of the way of desks and tables. At the shout of “Class-time!” we would jump up from wherever we had been relaxing, under the windows, or in the quiet light by the sliding half-transparent paper doors, or in one or other of the shadowy corners of the room, to sit in a big circle—and there was our “classroom”. Outside of lesson times you might find anything going on: […]

Strict discipline was required to preserve the kind of formal atmosphere, which most masters deemed indispensable for systematic study. Regulations telling students to tidy up in the morning, to assemble for a formal greeting ceremony and to wear formal clothing at least during lessons show how the master tried to prevent the kind of scenario described by Fukuzawa Yukichi. Tokutomi Kenjirō, too, describes the students of Seizan’s juku sitting “stiffly upright in the formal posture” (p. 79) during lessons.

During the summer heat it must have been particularly hard to maintain discipline, and a certain relaxation of rules was permitted. Nevertheless, Benzai’s summer regime described above shows an attempt to preserve decorum during the hotter part of the year. Some juku closed for a month or so during the summer. Even if they did not do so formally, students sometimes
chose this time to leave. Yamamoto Shōheita, who studied at Inukai Shōsō’s San’yo juku (see “The students”) in the 1870s, wrote to his parents, “By the way, the juku is extremely dirty and there are many fleas and lice. Besides, people say that after “Shōbu” the summer heat in the juku became unbearable and most people leave.”

The picture of sheer squalor that this letter suggests is one that rarely appears in nostalgic reminiscences. On the other hand, it was often admitted with some pride that life at a juku could be Spartan. *Footprints in the Snow* is a work of fiction, but Tokutomi’s account of juku life, however idealized, may be close to reality. The poverty, the winter cold, the hard physical work of fetching firewood, drawing water from the well, making manure from their own night soil, cooking for their frugal communal meals, are sometimes mentioned in other accounts. Of course, students at urban juku would probably have been spared the experience of making manure for the master’s plantations.

Students brought their own equipment with them. Tokutomi mentions bedding, a small desk and a wicker box. Tani Kanjō (1837–1911), who studied at Yasui Sokken’s juku in the 1850s, mentions a somewhat longer list of things he bought in preparation for moving into Sankei juku; it included a desk, a box for books, eating utensils, a charcoal brazier, a lamp, a pillow, a fan, a set of boxes. The letters of Yamamoto Shōheita read like a shopping list. They were obviously written soon after his arrival at the juku and consist mainly of lists of things Shōheita wanted sent from home—not unlike letters written by boys at boarding schools to their parents at many different times and places.

In his first letter Shōheita explains that the juku is housed in two buildings, that there are 19 boarders and 15 day pupils and that the cost is 25 sen on entry and six sen five rin per day plus a share of the costs. He also mentions presents for the teacher and the fellow students. Then he goes on to ask for books to be sent, either owned by the family (Sashiden, Bunsho kihan) or to be bought (Genmei shiryaku; 4 volumes at 80 sen). The second letter again mainly lists things he wished his parents to send him. He asks for a dictionary (Kōeki seiijitsū) and several everyday items: different kinds of writing paper, including some of the best quality for copying books, a bag, a box for storing books, bonito flakes, his favourite glass bottle, an umbrella, a comb, a mirror and some cotton thread. His third letter adds to the list, asking for more books (Book of Rites, Doctrine of the Mean, Greater
Learning) and miscellaneous items: *gomashio* (salt with sesamy seeds), *irigashi* [a sweet made from popped rice or beans and sugar], an ink pot and a brush stand. One hopes that Shō Heita received what he wanted and soon settled down at San’yo juku (although the P.S. in the last letter, cited above, suggests that he did not expect to stay long).

Food seems often to have been basic. A common pattern was that students cooked rice for the whole group in turns, and that students supplemented this with their own vegetables, as in Murakami Butsusan’s Suisaien. The students at Suisaien provided their own rice, as they did at the juku of Kunitomo Koshōken, where two students cooked rice for all of them. In other juku the rice was bought from upkeep fees. Katayama Sen (1859–1933), who entered Oka Senjin’s juku in 1882 or 1883, reports that for 3 yen a month students received basic foodstuffs, rice, miso and soy sauce, imported from Sendai (where Oka came from) and of good quality. They would supplement this with vegetables and sometimes fish they bought and cooked themselves. Katayama himself could not afford to buy anything extra. Tani Kanjō’s diary frequently mentions that he bought food items like roast potatoes during outings into town. In Tokyo, students could also supplement their diet with trips to the numerous restaurants in the student quarters when they were permitted to leave the grounds.

Abe Isoo reports about student life in the kangaku juku he attended that students bought their own rice and that a share of rice from each was cooked in a large pot given out to the students. They did not receive much else, pickles for breakfast and lunch and fish or miso soup with shellfish in the evenings.

Why did the students lead a life of such extreme frugality? That was apparently because it was the rule at the juku Onishi-sensei went to in his youth, and sensei thought this was one method of training. Of course, we did not dream of clamouring that this was unfair. At that time our standard of living was very low. Especially the samurai class experienced a sharp decline after the Restoration, so this kind of student life may have seemed natural. Since we even regarded buying pickles as a luxury, we attempted to negotiate directly with a farmer in the neighbourhood and bought a lot of vegetables, which we took to the juku and pickled in one or two large tubs. There was a river not far
from the juku and at its mouth there were many clams. We sometimes went there and took the clams, received free miso paste from a rice merchant and made miso soup with clams.\textsuperscript{94}

In some cases the master is reported to have eaten with his students, as Seizan does in \textit{Footprints in the Snow}. for example, Yamada Hōkoku. The master’s family presumably ate separately. They are rather shadowy figures in accounts of juku life, although the master’s wife is sometimes portrayed as being especially kind to younger students, giving them extra food or helping them with some difficulty.\textsuperscript{95} The sons often studied in their father’s juku, taking on teaching duties at an early age to prepare them for their role as heirs (e.g. Makino Kenjirō; Chapter 5). How often the daughters were involved (like Atomi Kakei, who also taught at her father’s juku) is hard to say, but presumably rarely—unlike at terakoya-type schools.

What did the students do when they were not studying? Study schedules suggest that students at some juku had very little time to themselves, but this probably varied from juku to juku. One of the students of Kunitomo’s Ronseidō stated: “Of course, since it was a shijuku, there were no detailed rules and the way we used our time was not in the least regulated. Thus, when we had to go to a lecture the next day we studied intensively until dawn.”\textsuperscript{96} As activities outside study hours, he mentions practice in the martial arts and regular rabbit hunts in the autumn and winter. Outdoor pursuits may well have been common in the rural juku; in \textit{Footprints in the Snow} rabbit hunts are likewise mentioned, as are fishing, swimming and exploring trips (p.85). Ikeda Sōan’s student farmed, producing some of their own food. Martial arts are also mentioned in some of the reminiscenses of former students at Nishō gakusha. Yamada Jun mentions clubs and outings.\textsuperscript{97} Tokyo would of course have offered plenty of possibilities for students to spend their free time, although the strict curfews of juku in Tokyo may have limited students’ freedom to enjoy them.

Both the regulations and the details of daily life show us how education at a juku was determined by circumstances as much as by lofty ideals; boys of different ages slept, ate, studied and amused themselves within a confined space that was part of the teacher’s home. Living conditions could be Spartan. Lessons, with their lack of variety both in the subjects studied and in the
teaching methods used, may well have resulted in many hours of boredom for the less enthusiastic students. On the other hand, the emphasis on self-study may well have promoted a high degree of student responsibility and self-reliance. Moreover, communal life and study provided an experience that was fondly remembered by many in later life.

THE STUDENTS

Who were the students at a juku? This depended very much on the juku. Small juku outside the large towns often catered mainly for the local population and had mostly day pupils. Others, like Suisaien, Žōshun’en and Seikei shoin, attracted students from different parts of the country, although most were locals. This is also true of Yamada Hōkoku’s juku. The records probably list only a fraction of the people he actually taught. The following numbers are given for his juku at Osaka: 102 from the Bitchū area (including 16 from former Takahashi domain and 16 from the village of Osakabe); 28 from Bizen (16 from former Okayama domain), 62 from Mimasaka, 20 from Harima, 9 from Bingo, 10 from Tanba, 2 from Tajima, 11 from Inaba, 14 from Izumo, 16 from Bungo, 3 from Chikuzen, 1 from Buzen, 2 from Kyoto, 4 from Ise, 1 from Owari, 6 from Hitachi (6 from former Mito domain) and 1 each from Echizen and Musashi.98 These figures suggest that most students came from places in the immediate neighbourhood or from surrounding areas, especially from present Okayama prefecture, but also from the adjacent prefectures. A significant number came from further away, in particular from northern Kyūshū. Many came from rural, even isolated areas, not from the larger castle towns, where there would have been local schools and juku to choose from.

The students of Inukai Shōsō’s San’yo juku appear to have come mainly from the surrounding area. Of the 309 students known by name,99 29 came from Okayama city, 4 from Kurashiki city, 180 from Tsukubo district and 50 from Kibi district (both near Kurashiki) and 81 from other districts in the prefecture. Eleven students are listed as coming from outside the prefecture, but the 6 from Tokyo included Inukai Tsuyoshi, who came from Okayama (Niwase domain, now Okayama city), so some or most of these may well have originated from places close to San’yo juku. For 44 names no place was known. The figures, incomplete as they are, show that the juku was predominantly of local
importance with few students coming from outside the surrounding districts.

Figure 8: Illustration of juku students (from a document on display in the Morohashi Tetsuji museum). Photograph: the author

One of Shōsō’s students, Nanba Kuichirō, kept a diary in 1881. The Nanba were a family of village headmen and, in early Meiji, local administrators (kochō) in the village of Shimoshō. The papers of the Nanba family also include excerpts of Inukai’s lectures and works read between 1881 and 1883, some at least from the same Kuichirō. Titles include the Outlines of the Eighteen Histories, Mencius, Sun Zi, Nihon gaishi, Spring and Autumn Annals and the Greater Learning. In the diary Nanba recorded daily (sometimes clearly retrospectively) what he did and whether or not he went to San’yo juku. For most days he recorded that he busied himself with affairs in and around the house (kayō ni tsukamatsuri) and attended juku. Sometimes he recorded errands in detail. At the end of the year he recorded for each month how many days he went to the juku and arrived at a total of 234 days. There were two long breaks when the juku was closed, at the beginning of the year and in the seventh month (Namba used the old-style calendar), at the time of the bon festival.
The Nanba papers also contain an undated letter from Kuichirō to his friends and fellow students, Kurisaka and Akagi (both names appear in the diary). Kuichirō writes that the juku has started again after the break for the bon festival and informs them about the contents of lessons: lectures on the *Spring and Autumn Annals* every day, on the *Outlines of the Eighteen Histories* and Mencius every other day and group readings on the *Spring and Autumn Annals* and Mencius. Other works mentioned are Sun Zi and the *Analects*.

Hakuen shoin in Osaka, although an urban juku, appears also to have catered mainly for students from the vicinity. By 1904, 5,000 are said to have studied at Hakuen shoin, 4,500 of which came from Sanuki, where the Fujisawa family originally came from, the others from all over Japan. Unfortunately, there seem to be no entrance registers for the Meiji period, but the entrance registers for the years 1843 to 1859 list 288 students, mostly boarders and only a fraction of the students at Hakuen shoin. They came from many regions, but those close to Osaka dominated; 47 students came from Sanuki, including Takamatsu domain, where the Fujisawas originated from, 21 from Osaka and 20 from Kii (including 6 from Mount Kōya). About 10 to 20 entered the juku each year. In his application submitted to the authorities by Nangaku in 1872, 15 boarders are mentioned by name and the number of 46 day pupils is given. The day pupils would mostly have been local, although some students from further away may have lodged with relatives.

Juku in Tokyo, on the other hand, were often attended by students from all over Japan, and most of their students were boarders. Whereas the local juku in a remote area might be the only educational institution a student ever attended, students in Tokyo would study at a variety of juku and schools simultaneously or in (sometimes rapid) succession. In 1905 Nishō gakusha’s school magazine published a list of students studying at another school while staying at the juku. Nine students were studying at Seisoku Eigo gakkō, five each at Meiji daigaku and Kokugakuin, four at Kokugo denshūsho, three at Gaikokugo gakkō (Foreign Language School), two each at Hibiya chūgakkō (middle school) and Nihon chūgakkō and one each at Hōsei daigaku, Waseda daigaku, Junten chūgakkō, Hokakuin daigaku, Senshū gakkō, Kokumin eigakukai, Tetsugakukan, Keihoku chūgakkō, Seisoku chūgakkō, Kōtō shōgyō gakkō, Kogyōkusha chūgakkō, Azabu kōtō shōgakkō, Kaijō gakkō and the French...
department of Gyōsei gakkō. Thus many were attending middle schools or private institutions of higher education while studying kangaku. Several held appointments as elementary school teachers or in government. In all, Nishō gakusha had 100 students at the time, boarders and day pupils, and the juku was occupied to capacity.\(^\text{104}\) By 1905 Nishō gakusha had established itself as a specialist school (even if it did not formally become a senmon gakkō until 1928), so we would expect more students to be studying at other schools as well as Nishō gakusha than in the earlier years.

If the master came from a region outside Tokyo, a high proportion of his students also came from there. This was the case in the early years of Oka Senjin’s juku in Tokyo, especially in the first years. By 1874, from which year until 1886 we have a total of 760 documented entrants, students were coming from all over Japan. The documents in the metropolitan archives record their promise to abide by the rules of the academy, with the date of their entrance, their age, the name of their father or guardian and of their guarantor. Most pupils were in their teens and early twenties. Few were 14 or younger, the youngest 9. A few were in their late twenties and early thirties; the oldest was 37. About half of the pupils came from the samurai class, the rest were commoners. Some are recorded as farmers and two as members of the nobility. Most of the students from outside Tokyo may well have belonged to a local elite and completed their elementary education close to home before coming to the capital.

We do not know how long most students stayed at Suiyūdō, except in a few cases. One of Senjin’s students was the China scholar and professor, Tatemori Manpei (Kōchūkai, 1863–1942), who reportedly spent six years at Oka Senjin’s juku before moving on to Šhigeno Yasutsugu’s. He came from Sendai, like Senjin, and had studied kangaku in his home village before coming to Tokyo.\(^\text{105}\)

In later years the juku, like others of its kind, served mainly as a boarding house. Katayama Sen (see Chapter 5), who entered in the early 1880s, states that by then the juku was perceived as offering supplementary training for those who needed kangaku for the entrance examinations to government schools and that it was mainly popular as a cheap boarding house. He remarks that the students were not particularly brilliant. Senjin went to China in 1884, a year that saw 74 new entrants, a high number, although lower than the peak years of 1880 to 1883.\(^\text{106}\)
Students in Tokyo tended to be older, since they had usually completed elementary and some secondary education before coming to Tokyo. In 1872 Hayashi Kakuryō had 8 students, over 19. Also in 1872, Oka Senjin reported to the authorities that Suiyūdō had 3 pupils aged six to nine, 6 aged ten to thirteen, 10 aged 14 to 15, 3 aged 17 to 19 and 10 over nineteen, 32 in all, all of them male. Tatemori Manpei’s contemporary Taka Otozō, at Shigeno’s juku, reported that when he studied there, the 34 pupils had mostly completed elementary and middle school education and were around 20 years old, although some were 30 or 40. Most of them were studying English, law, political economy or other Western subjects elsewhere and were preparing for the civil service examinations.

Students from kangaku juku had a reputation for being rough, although Fukuzawa Yukichi’s description of life at Tekijuku suggests that this was not limited to kangaku students. The Spartan life and the fact that most of them where samurai with a relatively conservative attitude may have contributed to this image. Descriptions of kangaku students in Tokyo in early Meiji say that they were dressed like savages, hatless or with braided hats (amigasa), in summer half naked and barefoot, in winter without a shirt, only wearing padded cotton clothes, in rainy weather they clattered along in high clogs (geta) holding up umbrellas rather than wearing rain coats. Their hair could be dishevelled or they still had topknots. Their behaviour often matched their dress. Students of Taguchi Bunzō’s juku are reported to have stood in a row at Ryōgoku bridge, blocking the way while they shouted at passers-by and commented on the women. Tsubouchi Shōyō, in his novella Tōsei shosei kishitsu, writes that the obscene and rude behaviour of juku students did not bear description. An article from the newspaper Tokyo nichinichi shinbun on 26 June 1872 describes a scene in Asakusa involving students from a kangaku juku who were out walking with students from a juku for Western studies:

 […] The kangaku students were wearing the usual gusseted hakama of Kokura cotton with high-heeled geta and bearing large swords, and carrying fans and blocking the wide street as they walked. Just then a Westerner was walking along, and the kangaku students made grim faces and flexed their elbows and, turning round to the yōgaku students asking, “tell us what country is this barbarian from?” When the
yōgaku students answered, “from Germany”, the kangaku students pointed their fans in his face, saying “doitsu” [Germany] [...]110

Students at Nishō gakusha are also reported to have been rowdy, especially those who aspired to enter the military school. In one incident, in the 1870s, well remembered by those who witnessed it, a group of students from Saga prefecture attacked those from Satsuma, who lived apart from the others over the lecture hall because of their different customs. The conflict escalated until high-ranking men outside the school were involved in negotiations with Nishō gakusha. Another student, who entered Nishō gakusha in 1891, also remembered the students from Kagoshima prefecture as particularly troublesome.111

Fujisawa Nangaku’s juku appears to have had its share of ruffians too. A grandson told the following story he had heard about a visit Nangaku made to the shrine of Sugawara no Michizane with his students:

Among the students of Fujisawa juku at the time, many were rough and lively. In town some of them were given a wide berth. The students accompanying Nangaku walked swiftly through the crowds of pilgrims, bumping straight into people coming towards them. My grandfather found this hard to handle; he dived into a hardware shop and bought the biggest rice tub, making the ruffians carry it. You cannot bump into the people walking on the street if you are carrying a large rice tub, so, as he expected, these people were put in their place.112

The episode may illustrate Nangaku’s resourcefulness, but one wonders how these students, whom the master tamed only with difficulty, behaved in his absence.

Unsurprisingly, young women were rarely found in this kind of company, and the typical kangaku juku was an all male community. Nevertheless, female students occasionally attended kangaku juku, as day pupils, as we already saw in the case of Suisaien. Another example is Fukunishi Shigeko (1847–98), who studied with Yamada Hōkoku and in 1885 opened a secondary school for girls in Bitchū-Takahashi, her home town.113 While she may have been taught separately from the other students, a few
young women are known to have attended lectures at Nishō gakusha. They included the educator Kaetsu Taka (1867–1944) and the future Christian minister and missionary Uemura Tamaki (1890–1982). Kaetsu later reported that there were three or four of them in her time (1890–91); they used a separate entrance to the lecture hall from the men and found graffiti on their desks. Kaetsu remembered Chūshū lecturing in a hall with damaged tatami mats and old desks and thought the other women did not come for long. Uemura remembered that there were about 30 students in her time (1914–15); she and her friend were the only women, and the students were all disciplined.¹¹⁴

What was the master’s ideal student like? Yamamura Benzai describes such a student in two dedications he wrote (in 1885 and 1888) for Satō Shiken (Kihachirō), who studied at his juku from 1879 to 1888. Satō was praised for his personal and moral qualities rather than his intellectual abilities. He was reportedly very diligent, did not trouble the servants, mix with people outside the juku, overeat, drink, visit tea and sake houses, or waste time with women, music or games. He went for walks only in his free time, kept his room and his things clean and tidy, studied harder than anyone else, sticking to kangaku at a time when Western studies were fashionable. He visited his family twice a month and after completing his studies prepared to return to them and fulfil his promises to them, although he also wanted to ask permission to continue studying. Benzai stated that of all his students, Satō really practiced what he had been taught and was a true gentleman (kunshi). Benzai referred to his model student in 89 poems. They continued to have a close relationship and after Benzai’s death, Satō built a monument to him built with a text by Fujisawa Nangaku inscribed on it.¹¹⁵

Traditional juku are remembered today for the relationships that defined them, mainly the relationship between master and student, but also the relationships between students. They lived together in close quarters, often for years. In some cases they came from different parts of the country with different customs and different dialects. How did they communicate, given that there was no standardized spoken language and people speaking regional variants can be mutually unintelligible, even today? Sometimes with difficulty, it seems. Of Daigaku Nankō, a precursor to Tokyo University, it is reported that misunderstandings between students could lead to fights, and this may well have applied to kangaku juku as well.¹¹⁶
Reminiscences emphasize the positive, even sentimental aspects of this communal life, including the friendships that grew from it. Tokutomi Kenjirō’s hero, however, while painting a rose-tinted picture of juku, also describes students meting out “unofficial punishments” or, more bluntly, bullying each other. One can only guess at how common such behaviour was. Presumably, given the architecture of a traditional Japanese home, the master and his family would in most cases never have been far off, and this may have imposed restraint.

In a setting where students were expected to do much of their learning by themselves, competition could be a useful incentive. Kōda Rohan, who spent a short while in a juku at the age of 17 or 18 in the 1890s, gives a vivid description of such a situation:

So when a rumour like “so and so is an exceptional fellow, he has read the biography section of Shiki completely in one hundred days” spread around the juku, some hero would emerge and say, “So what, I’ll read the whole thing from end to end in 50 days”, and another would appear and say, “I will study the main section and the biography section completely in one month”. In this way they would fire each other up, and a lazy chap, instead of just being lazy and never progressing would instead study and advance rapidly.

Sometimes such competitiveness resulted in students trying to put each other down at the group reading sessions:

We would each expound on the passage assigned to us and if we made a mistake the others would intervene and discuss it and the teacher would judge and the person who made a mistake would get a black mark in his notebook. Thus, if the students said to each other, “This chap looks arrogant and pretends he’s great, although he can’t do anything, let’s give him a hard time”, they would band together and bully him terribly at the group reading. When I think of it now, we had a very odd way of fighting. Once someone thought he wanted to annoy another. He went through the dictionary—of course he was someone who habitually made good use of the dictionary—and even investigated the origin of a character in advance. Then,
without being able to wait until his enemy had finished his exposition, he let out his hard question. Since he had investigated so thoroughly, he stubbornly discussed the character and the speaker was greatly teased, but because he was teased too much, he eventually lost his temper and told his tormentor, “I think it is enough to understand the general outline of the texts I read, so I do not bother with things like interpreting every detail”, and so the two argued fiercely.  

Because the boarders of a juku formed a close-knit community, it is easy to assume that ties between students of a juku were particularly close and could last a lifetime. But were such ties closer than school ties in general? There is occasional evidence of their political significance. When Inukai Tsuyoshi, a former student at San’yō juku, stood for election to Japan’s first parliament, some of his former fellow students mounted a campaign to support him. In this case the men in question also came from the same region. Another example of juku ties used for political ends is that of Makino Kenjirō’s and Fujisawa Genzō’s role in the 1911 textbook controversy about the depiction of the Nanbokuchō period (period of the imperial schism in the fourteenth century). Aroused by a leading article in the newspaper Yomiuri shinbun in January 1911, two professors of Waseda University, Matsudaira Yasukuni and Makino Kenjirō, persuaded Fujisawa Genzō, a son of Fujisawa Nangaku, to raise the issue in parliament. Makino was a former student of Fujisawa Nangaku.

How significant were such ties between students and what effect did the experience of study at a juku have for the students’ future lives? The importance of yūgaku in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji period has been stressed, although the evidence is not conclusive. Most juku outside the large towns catered mainly for local students. Besides, the fact that many future leaders spent time at a certain juku does not in itself prove that the experience was decisive. Many juku can boast a few famous students, yet most of their students are now forgotten. Thus it is difficult to make a case that ties between people at juku were closer than school ties in general.

Perhaps more remarkable is that in some cases ties between students of a juku extend to their descendants, although the juku no longer exists. In November 1990 an association of descendants
of Kangien students (Kangien monkasei shison zenkoku dōsōkai) was established in Hida, with members coming from all over the country, from Hokkaidō to Kagoshima. They visited the site where Hirose Tansō started teaching and listened to a panel discussion on Hirose Tansō and his idea of education. Tsunetō Toshisuke, in describing the meeting, writes that it was like meeting old acquaintances.120 This may be an exceptional example, but there are other instances where activities to commemorate the master draw together the descendents of former students (Chapter 6).

THE JUKU AS A BUSINESS: FINANCE

Traditionally, the master of a juku would not take fees. He would not depend on teaching for his income. If he was a samurai, he received a rice stipend; often he had an official appointment, such as teacher at the domain school. In Tokyo many masters were officials of the shogunate.121 Hayashi Kakuryō had various appointments while running his juku and Yasui Sokken was appointed to the Shōheikō, although not until 1862. A commoner would usually derive his income from his main profession. If he was a physician, this would be his practice. Kan Chazan (Chapter 6), a merchant’s son and initially a merchant himself, received support from his feudal lord when his juku became well known. Murakami Butsusen received a share of farmland from the family inheritance when he set up his juku. This is also true of Suzuki Bundai, the founder of Chōzenkan. Inukai Shōsō saw teaching as something he did when his main calling as a farmer allowed it. Nevertheless, Nanba recorded in his diary in 1881 that he paid 1 yen 50 sen to the teacher and 17 sen as juku fees each half of the year. In fact, a master did not always find it easy to make ends meet.122 Thus, the absence of a fixed monthly fee does not mean that the students paid nothing or that the juku could survive without contributions from students. At the very least, students paid their living expenses. It was also usual to give presents in currency or kind on entry and twice a year, in summer and at the end of the year or more often, such as at the gosekku, the five seasonal festivals.

The report on the juku of Kimigabukuro in the former domain of Sendai, submitted in 1883, gives more details than most on contributions from students. The section on fees begins by stating: “The master originally received a stipend from his lord and
therefore his family did not lack resources and there was no fixed fee.” It goes on to say that in some cases the family of the pupil would present from 1 or 2 gold shū to 1 bu (old currency), according to their means, on entry. In other cases they would prepare steamed rice with azuki beans and two or three kinds of vegetables for the other students. During the year at the five seasonal festivals or on the 15th of January, July and October, people would present as an offering of thanks 30, 50 or 67 mon or 100 mon (iron coins of low value in the old currency). Many would present fish or vegetables according to the season (the report gives examples). The end of the year and the bon festival in particular were dates for presentations to the teacher, according to each family’s means, from 1 or 2 gold shū to 1 or 2 bu. Contributions towards firewood, coal and lamp oil for studying at night were also common. Other reports on juku in Miyagi prefecture likewise stated that there were no fixed fees, as do the reports on juku in Ōita prefecture compiled in 1883. In the late Edo period an increasing number of masters lived mainly from their teaching and depended on gifts and fees from students; this was also true of Hirose Tansō, the master of Kangien. Even more had to rely on income from their juku in the Meiji period, including the samurai, when they lost their stipends. A letter from Yasui Sokken to his daughter Sumako illustrates their plight. At the time he wrote, in April 1872, the government had stopped granting scholarships to students coming to Tokyo to study at private institutions, and Sokken wrote that most of his students were former samurai who could not afford to study away from home any longer; the number of students at his juku had shrunk to 10 and he was contemplating a move to Chiba.

Applications to open a juku submitted to the metropolitan government in Tokyo in 1871–73 generally include a section stating fees, presumably because the applicants were required to do so. In many cases the applicant stated that there was no fixed monthly fee; Hayashi Kakuryō’s application is an example. Yasui Sokken’s application stated that students were to pay 1 yen 25 sen on entry, when they left and twice a year and a contribution towards their food. Day pupils were to pay 50 sen twice a year. At Oka Senjin’s juku, the entrance fee was 1 yen and the monthly fee one yen 3 bu. Shigeno Yasutsugu’s application of 1874 stated the following fees: on entrance (sokushū): 200 hiki; 100 hiki at each of the five sekku festivals; monthly fee, 2 yen. The latter
was variable, as it was based on the rice price. In his second application of 1888, Shigeno stated that he had an income of 50 sen per person per month in fees, totalling 360 yen a year. Of this, 300 yen came from tuition fees and 61 yen was “miscellaneous income”. His expenditure totalled 361 yen, of which 300 yen were teachers’ salaries (for 2 teachers) and 61 yen “miscellaneous expenses”. The juku rules stated that the monthly boarding fees were 2 yen 50 sen, but could vary with the commodity prices.129

According to Taka Otozō, who was at Shigeno’s juku from 1889 until its closure in 1891, Shigeno had too few students to make the juku financially viable. He received a loan from the publishing house Taiseikan, which dealt with the publications of the Office of Historiography, where Shigeno was employed, but finally had to close his juku.130

Many kangaku juku had a reputation for being cheap, which explains why some became popular boarding houses. In general, registration fees, if they were fixed, ranged from 25 sen to 1 yen for kangaku juku and from 1 yen to 2 yen 50 sen for foreign language schools. The monthly fees, where fixed, ranged from 10 sen to 50 sen, sometimes with variations depending on the level of study or the subject; again foreign language institutions were more expensive, ranging from 25 sen to 2 yen 50 sen and in one case three yen. Foreign language juku or schools tended to be larger and employ teachers, who had to be paid for, and this may explain the higher prices. There is less variation in the boarding fees, although some kangaku juku did not take a fixed fee (either in money or in kind) even for boarding. A monthly sum between 1 yen 50 sen and 2 yen 50 sen was common.131

How high were prices outside Tokyo? Nishinomiya Tōchō’s application to reopen Shijōdō (Chapter 5) gives the sum of 25 yen, possibly a yearly fee, which is broken down into proportions for changing the tatami mats once a year, fuel, roof maintenance and miscellaneous costs. The report for Chōzenkan in Niigata, submitted in 1870, states that there was no entrance fee: 1 shū each was due at the beginning of the year and at the beginning of March, 2 shū in May, 1 bu in midsummer, 1 shū in September and 2 bu at the end of the year; the report added, however, that this was not definitely fixed. A pupil of Gengaku’s time reported that the monthly fee was 50 sen when he attended.132 An application to open a juku in Osaka in 1882 stated that the fees were 50 sen on
entry, 50 sen per month, 9 sen per day for food and 10 sen per month for boarding.\textsuperscript{133}

Potential students who could not afford fees were not necessarily prevented from studying at a \textit{juku}. They were often allowed to pay their way by doing various jobs around the \textit{juku} and the master’s household. This is how Katayama Sen was able to study at Oka Senjin’s \textit{juku}. He became a \textit{jukuboku}, a servant, whose job was to announce the start and finish of a lecture, clear the lecture hall, explain the rules to newcomers and to perform reception duties and the occasional errand. Katayama would have preferred to study Western learning, but the fact that he could study at Oka’s \textit{juku} without funds of his own was decisive.\textsuperscript{134} A student at Nishō gakusha reports that not only did he not have to pay fees as a \textit{gakuboku} (school servant), but was even paid 50 sen a month. His duties included watching the door and announcing the lessons.\textsuperscript{135}

The concept of school fees was accepted with difficulty, as shown by the many applications stating that there were no regular fees and that the teacher received no salary. A memorandum by Ikeda Sōan illustrates the traditional attitude of the Confucian scholar towards charging fees. His application, drawn up in 1873, stated that payments on entry and payments to the teacher were not fixed and left to the discretion of the students. Boarding fees were 6 gō (1.08 liters) of white rice and 1 sen 7 ri per day. In his “Resolution to submit an application to open a \textit{kajuku}”, written in October 1873, Sōan deplores having to ask for permission to do something that belongs naturally to the vocation of a Confucian scholar. He opens his memorandum with the following words:

\begin{quote}
At this time, when I am applying to open a \textit{kajuku}, I am already a scholar and close to saying that I want to teach. Can this therefore be called the pride of a scholar? Moreover, if I submit an application and ask for permission I will certainly open a \textit{kajuku} and I will be like those scholars of \textit{yōgaku}, who sell their skills for money and let fall the principles of our predecessors, and our scholarship will fall into disrepute. Given these two assumptions, the word “negau” [i.e. having to ask for permission] disturbs me; there will probably be people who close their \textit{juku} and dismiss their students.
\end{quote}
Ikeda laments the changes of his time and expresses fears about the future of *kangaku*. Yet he is resolved to comply with the new order, however distasteful, so that he can continue to teach, since he feels that his teaching is needed more than ever:

Look at it this way; now schools are built in all the villages in the realm, and the learning that is proclaimed everywhere is all about technical skills and making profits. There is no one at all to explain even the rudiments of humanity, justice, loyalty, filial piety and duty (*jingi, chūkō, giri*).  

For Sōan the issue of fees is just one aspect of the repressive policies of the government towards *kangaku juku*. He obviously saw himself as a professional, as the memorandum shows, but charging fees for his services did not belong to this image. A private student of Yasui Sokken’s heir, Bokudō (Nagasawa Kikuya, 1902–80), stated that Bokudō refused to charge for lessons. Nagasawa sent him a midsummer present of soy sauce for many years, until Bokudō asked him to stop. Bokudō would presumably have derived his main income from teaching at regular schools.

In the end the success or otherwise of a master to place his *juku* on a sound financial basis may well have been one of the most significant reasons determining whether a *juku* survived or not. The master had to offer something that was in demand, which often meant supplementing *kangaku* with other subjects. He also had to comply with regulations governing private schools. If he employed additional teachers, he had to find money to pay them. If he had many students, he needed buildings to accommodate them and these had to be maintained. In short, for anything beyond a small number of private pupils taught informally in his living room, a master needed money and business sense, but such thinking was alien to many *kangaku* scholars. Masters of *juku* for Western learning appear to have found it easier to shake off traditional attitudes. They were, for example, more likely to advertise their *juku* in the newspapers.

As the example of Nishō gakusha shows, it was possible for a *kangaku* master with determination to create a permanent institution, if he had enough support. Mishima Chūshū was able to fill a niche in educational provision and, perhaps most importantly, to use his influential connections. Although his *juku*
for a time degenerated to a cheap boarding house, with a few lectures thrown in, it became a school which still exists today. But how many schools like his, based on kangaku, could be expected to survive once Western learning had become the key to social advancement? Anyway, most kangaku masters may well have been content to teach a small number of students informally for as long as they could, accepting that the times had changed and that their juku would end when they died. After all, any juku that survived for generations appears to have always been the exception rather than the rule. Like Ikeda Sōan, many kangaku masters refused to regard their juku as a business, which, in an age where private education had become just that, meant that the establishment was doomed.
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CHAPTER FIVE
The Decline of the Juku

JUKU IN GENERAL, INCLUDING KANGAKU JUKU, flourished in the 1870s and continued to hold their own in the 1880s. But by around 1890, sooner in some places, later in others, they were definitely in decline. The national school system was by then fully established. It stressed Western knowledge, and as a new generation educated in the new schools grew to maturity, the importance of the traditional kangaku education declined. Given the government’s aim to control education and its preference for public schools, it is perhaps surprising that the kangaku juku survived for as long as they did. But the example of Akita shows that private initiative was not easily suppressed, nor was a hard line approach necessarily beneficial in achieving the central government’s goal of spreading education.

In the end it was not direct government intervention that brought about the juku’s demise, but the social changes resulting from the national education system. At the same time, juku of the kind we know today began to emerge.

THE CASE OF AKITA

The feudal domain of Akita (or Kubota), now part of Akita prefecture, became the only northern domain to take the side of the new government during the Meiji restoration. Akita’s educational policies show a determination to implement the decisions of the central government that went beyond that of most other prefectures.¹

Education in this region had flourished during the Edo period with a rise in the number of different types of schools from around 1800. The Akita domain school, Meitokukan, was established in 1789, and other domains established schools at
around the same time. Many teachers at the domain schools had their own juku, and from 1828 the domain gave financial support to juku.2 Nihon kyōkushishiryō lists 66 juku for Akita (Akita kenshi lists another 19),3 more than, for example, Kyoto (34), Hyōgo (52), Chiba (52), Aichi (43), Fukuoka (50) and Kumamoto (45) and about as many as Hiroshima (65). Nearly all of them were kangaku juku. None specialized in Western learning.4 In 1869 the domain schools, which had been closed during the Restoration wars, reopened and the other schools too continued to operate. This changed with the Education Law of 1872. The execution of the policies was the responsibility of the prefectures, and the authorities in Akita prefecture were particularly strict in their interpretation of the central government order. All schools were ordered closed and few received permission to reopen. Prospective teachers had to acquire a licence by passing a public examination, which included a range of subjects. A teacher training school was established, which produced its first graduates in 1874.5 In practice it was almost impossible for traditional kangaku scholars to pass the examination.

The reason for the prefecture’s radical approach was given in an order to juku teachers on 30 April 1874 to report the closure of their juku by 31 May. The order alleged that the juku did not teach the basic skills of reading, writing and numeracy and hindered progress by encouraging empty discussions of hollow principles and that teachers confused the people by criticizing the new elementary schools. Teachers at juku had already been told to stop criticizing the new schools by a previous order on 25 February.6

The regulations were apparently ignored. A prefectural order on 30 August 1875 warned that teachers found teaching secretly would be identified and charged a fine, although parents were allowed to teach their own children at home. A similar order was issued on 9 October 1876.7 In 1875, an official of the Ministry of Education visited the school district of Tsuchisaki and reported that there were very few pupils at the public school there, because many children were attending illicit kajuku.8 A report by inspectors from the Ministry of Education in 1875 deplored the alleged stupidity and backwardness of the people of Akita and stated that the prefecture’s effort to create schools met either with open defiance or secret attendance of juku.9 Another report two years later again criticized the backwardness of the people and described the government’s efforts, but conceded that the
prefecture’s radical approach in dealing with private education was not necessarily conducive to progress in education. According to the report the government had put an end to private institutions in 1874, because the scholars of Chinese and Japanese learning had impeded the new schools. Some older teachers were continuing to teach secretly.\textsuperscript{10}

The sentiments of the scholars resisting the prefecture’s measures are expressed in a memorandum by Komatsu Guzan (Kōki, 1822–97), who had taught at the domain school and had his own juku since 1853. Komatsu stated the following:

As I teach \textit{kangaku} students, the proclamation to the effect that, since we mislead the students into hollow discussions of empty theories, we must close by 31 May, fills me with utter perplexity. \textit{Kangaku} only teaches the five Confucian relationships and the five cardinal Confucian virtues, lacks nothing in application in daily life and is venerated as the path of righteousness. It is in complete contrast to heresies like the Western barbarian teachings, which revere the [Christian] god and uplift personal gain, while looking down on morality. Moreover, the characters and compound words that make up your proclamation are mostly based on \textit{kangaku}; the expression “denshū” from the Denshū school [the new teacher training school] comes from the Analects of Confucius. When the students have read \textit{kangaku}, they can of course naturally read works on Japanese history and translations, and so their daily actions will certainly be conducted on the basis of maintaining peace and tranquility in the prefecture. Besides, the teachings of the sages include, among the six arts, the art of writing and that of numbers, and all students, with whatever teacher they study, usually master writing and arithmetic etc. Therefore it goes without saying that they study reading and writing in \textit{kajuku}. What is wrong with \textit{kangaku} that I should close my juku? Please provide a convincing explanation.\textsuperscript{11}

Komatsu even sent his son to present his case to the central government. As a result, the prefectural governor at the time lost his post, but Komatsu still did not receive permission to run a juku until April 1879.

Another juku not permitted to reopen after 1872 was the Shijodō. The application was made by Nishinomiya Tōchō (1825–
Nishinomiya was born in Kakunodate and adopted into the Nishinomiya family, a family of merchants. From 1841 to 1848 he studied with a scholar of Chinese learning in Kubota (now Akita city). From 1850 he had various posts at the domain school. In 1870 he became the head of the Kubota domain school (bungaku). But the school had to close when the domains were abolished in 1871. Nishinomiya, however, continued in an official positon and held high offices in the prefectural government. Shijodō had been founded by Kurosawa Shijo (1783–1851) in 1821. Kurosawa was born in Kakunodate, studied at the domain school Meitokukan and then taught there, becoming head of the school in 1845. At Shijodō the Chinese classics were studied, and the juku is said to have had several hundred students during Kurosawa’s lifetime, including Hiramoto Kinsai (1810–76), who took over the juku.12 Hiramoto also taught at Meitokukan, and later headed the domain school. He also was a tutor to the 30th, 31st and 32nd lords of the domain, besides holding other official positions.13 In 1866 he was sent to Kyoto in the service of his lord, and it was probably at this time that Tōchō took over Shijodō.14 Thus Shijodō was a prominent juku run by scholars who had risen to the top of the official domain hierarchy prior to 1868. It may well be that this gave the prefectural authorities particular reason to regard it as a threat to the establishment of new schools, and subsequent developments suggest that they may have been right. But first let us look at what Nishinomiya had in mind when he applied to reopen Shijodō in the summer of 1873.

The application submitted in July 1873 states that the subjects to be studied were Chinese and Japanese classics (kō-kanseki); Western works could be read in translation. Students were to be divided into five ranks and certain texts were allocated to each, including the Four Books and Five Classics, the Outlines of the Eighteen Histories and Japanese histories in kanbun, such as the Nihon gaishi. Students over 21 years old were to read according to their own abilities. Examinations were to be held in the spring and autumn. The aims and admonitions stated under jukusoku (juku regulations) can be summarized as follows: (1) Students were to learn to love their country and revere the gods through the study of Japanese classics, to learn moral principles from the Chinese classics and to become clever in practical skills through the study of Western works. They were not to let private views interfere with the public good. (2) They were to learn filial piety and loyalty by studying many works from political leaders. (3)
They were to venerate what is higher, love what is small and childlike and never to neglect good forms in their actions. (4) Reading lessons (sodoku) were to take place in the mornings from dawn; the afternoon was devoted to the explication of texts (gikai). (5) Students were to attend on all the days when lessons took place.\footnote{15}

The application was turned down. It is not clear what happened to Shijodō subsequently, but later newspaper reports (see below) suggest that it operated for a short while before closing in 1874. Nishinomiya returned to a post in the prefectural government, responsible for education (shōmuka gakumu kakari).\footnote{16}

Akita’s policy of suppressing private schools was not continued with equal force. In 1878 the Ministry of Education loosened its control over private schools, and Akita too adopted a less radical approach, approving some juku of teachers without a licence.\footnote{17} Not everyone was happy with this change; one Katano Shigeo, a student described as a ryūgakusei (from outside the region?) at the Akita teacher training college, expressed the fear that allowing juku again would mean the end of the new schools, since the unenlightened preferred the old-style terakoya and juku.\footnote{18} Others, however, welcomed the new freedom and the choice it gave people; Ishii Kōkyō condemned Katano’s argument and claimed that people abandoned the public schools in favour of juku because the juku were more appropriate for them.\footnote{19} Apparently more than one public school found itself without pupils, because these preferred the newly permitted juku. In Kakunodate even the assistant teachers from the public school left when two scholars were permitted to open juku. A new teacher had to be called in from a neighbouring district and he called in the children’s families to lecture them on the importance of public school education. But people continued to prefer juku, so the district governor himself explained the official view to the people.\footnote{20}

The Education Ordinance (kyōikurei) of September 1879 made the establishment of private schools easier and even made it possible for them to receive public support. The change of policy encouraged Nishinomiya Tōchō to apply for permission to reopen Shijodō. He resigned from his post with the prefecture on 5 December. An acquaintance, styling himself Kizendō Shujin (probably a pseudonym), prepared a publicity text for the newspapers.\footnote{21} He described how Nishinomiya had been forced to close Shijōdō to his own deep regret and that of his predecessor,
Hiramoto Kinsai. When the new ordinance made it possible to reopen the juku, Nishinomiya reportedly said to himself:

This juku that I opened and closed myself, how should I leave it and not concern myself whether it stays closed or is reopened? Shijodō was opened by my predecessor Kurosawa and taken over by Hiramoto, and he passed it on to me. From this scholarly line it originates. Previously I had to distort the will of my predecessors to follow the order of the prefecture. Now to reopen the juku is to follow the imperial order and to fulfil the will of the teachers that went before me. Meeting with this good opportunity, if I did not give up my official post and revive the juku, I would not be able to face meeting my teachers in the other world in death, nor have the words to speak to the students I met in this world in my lifetime. Whether the revival succeeds will depend on whether or not students take it up; but even if following the order achieves no success, I am only doing my duty, so why should I feel shame in my heart?

Kizendō also described the curriculum:

[... ] the curriculum will consist mainly of kanseki; but Nishinomiya will not get stuck in the old methods, but combine selectively with today's methods and, based on the third section of the Education Ordinance [which specified the subjects to be taught at elementary schools], teach the way of ethics, only polish the moral behaviour, let students read Japanese, Chinese and Western historical works to make clear peace and unrest, gain and loss of old times and modern, not be glued to the details of words and phrases, nor discuss circumlocutions. Instead, by means of abacus calculation the principles of the four arithmetical operations will be taught; in brush writing, handling the brush will be made the first purpose and in all times he will choose to consider the measure of human progress, so I am told.

Kizendō’s remarks reflect Nishinomiya’s efforts to counter the criticism the prefecture had levelled at kangaku juku a few years before and to provide an education suited to the times in the best way he knew.
Nishinomiya had the backing and financial support of like-minded men, and this time he was successful. The opening ceremony was held on 3 February 1880. The local newspaper, *Akita kaji shinbun*, quoted some of the opening speeches, which mention the fact that Shijodō already had 200 pupils, including the ones from Tōkaku gakkō, a public school on the grounds next to Shijodō, established in 1874. The speeches praised Nishinomiya’s private initiative and the independence of private schools and spoke critically of public education, which was perceived to be contaminated with officialdom.\(^\text{22}\)

As the articles celebrating the opening of Shijodō pointed out, its 200 pupils included the 30 pupils of Tōkaku gakkō, who transferred to the new juku, apparently with the support of their teachers. As a result the public school had to close and Shijodō took over its buildings.\(^\text{23}\) The increase in student numbers required extending the school buildings, and Nishinomiya applied to the prefecture for a loan of 500 yen, which he received; in May 1880 he reported how it had been spent.

Tōkaku gakkō was not the only public school which lost its pupils to a juku at this time. A newspaper article appearing three months after the opening of Shijodō mentioned another private school in the same district, Kyūsei gakkō, which had replaced a public school.\(^\text{24}\)

These developments disturbed the prefectural authorities. The Education Ordinance made it possible for private schools to receive public funding, and when the district governor asked for financial support from the Ministry of Education and out of the regional taxes in May 1880, the prefectural authorities launched an enquiry to determine whether the two schools served the public good, how they were financed and what had happened to the public money which had gone to the former public schools in 1874. The district governor was asked to provide detailed information on the two schools’s finances, the number of pupils, the circumstances of their taking over the public schools and the financial arrangements of the takeover and even maps of the schools indicating from which surrounding areas the pupils came.\(^\text{25}\)

We have little information on the actual day-to-day running of Shijodō (even less is known about Kyūsei gakkō, which had as many as 400 pupils). Pupils seem to have come from the neighbourhood, there is no mention of boarders. At the time of the enquiry it had 242 pupils at three different levels, 22 of them
female. Sewing classes were held for the girls. From this and from Shizendō Shujin’s statements it would appear that Shijodō catered for pupils from elementary to more advanced levels, aiming to teach basic skills as well as to provide a *kangaku* education. Thus, rather than filling a niche (as a *juku* specialized in advanced studies of *kangaku* might have done), Shijodō was in direct competition with public education. Perhaps this was why it was not tolerated for long. When the central government amended the ordinance of 1879 in 1880, Akita again took an extreme course and ordered all *juku* closed, although the government regulations did not call for this. They merely stipulated that private schools should no longer receive public money.  

But Shijodō, despite or because of its success, was not allowed to continue. Nishinomiya had to close his *juku* and its grounds and buildings were taken over by a public school (Kōun gakkō).

Again the prefecture’s radical stance met with criticism. An article in a local newspaper in February 1881 criticized the excesses of standardization and regretted the closure of Shijodō. Nishinomiya once again took up posts in the prefectural government and became head of a new girls’ school. He was very active during the revival of *kangaku* in the 1880s.

The case of Shijodō illustrates how the traditional *juku* could be perceived as a threat to the planned system of modern schools. Scholars like Nishinomiya were respected in the community, and it is not surprising that their *juku* were more popular than new institutions which had yet to prove their worth. On the other hand, the fact that educational provision in Akita was slow to expand suggests that *juku* ultimately benefited the establishment of a modern system by providing a pool of educated people from which future teachers and leaders could be recruited.

Akita’s policy of suppressing private education because of its perceived threat to the success of modern schools may well have been the reason why the prefecture lagged behind in both school provision and school attendance. The first middle school was not established until 1882. Private elementary schools did not exist between 1872 and 1877, while for the whole of Japan 36.5 per cent of all elementary schools were private. Until the turn of the century, attendance at public schools in Akita was well below the national average; in 1877 it was below 30 per cent and the prefecture ranked among the worst five (with Aomori, Kagoshima, Wakayama and Hiroshima).
One of the few *kangaku juku* allowed to continue was that of Kanzawa Shigeru (1848–1902). Kanzawa had been a pupil of Nishinomiya’s and excelled at the domain school, Meitokukan, where he held the position of administrator (*gakukan*) in 1869. In 1873 he entered the domain’s new school, *denshūsho*, determined to obtain the formal qualifications to become a teacher, but illness prevented him from completing the course and instead he taught privately in his own home. When Nishinomiya revived Shijodō, Kanzawa became his administrator (*jukukan*). After the closure of Shijodō he again ran his own *juku* (Shinzen gakusha, formally established in 1882), and was tolerated by the authorities.  

*Kangaku*, ethics, reading and writing formed the main part of the curriculum, but from 1888 the number of subjects was increased and included English. Some of the subjects were taught by Kanzawa’s pupils. Kanzawa received no fees from his students until 1888. Even then his income from teaching only covered the cost of maintaining the buildings. Altogether he taught well over 1,000 students. If Akita did manage to bring forth some well-educated leaders, this was in no small measure thanks to the efforts of Kanzawa.

### JUKU AND PUBLIC EDUCATION IN CONFLICT

Akita is an extreme example, but in other prefectures too the authorities took a more determined stance against *juku* than the central government or the metropolitan government of Tokyo, at least at first. In Aomori, all *juku* were ordered closed in July 1873, but the following year the authorities began to encourage private schools. Iwate prefecture aimed to abolish private establishments, but unlike Akita, the authorities accepted the old teachers as teachers in the new schools. In Gifu prefecture the authorities forbade *juku* in March 1873 and attempted to force their closure, but many survived, especially at post-elementary level. Unlike the new schools, the *juku* had the trust of the local people. The authorities of Chiba prefecture were also stricter initially than the central authorities in their attempts to control private education, although they did not actually forbid private schools. Nevertheless, in the late 1870s and early 1880s Chiba had the highest number of private middle schools after Tokyo, as well as a number of illicit *juku*. In Saitama prefecture, private establishments were forbidden in November 1872, but from 1874...
onwards *juku* were tolerated if they catered for people above the compulsory school age. Permission to open a *juku*, however, was not easily given. Two thirds of the *juku* are reported to have closed after the the proclamation of the Education Law. Ehime prefecture also took a stricter stance against private education than the Ministry of Education’s policies warranted. When the number of private elementary schools nationwide drastically decreased after 1876, it did so particularly rapidly in Ehime.

Not only in Akita did the authorities face resistance to their policies. This is shown by the number of *juku* that continued to exist after 1873, as well as by prefectural orders against people operating illicit *juku*. For example, in Osaka in 1875 local administrators were ordered to report people operating *juku* without having applied for permission. An order to the village administration of Tennōji in 1893 similarly demanded that measures be taken against people running private schools without permission.

What the authorities’ policies meant for individuals can be glimpsed from the situation of some of Ikeda Sōan’s correspondents; former samurai were often especially hard-hit, since they had no alternative source of income. Yoshimura Hizan, formerly a teacher at the Hiroshima domain school, applied to open a *juku* when the school was abolished, but his application was turned down. He and his son became elementary school teachers. In 1873 he was at last allowed to open a *juku* at elementary level. In 1876 he was forced to include other subjects besides *kangaku*, and in 1880 he had to close his *juku*. Tamura Kanzan in Toyooka (now Hyōgo) prefecture had even greater difficulties. He became an elementary school teacher in 1873, but soon resigned and applied to open a *juku*. His conduct as a school teacher was called into question and the application turned down. He resubmitted, but in 1878 he still had not received permission, and finally he had to give up the idea. Kusumoto Tanzan was likewise denied permission to continue his *juku*, but as he wrote to Sōan in 1876, he had to run his *juku* in order to survive and “[…] if [my *juku*] is officially prohibited, I will order the students on the basis of this, and if they continue to come anyway, there is nothing I can do”. Presumably many acted in the same way if they could get away with it.

Thus the central government and the prefectures to varying degrees aimed to gain control over education and did not regard *juku* favourably. But how significant was the conflict between
public education and juku? And in how far did the government really perceive juku as a threat, and if so, why?

The most obvious, or most commonly imagined threat stems from the idea that juku could be a hotbed of political opposition. This is one of the characteristics that made Yoshida Shōin’s juku famous, where many future leaders of the Meiji restoration spent part of their formative years. Students of Ikeda Sōan’s juku were also involved in activities directed against the shogunate; three of them took part in the Ikuno riots in 1863, when imperial loyalists occupied the seat of the governor of the bakufu domain, Ikuno. However, they did so despite Sōan having denied them permission. Years later several of Sōan’s students were in the front line of the Movement for Freedom and People’s Rights, but again their action was against Sōan’s views. After the Restoration, Saigō Takamori’s system of so-called private schools (shigakkō) in Kagoshima produced the participants in the Satsuma rebellion of 1877, thus becoming another well-known hotbed for rebels. It is said that Fujisawa Nangaku (1842–1920), who ran a juku in Osaka, was under suspicion during the war against Satsuma because of his sympathies for Saigō Takamori; allegedly, spies came to investigate his juku, but he recognized and expelled them.

Moreover, kangaku students in particular had a reputation for engaging in idle political discussions. Has this something to do with the history of Confucian thought, the disputes between the different schools that characterized the development of Confucianism from earliest times? Had the connection between kangaku and political discussions become a stereotype? Or was it a legacy from the last years of the Tokugawa regime? Shōin’s juku was not the only institution where samurai discussed the politics of the day. The Shōheikō, highest institution of learning under the shogunate, is reported to have been a place where samurai from all over Japan came together and discussed current affairs.

Itō Hirobumi even blamed the excessive study of kangaku for political turmoil:

To have too many political disputants is no blessing for the nation. The root of present conditions can be ascribed to samurai youths of very little talent who compete among themselves as political disputants. The students of today are generally from academies of Chinese studies, and whenever these students of Chinese classics open their mouths it is to
debate on world affairs, elbowing each other aside to expound on political theory.\textsuperscript{40}

Many \textit{kangaku} scholars, like other teachers and physicians of traditional (\textit{kangaku}-derived) medicine, participated actively in the Movement for Freedom and People’s Rights (\textit{jiyū minken undō}),\textsuperscript{41} which would have made them suspect with the government. And of course \textit{kangaku}, having been the basis of all learning for most of the Tokugawa period, was associated with the old regime. \textit{Kangaku} teachers were often conservative in outlook and in Tokyo many of them were former bakufu officials. Even so, there is little evidence that the \textit{juku} masters in general were likely to involve themselves in political activity or encouraged their students to do so. Certainly the ones studied here seem to have mainly devoted themselves to education and scholarship.

If \textit{juku} posed a challenge then it was for another reason, as the example of Akita has shown. For the people, \textit{juku} were familiar, often run by respected members of the community. It was natural to prefer them to the modern schools, which had yet to prove their worth. In Tokyo the new schools were associated with the new government, dominated by the \textit{hanbatsu}, men who had come from faraway provinces and were resented.\textsuperscript{42} The success of Atomi Kakei’s \textit{juku}-style girls’ school with the nobility, for example, may have been due to the fact that Kakei, who was educated in \textit{kangaku} and painting, had run a \textit{juku} in Kyoto with her family and taught members of the imperial court there.\textsuperscript{43}

In Ibaraki prefecture, home of the famous Kōdōkan Academy in Mito, the persistence of the Mito tradition is reputed to have impeded the modernization of education.\textsuperscript{44} The former members of the Kōdōkan taught privately in their own \textit{juku}. Kurita Hiroshi (1835–99), one of the scholars whose name is associated with the completion of the Mito history, \textit{Dainihonshi}, was one of them. In 1874 he was one of the group of scholars who established a private academy, the Jikyōkan, to continue the tradition of Mitogaku after the domain school Kōdōkan had been closed. In 1880 Kurita established his own \textit{juku}, the Hōjin gakusha, and when he moved to Tokyo, where he became professor of history at the Imperial University in 1892, he ran a \textit{juku} there.\textsuperscript{45} The Jikyōkan (Jikyōsha) changed its name several times and in 1927 became a private middle school. Today it is the private Ibaraki High School.\textsuperscript{46} The first middle school, Mito chūgakkō, was
established in 1880 and, except for a brief interlude from 1883 to 1886, remained the only one of its kind until 1897. Even so, it produced only 35 graduates in total between 1880 and 1885.\(^47\)

The lack of public alternatives and the persistence of the Mito tradition are not the only reasons for the continuing popularity of *kangaku juku*. In areas remote from the large towns the fabric of society changed little until after the Meiji period, and while the traditional social structures were still in place, traditional education remained relevant. Often children of the local elite would attend the same *juku* for generations.\(^48\) The prevailing atmosphere in Ibaraki was criticized by contemporaries. In 1879 a newspaper article reported:

> The tone of the people of Ibaraki prefecture is still one of subservience. Well, there are also disputants, but many of them are people maintaining the outdated idea of unity of government and ritual (seisai itchi) and the backward-looking leaders of opinion are *kokugaku* [National Learning] and *kangaku* teachers, the so-called scholars Kurita, Tsuda, Obara etc. The *kangaku* school named Jikyōsha is flourishing, and is like a thorn in the side of the teacher training school.\(^49\)

Thus there is evidence that traditional, more informal types of schooling were preferred by the population, who perceived the modern, foreign system as an imposition.\(^50\)

As the modern school system became fully established, problems that came with it became apparent. Soon critics began to contrast the modern school system with the *juku* and to extoll the virtues of the latter. An early example is a memorandum by Washizuzu Kōun, the fifth master of Yūrinsha *juku* in Aichi prefecture, entitled “The school must be given the role of a second family”.\(^51\) Present-day schools, he argued, teach a large number of pupils in the same way, ignoring the differences between individuals. They impart knowledge, but they neglect moral education. But schools should act as a second family, since the family setting is the best place to educate children. Teachers should set a good example and associate with their pupils in a harmonious way, training their character as well as teaching them knowledge. In other words, Kōun says, in some ways a school should be like a traditional *juku*. 
Kōun (b.1870), been educated at Yūrinsha and graduated from Keiō gijuku in 1895, belonged to a different world than the kangakusha of early Meiji. When he, like Ikeda Sōan, criticized teachers who were in their jobs for the money, he cited Rousseau’s *Emile* rather than Confucian writings. While sharing some of the ideals of older kangaku scholars, he did not stand outside the new system. His criticism of mainstream education addressed issues that are still raised today: the lack of attention to the individual and the emphasis on knowledge and passing examinations. In the twentieth century this kind of criticism was reiterated and sometimes motivated attempts to establish alternative schools inspired by the juku ideal.

*Juku*, while not presenting a serious threat of rebellion to the government, did interfere with the establishment of the modern school system envisaged by the government. For this reason the Ministry of Education would have preferred to do without them. It was, however, in a dilemma, since it could not provide enough new schools to replace them. Not all prefectural authorities appreciated this dilemma, and as a result some did their best to abolish *juku*. But the example of Akita illustrates that this did not necessarily improve educational opportunities—on the contrary. In the long run, the social changes resulting from the expansion of the national school system contributed as much to the decline of the *juku* as direct intervention.

**STUDENT CAREERS: NARROWING OPTIONS**

Today we take it for granted that successful people pass more or less smoothly through a system of schools at different levels, whether public or private, and finish with some recognized formal qualification. The private schools follow the pattern of the public schools to fit into the system, and a characteristic of this system in Japan is, that for the ambitious, it is not good enough to go to any elementary, middle or high school and university. To guarantee a successful career as a government official or in a large company, it is necessary to attend the schools that will ease the way into the most prestigious universities, above all the University of Tokyo. Given the relative rigidity of the current situation, it is easy to forget that things were not always so, and during the first two decades of the Meiji era things were far more in flux. The government schools may have been prestigious, but they were few and far between, and meanwhile educated people
were needed to build the new Japan. There was a general belief, at least among the samurai, fuelled by Fukuzawa’s *Encouragement of Learning* and laid down in the Education Law of 1872, that education was the key to social advancement. Since the school system was not ready to accommodate the demand for education, ambitious youths sought education in whatever form they could. The early lives of men born in the late 1850s to early 1870s show that formal schooling was not a necessary condition for a successful career.

For example, Suematsu Kenchō (1855–1920), studied at Murakami Butsusan’s Suisaien from 1866 until he left for Tokyo in 1871. He stayed with the politician Sasaki Takayuki (1830–1910) as a live-in student (shosei), attending the juku for Western studies of Ōtsuki Bankei (1801–78) and of Kondō Makoto (1831–86). When the government opened the Normal School for teacher training (shihan gakkō) in 1872, he was one of the few applicants who passed the entrance examination and received a government scholarship. Nevertheless, he had just started to study there when Takahashi Korekiyo (1854–1936), whom he had met through Sasaki, persuaded him that he would learn English more quickly if he studied privately. Despite the opposition of Sasaki and the head of the new school, Suematsu withdrew and began to earn money by selling articles from foreign newspapers, which he and Takahashi translated from English. In 1874 Suematsu was employed by the Tokyo Nichinichi newspaper company, and the following year he was introduced to Itō Hirobumi, who became his mentor and launched him on a career in government. The key to his success was not formal schooling but the fact that he was highly able, had learnt English and met people who furthered his career.53

Katayama Sen (1859–1933), a leader of the early trade union movement and leading Christian Socialist, likewise received little formal schooling. He was born into a farming family in Okayama. In his autobiography he states that young children did not go to school there.54 He received elementary instruction from a private teacher and then at temples, where he also heard lectures on the Chinese classics. When a new elementary school was established in the village, he was invited to attend, although he was already around 14 years old. Although he enjoyed studying there, he had to leave after a few months to help on the family farm. Katayama reports feeling envy when listening to sounds coming from the juku of Yamada Hōkoku nearby. Eventually, he was able to work
as an elementary teacher and study simultaneously for one year. He was in his early twenties by the time he moved to Tokyo to receive more education. There, while working for a printing company, a roommate invited Katayama to Oka Senjin’s juku, since it was cheap. The relevant entrance document is dated 1883, but he may have entered a year earlier, as he states in his autobiography. Since he worked he could not actually attend lectures, except on his free days, so he was one of many who used Suiyūdō as a boarding house; he was so poor that he could not afford to supplement the basic food provided at the juku. After a few months he became the new juku servant and gave up his printing job. Now he could study, and for a year he heard Senjin’s lectures. Katayama also helped Senjin with his writings, including his work on the Meiji Restoration, Sonjō kiji.

For a short while Katayama became the juku servant at another well-known juku of the time, Kōgyokusha, but he returned to Suiyūdō. Although he regarded kangaku as outdated, and would have preferred to study Western learning, it was thanks to the low expenses of Oka’s kangaku juku that he could further his education at all. His name is recorded among three who formed an association of Senjin’s students and among those attending the funeral in 1914; that year Katayama emigrated to the United States.

Other young men in the 1870s and 1880s put their education together like a patchwork quilt; time at a terakoya or juku here, a stint at one of the new schools there, another juku or several, perhaps in Tokyo, a series of public and private schools. One of the best-known examples is Tokutomi Sohō; his early life illustrates this pattern well, so is worth repeating here. Sohō was born in 1863 in Minamata, a village in what is now Kumamoto prefecture. His family was wealthy and important in the local community. Although they were farmers, they also had some of the social privileges of the samurai class and held offices in local government. Sohō’s father Ikkei was a talented scholar of the Chinese classics and Sohō studied these at home from an early age, as was customary for samurai and for the rural elite at the time. For a short while he attended a local elementary school, which was still much like a terakoya.

However, Sohō was his parents’ first son and his education was too important to be left to a school which provided chiefly for the children of ordinary farmers. At the age of seven he joined his father in the town of Kumamoto, and there for the next few years
he studied *kangaku* at various *juku*, including Kunitomo’s (see Chapter 4). Since it was common for pupils of different ages to study together even in the new schools, and since his ambitious parents wanted him to progress by three years for every one year of study, Sohō was the youngest and smallest pupil in every school he attended. From 1870 to 1871 he studied at the Gōrakuen, a *juku* run by Motoda Eifu. When Motoda left for Tokyo to take up his appointment with the court, Sohō briefly entered an academy established by a colleague of his father’s, but he soon changed to another *kangaku juku*, that of Kanezaka Shinsui, another associate of Tokutomi Ikkei. Sohō was a boarder there from 1871 to 1873, thus spending more time at that school than at any of the others he attended in Kumamoto.

Kanezaka’s school later became the model for the *Seisan* academy in *Footprints in the Snow*, the novel by Sohō’s brother Kenjirō. Kenjirō describes it with an affection that his brother was probably far from feeling while he was submitted to the Spartan regime of his teacher Kanezaka. Again, he was the youngest and smallest pupil. Nevertheless, Sohō himself appears to have regarded his old school highly in later years, saying that it had given him valuable experience of living in a democratic society of equals and learning to stand on his own feet without relying on his privileged family background. Sohō left Kanezaka’s *juku* because his father wanted him to receive a “modern” (and that meant a Western) education. Sohō was then only ten years old and had completed most of the formal training in the Chinese and Japanese classics that he would ever have.

Sohō’s first contact with Western studies was a failure. He was enrolled at Kumamoto School of Western Studies, which had superseded the old domain school for Confucian studies, but was dismissed after only a few months with a letter stating that he lacked maturity and should try again later. Sohō spent the next year and a half, until his re-enrolment, in private study of the Chinese classics and being tutored in English and mathematics by a friend of his father’s. When he reentered the school in 1875, he became a very successful student and a leader among his peers as well as a friend of his older schoolmates, some of them his former classmates of 1873. The students were taught by the U.S. Army Captain Leroy Lansing, a devout Christian, who taught applied science and universal history as well as giving character training and religious education. Like Kanezaka in his old-style academy, Lansing in the “modern school” impressed his pupils
by his personality and his dedication to their individual development. So strong was his influence that many of his students converted to Christianity, provoking severe conflicts with their families. In a particularly dramatic instance, several students, including Sohō, climbed a hill in Kumamoto and publicly announced their allegiance to Christ. This was more than the initiators of the school for Western studies had bargained for and the school was closed soon after, in 1876.

Sohō left for Tokyo. For a short time he studied at the Tokyo School of English, but this school was different from the schools he had previously experienced. Classes were large and teachers only appeared to give their lessons, then went straight home afterwards, avoiding contact with students. There was nothing of the personal atmosphere Sohō had grown accustomed to in the private academies he had attended, or under Lansing’s tuition, and he was unhappy. Soon he left for Kyoto, where many of his friends from Kumamoto had entered Dōshisha, a Christian high school, recently established by Niijima Jō, who had studied in America and become an ordained minister there. Dōshisha was financed by foreign missionaries, who also did most of the teaching. At the time the Kumamoto students entered, Dōshisha was on the verge of closing down, and the new students were disappointed with what they found there. They would have returned home, but their former teacher Lansing urged them to stay. So instead of changing to another school they set about changing the school to suit their high ideals. They reformed student life, set new moral standards, which were rigorously enforced, and introduced student self-government. They also took part in reforming the curriculum in the programme of secular studies.

Just before graduating from Dōshisha in 1880, Sohō left the school after having started its first student strike, which only ended when Niijima took full responsibility for it and thus moved the students to give it up. For a short while Sohō attended another kangaku juku in Tokyo, before returning to Kumamoto. There he became involved in the political struggles connected with the Freedom and People’s Rights Movement (jiyū minken undō). To promote the kind of political education he considered important, but also to make a living and help improve the economic situation of his family, Sohō decided to establish his own school. In 1882, when only 19 years old, Sohō opened Ōe
gijuku (Chapter 2). He continued to study himself even while teaching.

However, although Sohō’s juku was successful, ultimately he was not content to remain in the provinces, far from the capital. In 1886 he closed his school and moved to Tokyo. There his career as a writer and publicist, for which he is famous today, began. His school was the expression of his early thought; Sohō stressed the importance of educating people to think independently, to be willing and able to shape their own destiny, but also to serve society and to take responsibility for the national good. He attached great importance to small numbers which made possible personal relations, and encouraged debate. In later years his views became more conservative and after World War II he was even purged for supporting the former government. It is as if Sohō’s personal history reflected the history of modern Japan; from an energetic youth, when everything seemed possible, he became more sedate in middle age, when conditions were more settled and options narrowed.

Sohō was a member of the “new generation in Meiji Japan”, growing up at a time when the new education system was beginning to replace traditional education. He received a kangaku education in his early years, but then attended modern schools because his parents perceived that the future lay in a Western education. His father’s generation would have continued to study kangaku until well into their teens, even into their twenties. His son’s generation would mainly be educated in modern elementary and middle schools, where foreign languages and natural and social sciences formed the core of the curriculum.

Sohō attended a variety of juku; in part this was a legacy of the Edo period, where informal schooling predominated. But it was also a sign of the times; things were in flux, and teachers as well as pupils moved around. A remarkable feature of Sohō’s career is the role played by student initiative in the new schools he attended; the dramatic conversion of the “Kumamoto band” and their subsequent reformation of Dōshisha. Nor were Sohō and his comrades the only students of their generation to react so vehemently because of opinions different from their elders. The novelist Futabatei Shimei (1864–1909), in his autobiography Mediocrity, relates two incidents in which he left schools after disagreeing violently with the principal. The left-wing radical Ōsugi Sakae (1885–1923) recorded in his autobiography that when the association which had built the middle school he
attended from 1897 in Shibata (Niigata prefecture) voted to dismiss the headmaster, the students protested violently, smashing the inventory of the school and refusing to attend lessons. Lafcadio Hearn, teaching in Matsue in the 1890s, claimed that students were far more likely to effect the dismissal of a teacher deemed incompetent than vice versa. This kind of behaviour may well have characterized a time of transition, when new hierarchies had not yet completely replaced the old.

The historian Mikami Sanji (1865–1939) belonged to the same generation as Tokutomi Sohō. He attended a terakoya turned into a public elementary school in Himeji, where he read a mixture of traditional and adapted Western texts. On his way home from school he would go to a former vassal of the feudal lord to read the Chinese classics. From 1878 he attended the new district elementary school in a former temple. There he read Western works, but he continued to study kangaku with a teacher outside school hours. After attending middle school for three years, he moved to Tokyo. For a few months he studied at the kangaku juku Shinbun gakusha of Tachibana Hatarō, where university graduates also taught English, before entering the preparatory school for the Imperial University. At university he studied in the Department of Classics (koten kōshūka) and then Western history under Ludwig Rieβ. He thus acquired a thorough grounding both in traditional and new subjects.

For the 1860s generation, however, it was still possible to avoid the new school system altogether. Makino Kenjirō (1862–1937), professor at Waseda University, prided himself on having done just that. His grandfather had studied with Kan Chazan and Satō Issai and his father had a juku, where Makino received most of his education, except for ten months spent at Fujisawa Nangaku’s juku. At 21 he took over his father’s juku, but in 1893 moved to Tokyo, where he was involved in the Shidankai, an association to publish the history of the leading domains during the Meiji Restoration, and taught at the metropolitan middle school. He became a lecturer at Waseda in 1901 and was active in several Confucian organizations.

Men born in the 1870s often experienced a mixture of traditional and modern education and some were later aware of having lived through a time of transition. The journalist and socialist Sakai Toshihiko (1870–1933), who came from a samurai family, was one of them. From 1876 to 1882 he attended elementary school and from 1882 Toyotsu middle school, then
the only middle school in the area and perceived as a school mainly for samurai. On at least two occasions Sakai studied with a kangaku scholar during the summer holidays. In his autobiography he mentions that the sons of kangaku scholars continued to attend kangaku juku like that of Murakami Butsusan and Kangien (another indication that Kangien was still operating in some form). In 1886 Sakai received a scholarship from a fund set up by men from the former domain and was able to study in Tokyo. Like Mikami Sanji, he states that going to Tokyo was almost like going abroad. There he first attended Nakamura Masanao’s Dōjinsha, one of the largest juku, but said to be in decline by his time. He also attended Kyōritsu gakusha before gaining entry into the First High School in 1888. The following year he was expelled and returned home. For a while he taught English in Osaka, where he also began to work as a journalist.

Another journalist, Hasegawa Nyozekan (1875–1969), a merchant’s son from Tokyo, later judged himself lucky to have been educated at a time of transition. In 1881 he was sent to one of the six new model elementary schools in Tokyo, but the following year he followed his brother to a private school, a former terakoya still run along the lines of a juku. In 1884 he went with his brother to Tsubouchi Shōyō’s juku and attended another elementary school while living with Tsubouchi. After graduation in 1886 he attended Dōjinsha, the famous juku of Nakamura Masanao. According to Sakai, kangaku was no longer taught there in his time, and he studied the Outlines of the Eight Histories with another teacher. During the next seven years, his long middle school period, as he later remarked, he attended a variety of private establishments until entering the private Tokyo hōgakuin, forerunner of Chūō University, in 1893. He said about his schooldays:

From the time when I, having lived through such an age, ended my youth, the age of Japanese nationalism progressed, and as the development towards a modern state reached a high degree, so was the education system, both its organization and content, rapidly put in order. We could not but think that the young people who came straight after us and received the well-ordered education of this age were fortunate. But at the same time we felt sorry for these people after us, who were stuck in uniforms with gold buttons, were made to wear the same regulation hats,
reflecting the content of their head, passing through the
tunnel of education in what Upton Sinclair called goosestep
fashion and put out as if from a conveyor belt. (p.318)

Even men born as late as the 1880s could still have experienced
informal schooling, including *kangaku juku*. Unsurprisingly,
many examples can be found among the scholars of China, the
modern successors of the *kangakusha*. One of them is Morohashi
Tetsuji (1883–1982), best known for the compilation of the *Dai
kanwa jiten* (Great Chinese-Japanese Character Dictionary), but
also the author of several other works on China. His father was a
teacher, and Morohashi learnt to read *kanbun* before he entered
the public elementary school. After graduating he studied for
three years at the *kangaku juku* Seishū gijuku, opened by Okubata
Beihō in 1894. Then he attended teacher training colleges in
Niigata and Tokyo, and after a short spell of teaching in Gumma
he taught at the middle school attached to the higher teacher
training college in Tokyo and at several other institutions. Unlike
the *kangaku* scholars of previous generations, he was able to
study in China, first for two months in 1918 and then for two
years, from 1919 to 1921. Morohashi’s experience of *juku* life later
inspired him to establish his own *juku* of sorts, together with his
friend Ichijima Tokuhiro (Chapter 6).

By the time Morohashi’s generation reached school age, the
modern school system was largely in place and attending the new
schools had become the norm. If students still went to *kangaku
juku*, they usually attended part time and in addition to the
mainstream schools. Ōsugi Sakae (1885–1923), left-wing radical
and political activist, was the son of a low-ranking army officer
who came from a family of village headmen near Nagoya. He
grew up in the former castle town of Shibata in Niigata
prefecture, a small, isolated place. Although not from a samurai
family, he was from a background where we could have expected
him to be sent to a *kangaku juku* for at least part of his education
had he been born a decade earlier. As it was, his exposure to a
*kangaku* education was minimal, unlike that of other socialists
and anarchists, for example Kōtoku Shūsui (1871–1911), who
spent several of his formative years in the *juku* of Kido Mei (1835–
1916) in Nakamura and Kōchi in the 1880s. While he attended
higher elementary school from 1895, Ōsugi studied the Chinese
classics with a private tutor from a former samurai family that
had fallen on hard times; with him he read the *Four Books, The
Analects, Mencius, The Doctrine of the Mean and The Greater Learning. At the same time he also received private tuition in English and mathematics. In 1997 Ōsugi entered Shibata Middle School, which had just been established; his headmaster was nicknamed Confucius and lectured on the Analects, so possibly he was one of those kangakusha who found employment in the new schools. From 1899 to 1901 Ōsugi attended the military cadet school in Nagoya, but returned home after being expelled. He subsequently went to Tokyo, where he attended Tokyo Academy (Tōkyō gakuin) and in the evenings a French language school to prepare for entrance into the advanced year of a middle school. In October that year he entered the private Junten Middle School; a stand-in had taken the examination for him, while he took (and failed) the one for Tōkyō Middle School. After graduation, in 1903, he entered the Foreign Language College in Tōkyō, but was disappointed with the level of French instruction there and skipped most of his classes. Soon he became a political activist. Ōsugi’s school career shows that in his time great importance was attached to formal schooling as the road to success; his way through education was characterized by a determination to succeed in the mainstream schools.

These examples are not wholly representative; most of the men described succeeded in finding a place in a changing society, but not necessarily at the top. In specific fields the picture could be very different. For example, the young men appointed to the law faculty of Tokyo University in the 1880s and 1890s had nearly all studied at the university’s predecessor institutions from an early age and were then sent abroad by the government. The younger staff in the faculty of letters usually followed the same pattern. They perhaps studied kangaku in their early years, but the key to their success was acquiring Western learning from an early age. Nevertheless, the above examples suggest that how the educational paths of individuals varied, and how the general trend changed over time. The tendency was towards more formal schooling, culminating for the ambitious in study at one of the imperial universities. Having the right educational credentials (gakureki) became increasingly important. Consequently, by the late 1880s options were narrowing. An early issue of the educational magazine Shōnen advised its young readers that the social order was stabilizing and that they had to tackle their middle school education more systematically than their elders. Even then, young men whose ambitions lay
elsewhere got away with minimal formal schooling. The potter Katō Tokurō, born in 1898, claimed he did not attend elementary school regularly, since his grandmother thought it would blunt his pottery skills. When as a young man he wanted to learn, he used correspondence courses and attended *juku*. Apart from the history of pottery and painting he also studied the Chinese classics.\(^{71}\)

For most young people, however, the educational scene had changed and with it the place of the *juku*.

**THE GAKUREKI SHAKAI AND THE JUKU AS A CRAM SCHOOL**

The late 1890s marked a watershed in the history of education. The school system envisaged in the Education Law of 1872 had largely become a reality. The reforms enacted by the education ministers Mori Arinori and Inoue Kowashi had given the education system the shape it was to retain until 1945. Compulsory schooling and rising school attendance resulted in more people being educated in the new schools. At the same time the value of formal schooling became more generally accepted and the demand for education beyond elementary level rose. Middle school attendance increased from 1,170 in 1895 to 9,927 in 1905 and 20,852 in 1919.\(^{72}\)

More middle school graduates meant more candidates for entry into the high schools. This, together with changes in the system, made it harder to pass the entrance examinations; in 1900 only one-third were successful. Over the next years the examination system was reformed several times.\(^{73}\) The high schools were intended by Mori Arinori to produce the country’s educational elite. They were funded and supervised by the central government, and by 1900 there were seven of them throughout the country. High school graduates would go straight into the working world or enter one of the numerous public or private specialist schools (*senmon gakkō*). Only a small number would continue into one of the two imperial universities; in 1900 the universities of Tokyo and Kyōto (established 1897) together took in only 564 applicants.\(^{74}\)

By the late Meiji period there was a clear link between education and employment. This had not been the case before, and the idea of education leading to social advancement was not at first universally accepted. Among farmers and merchants there
was little conception of formal education being important for success, especially if the family was wealthy. Farmers’ sons who did go to school beyond elementary level were commonly younger sons from families who could afford to send them away or who had impressed their teachers by their exceptional ability. Merchant families usually preferred their children to become apprentices after receiving elementary education.\textsuperscript{75} Women’s schooling beyond elementary school was not seen as important at all.

The number of professions for which schooling was a necessary condition was at first limited to posts in government, the law, medicine and teaching. These required passing examinations but not necessarily attending certain schools.\textsuperscript{76} One decisive step, however, did make attending the prescribed schools the only way to advancement (gakureki shakai). This was the system of privileging graduates of certain (usually state) schools by exempting them from civil service and professional examinations and allowing them a shorter period in the conscript army. From the introduction of civil service examinations in 1887 until 1893 only graduates of Tokyo Imperial University were exempt. Since the quota of civil servants was usually filled with privileged graduates, pupils who attended private schools had little chance of becoming civil servants. Even after 1893 university graduates were exempt from the first part of the two-part examination. Privileges relating to the examinations for doctors, lawyers, pharmacists and middle school teachers continued even after they were abolished for the civil service examinations. Some private schools managed to secure privileges for their graduates by meeting certain conditions imposed by the government. But the result of this system was that places at state schools were more desirable and state schools had more prestige.

Theoretically, it was still possible to pass the professional examinations without formal schooling. As late as 1904, 39 per cent of all middle school teachers had no formal qualifications at all and only half of the rest had gone through the school system, the others having passed examinations.\textsuperscript{77} Between the late 1890s and the early 1910s the private specialist schools catered for those attempting the self-study route by publishing lecture notes (kōgirokku; there was still a dearth of textbooks for the modern subjects) and offering distance learning.\textsuperscript{78} But here too options were narrowing as competition for the examinations increased,
and passing the examinations by self-study alone became virtually impossible.

Tokyo University by the late 1890s already held the dominant position it still has today, and its graduates provided a high proportion of the political elite and increasingly of the business elite. Another reason why educational credentials became increasingly important was that large companies preferred to recruit members of the educational elite. For those who aspired to the upper echelons of society, this meant that they had to pass entrance examinations into middle and higher schools and finally into one of the imperial universities, preferably Tokyo.\textsuperscript{79}

The highest rungs of the educational ladder were still dominated by former samurai at the turn of the century. For them, education was their only capital and because they showed a clear preference for government schools and government posts. Wealthy commoners tended to opt for private institutions and a general rather than a professional education, since they expected to return home to run the family business or start a similar enterprise of their own. Study at a kangaku juku was an option, but increasingly they went to private specialist schools, especially the law schools (which taught other subjects besides law).\textsuperscript{80}

The national education system focused almost exclusively on Western education, especially on law, political science, economics, the natural sciences and technical subjects. There was no equivalent to the European “classical education”, even at secondary (middle school) level, once the new schools had replaced the kangaku juku. In the mainstream middle schools, mathematics, English and Japanese (kokugo) became the principal subjects. Kanbun was thus by no means central to the curriculum, and in 1901 it was abolished as a separate subject and merged with kokugo, despite protest from kangaku scholars. As a result, people born after 1880 were much less likely to have a background in kangaku than even those born only a few years earlier, since it was no longer useful for social advancement.\textsuperscript{81} As a generation grew up that had received almost exclusively a Western education, this became accepted as the norm.

Thus the kangaku juku became obsolete because of the declining importance of kangaku and diminishing role of the old-style juku as the modern education system took root. At around the same time, a new kind of juku emerged, the cram school, to prepare students for entrance examinations, a function we associate with the term today. An early example is that of the artist Ishii
Hakutei (1882–1958). After graduating from higher elementary school in 1894, he studied mathematics and English in preparation for the entrance examinations into middle school. For English, he attended a juku near his school from 7.30 a.m. and for mathematics he went to the home of a teacher after school, at 4.30 p.m. This change was a result of direct intervention from the authorities in the running of juku and of the social transformations which meant that a juku education was not sufficient for success.

When did this change take place? There is no clear answer to the question. On the one hand, there is mention of studying kangaku at a teacher’s home out of school hours as late as the early twentieth century. From his second year at the First High School until his graduation from university, Nagasawa Kikuya (1902–80; bibliographer, professor) was among the private pupils of Yasui Bokudō, spending most Sundays at his home. Even today not all juku attendance is specifically aimed at preparing for an entrance examination. On the other hand, although preparing for examinations appears to become the most common function of a juku from around 1900, people were studying at juku, including kangaku juku, while preparing for examinations well before then. While the Education Law established the link between education and worldly success, entry into the highest institutions of learning required academic attainments that could not be acquired in the lower level public schools. As a result, as early as the 1870s, juku functioned as preparatory schools to fill this gap in provision.

For example, Hiroike Chikurō (1866–1938), who graduated from a middle level school in Nakatsu, attended a juku between 1883 and 1885 to prepare for the entrance examination of the teacher training school. After failing the examination for the second time he eventually passed the teacher qualifying examination, which was equivalent to graduation from the school. For youths coming to Tokyo from the provinces, where educational provision beyond elementary level was lacking, study at a juku was often a temporary measure until they could gain entrance into a more formal school. Nishō gakusha and Oka Senjin’s juku were mainly attended by people preparing for entrance examinations in the 1880s.

Still, a shift definitely occurred in the role of the juku from an unofficial (and barely tolerated) part of educational provision,
potentially representing an alternative to the new schools, to an auxiliary institution, helping to support the system.

The strong pressure to conform in order to survive is illustrated particularly well by Hōmei gijuku in Sasayama (Hyōgo prefecture). This *juku*, remarkably, was established in 1885, at the time when other *juku* were disappearing. In this it was not unique, but, unlike others, it was deliberately conceived as an alternative to the new system, and in its early phase *kangaku* dominated. Students read the Chinese classics in the teacher’s home, the emphasis was on moral and character training and many students did not graduate. Half of the students were of samurai descent. In 1899 Hōmei gijuku became a middle school, and gradually its curriculum developed to emphasize knowledge and passing examinations to gain entry to further schools. The proportion of commoners attending rose, as did the number of graduates. In 1920 it was placed under the administration of the prefecture. After 1945 it became a high school.

If a *juku* could thus change to become part of the mainstream, could not some of them have changed into another role to become part of the “support system”? In fact, there is no evidence of a direct continuity from the traditional *juku* to the modern cram school. A few isolated examples, should they exist, cannot confirm that there was continuity from the traditional to the modern *juku*. Most of today’s *juku* were established in the 1960s and 1970s, and today’s “masters”, as likely as not female (or else managers of a whole chain), do not claim any continuity from the prewar period.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that the significant role played by the traditional *juku* in the Meiji period paved the way for the present-day *juku*, if we look at the consumers rather than the providers of *juku* education; today’s *juku* thrive as a result of parental choice. From the Edo period onwards it was common not to rely solely on formal schooling, but also on informal types of education. In the 1870s and 1880s this pattern was reinforced, partly because provision of modern schools lagged behind and partly because modern schools were perceived to neglect traditional elements of education which were still highly regarded and part of a *kangaku* education: moral education and the Chinese classics. As a result, an established custom combined with the emergence of a society where educational credentials prevailed to set the scene for a new type of *juku*.
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WITH THE DECLINE OF THE KANGAKU JUKU and the emergence of a new type of juku, which did not directly evolve from the traditional one, this study could end. However, while kangaku juku after 1868 have been neglected by academic researchers, they have often received the attention of local historians, writers and educators. Much of the source material on juku has been preserved as a result of activities devoted to commemorating individual kangaku scholars and their juku. Moreover, almost before it disappeared, the traditional juku became “reinvented”. To examine the formation of this “juku myth” also serves to scrutinize the process by which much of our information about juku has been transmitted.

Significantly, times when fascination with the juku was particularly evident appear to coincide with periods when the discourse about modernization and its cost was at its most intense. There are three such periods, the 1880s and 1890s, the 1920s and 1930s and the 1970s and 1980s.1 The “juku myth” was first formulated by members of the “new generation”. The special section on juku in Nihon oyobiNihonjin discussed in this chapter was published in 1938. In 1971 the journal Bösei likewise published a special section on juku. By the 1970s few people alive had first-hand experience of them; only two of the seven journal articles deal with juku of the Tokugawa and Meiji period (Teki juku and Keiō gijuku), whereas the others are about twentieth-century institutions. In the introductory article, in the form of a dialogue between Tsurumi Shunsuke and Naramoto Tatsuya, whose pioneering book on juku in the Edo period appeared in 1969, the subject is not so much the historical juku, but the two speakers’ thoughts on education in the face of the student unrests of the 1960s. During this time students set up their own courses,
which Naramoto describes as a kind of *juku* (“isshu no shijuku”). These articles tell us more about the 1970s than about *juku*; apparently 100 years after being marginalized in reality, they now have been marginalized in myth.

A particular image of *juku*, rather than actual experience, influenced later generations. Educators, well-versed in modern pedagogical theories, were inspired to organize new schools in the “*juku* spirit”. This reinvention of the *juku* is just one example of many “traditional” things from the Tokugawa period that have been reinvented.²

The transforming *juku* of the Meiji period form the link between the *juku* of the Tokugawa period and this reinvention. Present-day *juku*, on the other hand, are often assumed to have no connection with the *juku* of the nineteenth century, and this is largely true on the institutional level. Yet on a more subtle level, through people’s attitudes towards education and their choices, through personal ties and informal networks, a measure of continuity may be said to exist.

**KANGAKU SCHOLARS AND JUKU COMMEMORATED**

The master of a *juku* often highly respected and inspired his disciples throughout their lives. Sometimes students went to great lengths to preserve his memory. Often they had a memorial stone erected. A prominent *kangaku* scholar, often an acquaintance of the deceased, would be asked to compose an obituary for the stone. Shigeno Yasutsugu wrote one for Uchimura Rokō, for whom a stone stands in Matsue, not far from the one commemorating Lafcadio Hearn (Figure 9).³ He begins by stating his relationship with the deceased:

> Uchimura Rokō died in his home town, Matsue. We were friends at Shōheikō, but we did not meet for fifty years. I wanted to travel to the San’in to see him and talk about old times; Rokō repeatedly urged me to come. I planned to go several times, but the plan was always abandoned. Alas, finally he died.

Shigeno continues with details of Rokō’s early years and his exploits as a young man in the turbulent final years of the bakufu.
Next he returns to Rokō’s childhood, mentioning his precocious interest in scholarly pursuits, a trait often found in the biographies of famous scholars:

He had great talent and liked reading. When he was 18 or 19, his father first allowed him to study with a teacher. But he had many chores in the house and could not go out often. By chance he managed to get hold of Dazai Jun’s *Wadoku Yōryō*. Rejoicing, he said here is the method of reading. By this way he read through the classics, the histories and various works. Every night, the lamp hidden under a basket, he immersed himself in reading. His father would wake and put the lamp out. In other words, whenever his father slept again, he would light the lamp again and carry on until morning broke. His mother feared that he would become ill and admonished him. She said, “the child enjoys himself and does not know exhaustion”. She entreated him not to put too much effort into his studies. When his mother talked to others she said, “he will certainly not end as a sake-brewers child”. It turned out that she was right.

Next Shigeno describes Rokō’s career in the service of his feudal lord. According to Shigeno, it was thanks to Rokō that his lord supported the new government during the critical phase of centralization and the abolition of the domains. Compared to the space devoted to Rokō’s role during the Restoration, that given to his later life is much shorter:

Rokō was modest and gave in to others. But when it was appropriate he expressed his thoughts and did not lose sight of the main issue. One can say that he put into practice his learning. When the domains were abolished he was made professor of the secondary normal school (*chūgaku shihan kō*). At his house he ran the *juku* Sōchōsha. He is said to have had 3,000 students and taught them diligently until his death.

The last lines of the inscription mention Rokō’s scholarly works and poetry and his family. The inscription ends with a poem summarizing the sentiments expressed before and finishes,
“when people die we often first realize their worth; he has left a great reputation and died naturally.”

Fujisawa Nangaku composed the inscription for Yamamura Benzai’s stone. The text takes a similar form to the one quoted...
above; an introduction which mentions the author’s relationship to the deceased, a short biography, praise of his virtues, a few details of his family life and a poem. Thus grateful disciples ensured that their master would be remembered by posterity. In some cases an inscription on a memorial stone is the only source of information about a juku.

That grateful students honour their teacher’s memory is not unusual, in Japan or elsewhere. More remarkable is the way commemoration of masters and their juku has in some cases continued beyond the death of their students and thrives to this day, even where the juku has long ceased to exist. Thanks to the efforts of devoted students to preserve information about their master, many juku, instead of following the majority of academies into oblivion, could be examined here. Particularly interesting are the attempts to continue a juku in some form after its demise. Ikeda Sōan’s Seikei shoin is an excellent example. Sōan’s adopted heir and his descendants, down to the present heir, Ikeda Kumeo, have actively promoted his memory. In 1956 the Society to Preserve and Honour Seikei Shōin (Seikei shoin hozon kenshokai) was launched, and restoration work on the buildings of Seikei shoin begun. Anniversaries are celebrated regularly. During the celebrations for the centenary of his death, in 1977, a statue was unveiled, lectures were held and Sōan’s works exhibited. That year a society to learn from Ikeda Sōan-sensei (Ikeda Sōan sensei ni manabu kai) was formed, which had 150 members in 1993. In 1983 a little museum was built near Seikei shoin to exhibit materials relating to Sōan and his juku. In June 1995 Seikei shoin and its grounds received national recognition when they were shown in a television programme on the history of education.6

Among the activities of the Society to Preserve and Honour Seikei Shoin has been the continued publication of Ikeda Sōan’s writings. They include diaries, letters, poetry and notes on his readings of Chinese classics.7 Other works relating to him or his associates and students have been published, and sometimes re-published as the commemorative activities themselves become an object of commemoration. The publication commemorating the 150th anniversary of Seikei shoin’s foundation includes documents relating to previous events. They include old newsletters reporting on activities of the society and of the Society to Learn from Ikeda Sōan-sensei or visits by school teachers with their classes, pilgrimages they could be called, with
the aim to learn from Sōan. Sōan is portrayed as the ideal teacher, as quintessentially Japanese (Nihon-teki), whose example, inspiring longing for a different kind of teacher from today’s, is still relevant.\(^8\)

Ikeda Sōan may be the most striking example, but there are others. Murakami Butsusan has also had his promoters. His direct descendant wrote his graduation thesis on Suisaien, and the retired businessman and local historian Tamae Hikotarō, who is married to a descendant of Butsusan’s pupil Suematsu Kenchō, has done much to keep alive local history, including that of Suisaien, in the memory of the people of Yukuhashi. Zōshun’en, not far from Suisaien, has received less attention, but, as with Suisaien, the descendants still live on the premises, where a memorial stone documents the achievements of Seisō. His library and writings are kept in the library in Kokura city. In his book on Zōshun’en, Seisō’s great-grandson, Tsunetō Toshisuke, enhances the juku’s status by linking it to Kangien, where Seisō studied.

Where no descendants actively promote their ancestor, the local community may still preserve the memory of a respected scholar. Yamada Hōkoku even has a railway station named after him, one of few stations named after a person. Apparently, after the Hakubi line was opened in 1928 to connect the San’yō and San’in regions (improving transport for these regions had been recommended by Hōkoku himself in a memorandum in early Meiji), a signalling point near Hōkoku’s former residence and juku at Nagase was to be turned into a station. The local people wished it to be named “Hōkoku”, but this was refused on the grounds that no precedent existed for a station being named after a person. The locals were not deterred, however, and they claimed that “Hōkoku” was in reality a place name, derived from the valley of Nishikata in the village of Nakai, and that Yamada Hōkoku had adopted the place name as his literary name.\(^9\)

Several other places bear Hōkoku’s name. Bichū Takahashi has a Hōkoku bridge, a Hōkoku forest, a Hōkoku park with more than one memorial stone, a pine tree on the grounds of the former domain school said to have been planted by Hōkoku and designated a historical monument, and a statue of Hōkoku in front of the local museum.\(^10\) Kosakabe has a Hōkoku park with a memorial stone; strangely, it has the shape of an obelisk.\(^11\) Hōkoku’s house near Shizutani gakkō is also marked.\(^12\)

Shizutani gakkō, although a community school (gōkō) supported by the feudal lord rather than a juku, is another example
of a local school commemorated after its demise. It was founded in 1670 by Ikeda Mitsumasa (1609–82), lord of Okayama. He had previously established the domain school (1669) and several writing schools. The school was to be a “shōmin gakkō”, a school for the common people. It was mainly patronized by members of the local elite and a few samurai families. Its reputation went beyond Okayama. After the Meiji Restoration, Shizutani gakkō was closed, but then reopened by the initiative of former samurai. The local leaders who promoted the school in the Meiji period wished to preserve its traditional character; the school always retained a strong kangaku component. It became a private middle school in 1903 and in 1921 a prefectural school. The move to make it a middle school in line with the state system aroused opposition by men who wanted to see its traditional character preserved. In 1964 the school was closed; it became an education centre for young people in 1965. The old buildings are listed as cultural assets. Although the various closures and mergers mean that there is no direct continuity from the founding, time Shizutani gakkō’s 300th anniversary was celebrated and a school history published in 1971.13

Despite all the landmarks connected with Yamada Hōkoku, he is hardly featured in the local museum of Takahashi, although the library next door has writings and artifacts connected with him, which have occasionally been exhibited.

Of juku in larger towns, there are usually no physical remains; Ogata Kōan’s juku for Western studies in Osaka is a notable exception. The physical location of Fujisawa Nangaku’s Hakuen shoin is only recognizable through a memorial stone. Nevertheless, it is still well remembered. After Nangaku’s death Hakuen continued under his eldest son, Kōkoku (Genzō, 1874–1924), his second son, Kōha (Shōjirō, 1876–1948), whose brother-in-law, Ishihama Juntarō (1888–1968), succeeded him. Kōkoku took over the house in 1902. In 1908 he became a member of the Diet, but resigned in 1911 in connection with the controversy about the representation of the Northern and Southern Courts in the government-approved history textbooks.14 Kōha established a branch (bun’in) of Hakuen shoin, but took over the main school after his brothers’s early death. He also established the preparatory department of Kansai University in 1922 and taught there. In 1938 he became professor of kangaku at Kansai University, but apparently continued to run a juku in some form. The newspaper Hakuen, published between 1927 and 1942,
includes announcements of an intensive lecture programme with daily early morning, afternoon and evening lectures. The alumni organization Hakuen dōsōkai had 417 members all over Japan in 1938, including some described as present juku students.

Ishihama arranged for the donation of Hakuen’s library of Hakuen to the university as Hakuen bunko in 1951, and it became the core library of the Institute of Oriental and Occidental Studies (Tōzaikkenkyūsho), established in the same year. In 1962 an association was established to commemorate Hakuen shoin. It publishes the journal Hakuen and holds lectures and exhibitions. In 1964 a symposium was held, where several participants, some old enough to have known Nangaku, exchanged reminiscences. The activities of the association continue to this day. In 2001 the Hakuen Memorial Foundation participated in organizing an international symposium to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Foundation of the Institute of Oriental and Occidental Studies at Kansai University.

Why are some juku still remembered so well? Respect for the scholar and teacher is one of the characteristics of Confucianism, but the fate of juku, the way they were gradually driven out by a new and at first alien education system, may have stimulated the urge to preserve. The juku came to represent tradition, individuality, regional distinctiveness and a more human form of education than that dominated by the quest for worldly success.

But there are also more down-to-earth reasons. The existence of an heir, whether a blood relative or adopted, appears to be decisive. He could take on a central role and coordinate the activities of a group of local leaders (yūshi), who sometimes had the backing of prominent people in the capital (Murakami Butsusăn). The physical remains of the juku, especially the buildings, provide a focal point as do the writings of the master. In remote areas with few other attractions, the former juku may well become a source of local pride and possibly a means to attract visitors; again, Seikei shoin is a good example. In the case of Kan Chazan this has happened on a larger scale. The buildings of Renjuku still stand in a section of Kannabe with several other buildings of the period, including an inn where the local feudal lord stayed when he travelled to the capital. Renjuku was listed as a national historical monument in 1953. In 1992 the Kan Chazan Memorial Museum, devoted to him and to local artists, was completed. It also functions as a local archive and has a lecture room for classes and cultural events.
The Kan Chazan Museum was in part funded with money from Takeshita Noboru’s 100 million yen grants, received by each of Japan’s 3,268 local governing towns and villages in 1988. The grants can be seen in the context of furusato zukuri or furusato sōsei (“native place making” or “native place creation”), Japan’s answer to the alienation and insecurity experienced in post-war urban society, especially since the oil shocks of the 1970s. For the government, this style of administration, which aims to forge a “cultural state”, to promote local developments and to include an affective dimension in its policies. The word furusato (literally “old village”, meaning home village) evokes feelings of nostalgia, and furusato zukuri serves to produce a sense and popular memory of the past. It comprises initiatives such as the revival and re-invention of local festivals and the development of “old village”-villages, where city dwellers can enjoy so-called traditional pursuits. The 100 million yen grants empowered local communities. Many of them spent the money on projects characterized by a combination of cultivating the local environment, reviving local traditions to foster local identity and efforts for economic revival, often through tourism. 

Furusato evokes images of agriculture and traditional crafts, festivals and anything associated with Japanese folklore. Kangaku scholars, representatives of an elite culture, do not fit this image. Nevertheless, the same year, 1992, which saw the completion of the Kan Chazan Memorial Museum (plans for which existed before Takeshita’s grants), also saw the completion of the Morohashi Tetsuji Memorial Museum in Shitada village, Niigata prefecture, built with money from the Takeshita grants. The museum is part of a huge complex, including Morohashi’s birthplace, a study moved from Tokyo, in which he and his assistants worked on the Dai kanwa jiten [The Great Chinese-Japanese Character Dictionary], a Chinese- and Japanese-style garden, a car park and a restaurant. The whole site is impressively named kangaku no sato [home of Chinese learning]. Morohashi (see Chapter 5) was a modern-day China specialist and teacher at the new schools rather than a kangaku scholar and juku master (his father had a juku). Still, like the juku and their masters, he is commemorated as a representative of “Japanese tradition”. During the last years of the Edo period and perhaps even more so in the early Meiji period, when schooling increased, Confucian ideas and morals spread from the ruling elite to the lower classes. Commemorating kangaku scholars as
part of furusato tsukuri illustrates the respect enjoyed by the local scholar and teacher and the nostalgia for anything associated with the time before Japan experienced the upheavals that came with modernization and Westernization. This yearning for the “traditional”, the local, the personal may well be the most important element in the commemoration of juku.

INSPIRED BY THE JUKU

The juku as it had existed from the Edo period was virtually extinct by the early twentieth century, but as an ideal it lived on. Even as the original juku disappeared, new institutions were founded to take its place; an early example are the dōjō in the castle town of Hirosaki (Chapter 3). In the inter-war years kokumin dōjō became popular in the farming villages; they were small-scale, juku-like institutions where farmers received technical knowledge, but also studied the Confucian classics. In Yamaguchi prefecture the Shōwa Shōin juku prepared farmers for emigration to Manchuria.\textsuperscript{20} The Shōwa juku established by members of the Shōwa kenkyūkai (Shōwa Research Association) in 1938 offered a programme of lectures by members of the association. These and other institutions, though very diverse, had in common that they were private, small in scale and offered a special kind of education, generally with a strong moral component perceived to be lacking in the public education system.

Most efforts at “juku revival” were informal and small-scale, and thus are difficult to trace. An example is Ichijima juku, opened by Morohashi Tetsuji and his friend Ichijima Tokukō in Ichijima’s home in the late 1920s. The idea was to give promising but poor students a chance to experience communal life and learn from their teacher by example.\textsuperscript{21} The juku, however, also inspired the establishment of larger, more permanent institutions. In 1899 the Taiwan kyōkai gakkō (School of the Taiwan Association) was founded, the predecessor of Takushoku University. Its first president was Katsura Tarō (1848–1913), who took up the tradition of Yoshida Shōin’s juku.\textsuperscript{22} In the beginning all the students were boarders. Training their spirit and character through communal life was given as much importance as educating them intellectually. The boarding houses were known as juku, and one author claims that for the first 20 years the school was like a large juku. As student numbers
increased, so did the number of boarding houses, which were known as ryō or juku. At least 20 are known to have been established up to the 1940s, but there may well have been twice as many. As in the traditional juku, students learnt by mutual encouragement and competition; unlike the traditional juku, there was no master and the houses were run by student self-government. They had statements of aims, the main aim being to create men useful to the nation. Tōmei juku, established in 1938, explicitly referred to Saigō Takamori’s shigakō. The juku had their own lecture programmes, often with lectures on Chinese classics; at Tōmei juku the programme included The Greater Learning, The Doctrine of the Mean, The Analects and Mencius. The system of juku and ryō ended during the war and was not revived, although one former member re-established one in 1967.

Among those fascinated by the idea of the juku (as they saw it) were educators who established their own schools in the 1920s. The liberal climate of the “Taishō Democracy” made itself felt in education. In the 1910s and 1920s the liberal New Education Movement challenged the educational orthodoxy with ideals of a more child-centred education. New translations of Western works on progressive education inspired experiments at both public and private institutions. A large conference was held in Tokyo in 1921 with lectures on new education; in literature and art new works especially for children were created. Several new private schools were established to put ideas about self-motivation and individualized learning into practice. Some educators called for a return to juku and terakoya education. The movement as a whole was short-lived, but some of the schools survived, even to this day.

Jōkō jogakkō (Jō High School for Women) was established in 1926 by Kōno Tsuneta (1891–1964), born in Tokyo as the eldest son of a former samurai. In 1914 he graduated from the higher normal school attached to Waseda University in Japanese, kanbun and history. After a spell teaching at the First Middle School in Sapporo, he taught at the Kanagawa Second Prefectural Middle School in Yokohama from 1917 to 1920. In 1922 he graduated from Tokyo Imperial University in Chinese philosophy. Then he taught at Japan University, Waseda University First High School and Gakushūin. Meanwhile, he began to plan his own school; for girls because these were less strictly regulated than those for boys. His co-founder, Masunaga Nobumaru (b.1877), had retired
from his post as an elementary school teacher in 1925. They bought the premises of a private girls’ school founded in 1922 by the kangaku scholar Mizutani Yumio (1848–1926). Mizutani originally came from Gifu, where he had run a kangaku juku. In 1905 he opened a kangaku juku in Nagoya before moving to Tokyo in 1918. Well-known figures supported his school, including the female educators Shimoda Utako and Tanahashi Ayako, but he ran into financial difficulties.

Eventually the school became a women’s high school. As the school history says, the shijuku-like school, founded by a kangaku scholar of the old type, was succeeded by a girl’s high school run by a kangaku scholar of the new type and infused with the spirit of Confucianism. His pupils read the Classic of Filial Piety and the Analects. His goal was to educate “virtuous mothers and faithful wives” (tokubo teisai), as he said, consciously deviating from the official slogan “good wives and wise mothers” (ryōsai kenbo). Like Mizutani, he wanted his school to be open to the common people (shōmin) and kept fees at the low end of the scale for private schools. In 1930 he explicitly invoked the “terakoya-type rural juku” (terakoya ryōjuku) in an address to the parents of prospective entrants. Unlike the public schools, his school aimed to educate the whole person and focus on every individual. According to him, the idea of rural juku education (ryōjuku shiki kyōiku) originates from the Book of Rites and means terakoya education. In other words, his models were not so much the kangaku juku offering high standards of scholarship to an elite, but the elementary (tenarai) juku for the common people. He laid great stress on close relationships with his pupils, making a point of knowing them all individually. This was possible because the school had only around 150 pupils, more than most terakoya, but no larger than the large juku in Tokyo in the 1870s. Teachers and pupils had meals together and shared cleaning duties. The day started with a morning ceremony. These features are reminiscent of juku education, as is Kōno’s insistence that a school must not be run like a business.

Jōu High School for Women survived into the post-war period. In the 1950s Kanbe Yasumitsu, one of the few to conduct intensive research into juku of the Meiji period, was a teacher there, and he reports having talked about private education and the juku of Meiji with Kōno, with whom he also studied kanbun. That Kōno saw himself as part of a long tradition of private education is also demonstrated in his publication Shigaku no
genryū, a survey of private education since ancient times. However, like many juku, Jōu gakkō survived the death of its founder only briefly. It ran into financial difficulties and in 1974 became the Bunka joshi daigaku fuzoku Suginami kōtō gakkō (Suginami High School Attached to Bunka Women’s University). Kōno’s educational course, which made the school special, found an end with this change.

Better known than Jōu gakkō is Tamagawa gakuen, established by Obara Kuniyoshi (1887–1977). Obara had no personal experience of juku education; in 1905 he entered Kagoshima normal school and thereafter Hiroshima Higher Normal School, where he also taught after graduating in philosophy from Kyoto University. In 1917 he became a director of the new Seijō Elementary School, where he was employed until 1933. In this private school he was able to practise some of his own ideas on education. But in 1929 he also founded his own school, which he named Tamagawa juku. Newspapers at the time praised the school for its “terakoya spirit” in a world of “examination hell” and “employment-seeking hell” (shiken jigoku, shūshoku jigoku). Obara himself described his guiding principles in Tamagawa-juku no kyōiku, published in 1931. He chose the word juku to evoke feelings of nostalgia (natsukashii); juku, he claims, are unique to Japan. Among his educational principles were education of the whole person, respect for the individual, self-study and self-determination and warm relations between teacher and students, all characteristics commonly ascribed to the juku. Obara published several works on education.

Even in the more repressive climate of the 1930s new private schools continued to be founded. One was the present-day Reitaku University in Kashiwa city (Chiba prefecture). The founder, Hiroike Chikūrō (1866–1968), is described by his biographer as a classical example of the risshin shusse spirit of early Meiji. He was largely self-taught, and his biography illustrates some of the points made earlier (Chapter 5, Student careers). The son of farmers from what is now Nakatsu city (Ōita prefecture), he graduated from the local middle school, then attempted to enter the normal school (shihan gakkō) in Ōita. To prepare for the examination he studied at a juku and with private tutors. Although he failed the examination twice, he passed the qualifying examination which was equivalent to graduation from the normal school. He taught at local schools until 1892, then moved to Kyōto in order to make his way as a researcher and
publisher on historical themes. There he met Inoue Yorikuni, who in 1895 invited him to work on the compilation of the Koji ruien (a classified encyclopedia of Japan’s cultural history in primary sources), which was completed in 1909. In 1912, while teaching at Jingū Kōgakukan University in Ise, Hiroike was awarded a doctoral degree from Tokyo University for his work on ancient family law in China.

That year his health, never good, reached a crisis, which marked a turning point in his life. He developed a strong interest in religion and moral education, and in what he called “moralogy” and began to publish and lecture on the subject. In the early 1930s he began making plans for a juku specialized in moralogy, and in 1935 opened Senkō juku, with a main department offering studies in moralogy and foreign languages to middle school graduates and a three-month course for the general public. All students lived in self-governing boarding houses. His personal library became the school library, and he encouraged students to make good use of it to study individually. Hiroike also continued to be active as a lecturer and publicist. His work is carried on by his descendants.

To give one more example, the founder of the present day Tōkai University, Matsumae Shigeyoshi (1901–91) from Kumamoto, was also inspired by juku. After graduation from Tōhoku Imperial University he entered the Ministry of Communications in 1925. At this time he came under the influence of Uchimura Kanzō’s Christianity and educational ideas, including his interest in the Danish folk high school (folkehøjskole) movement. When in 1932 the ministry sent Matsumae to Germany to study, he also visited Denmark. In 1936 he established Bōsei gakujuku in his own home. He built a boarding house with a lecture hall, a gymnasium, a library and a church hall. Seven students lived there while studying at university and about 100 people attended evening classes. The emphasis was on relationships between students rather than on the master-student relationship. This “juku” ended in 1942, but in 1943 Matsumae opened Kōkū kagaku senmon gakkō, a specialized college, as a boarding school; in 1946 it became the last university to be licensed under the pre-war system and in 1950 was named Tōkai University. Bōsei gakujuku is today a section of Tōkai University offering continuing education. Matsumae himself opened a new private school in Fukushima prefecture, modelled on the Danish folk high school, but had to
close it the following year because the Occupation authorities forbade people purged from government office from engaging in education.

Apart from the name, it is doubtful whether Bōsei juku had much in common with the traditional juku. Matsumae himself emphasized the influence of the Danish folk high schools (which may have originally had a faint resemblance to juku in that they were small private boarding schools where young people studied without the expectation of immediate worldly profit). Like the other foundations described here, the emphasis was on the community of students. The role of the master, who was at the centre of the traditional juku, was less important. The founders of these modern schools were strong personalities, yet it is their conscious development of pedagogical concepts, in which the juku formed one (small) part, that motivated them. By this time the significance of the juku lay not in a real institution that could serve as a model, but in an idea that could be blended with other ideas, including those of educational reformers in the West, and inspire something new and different. The campus of Tamagawa gakuen provides visible evidence of this eclectic approach. A stroll around it leads past reconstructions of Shōka Sonjuku and Kangien, but also two chapels. Statues include a bust of Beethoven and a full statue of Niels Bukh (1880–1950), known for his renewal of Danish gymnastics and today better known at Tamagawa than in his homeland.

At the same time, the word juku, as Obara rightly observed, was natsukashii; it was familiar and evoked memories of the time before a new and for many alien school system was imposed. In other words, by the 1920s and 1930s, the juku had become a myth.

THE JUKU MYTH

In March 1938 the journal Nihon oyobi Nihonjin announced a special section on juku. Readers were asked to submit manuscripts under the following five headings: (1) The juku at which I studied and the person of my revered teacher (onshi); (2) Teaching methods of juku and the relationship between teacher and pupils; (3) Juku which existed into the Meiji period; (4) Strengths and weaknesses of schools (gakkō) and juku; (5) Other opinions and views about juku education. The editors expected the contributions to be useful in the light of the planned education reforms. In April, 24 articles were published under the
following headings: *Juku* education and school education (12 contributions); The *juku* at which I studied and my revered teacher (*onschi*) (8); Talking about *juku* (4).

The headings suggest that most of the contributions did not claim to be reminiscences or even to record personal experiences, and so it was. Of the twelve authors whose articles appeared under the first heading, five said at the outset that they had no personal experience of *juku*, one admitted having only little experience, and five did not mention whether or not they had experience. Only one stated that he wrote from experience. Even in the articles under the second heading only three authors relate significant personal experience; three limit themselves to general remarks.

One of the latter is the contribution of Miwada Motomichi. Its title is “The *juku* of Mino-sensei in Takamatsu”, and it is the shortest of all. It consists of five statements: (1) The teacher was like a father. (2) I believe that a *juku*-like spirit (*shijukuteki no kibun*) is necessary in order to educate true human beings. (3) I was in the *juku* of Mino-sensei in Takamatsu. To this day I cannot forget the figure of my revered teacher and am full of gratitude. (4) Even if schools are more progressive in their material resources, I am convinced that the true essence of education lies in a *juku*-like spirit. (5) For intellectual education, schools may be better, but I believe that moral education can only take place in *juku*. If there is not education in the style of *juku*, no excellent human beings (*idai na ningen*) can be found.

Miwada’s claims for *juku* education are reiterated by other authors. What is interesting about his contribution, however, is not what he says, but what he omits. For Mino-sensei’s *juku* was not the only *juku* in Matsuyama that he attended. At the age of eight he entered the *juku* of Miwada Masako. She later adopted him and he helped her found her school in 1902, succeeding her as its head after her death. It would therefore appear that the sensei who had the most influence on Motomichi was Miwada Masako. He must have seemed doubly qualified to comment, having studied at a *juku* and run a school established by his teacher. One can only suspect that he was persuaded to contribute to *Nihon oyobi Nihonjin* against his inclination.

What characteristics of *juku* were named in the other articles? The ones mentioned by Miwada are the most common, regardless of whether the author was speaking from experience or not. In sum, the following characteristics are stressed:
• Personal, family-like relationship between teacher and pupils (12 mentions).
• Importance of teacher’s personal qualities (8).
• Value of juku education for character and moral training (kun’iku, seishin kyōiku) and for the development of talented human beings (jinzai, ningen o tsukuru; 10).
• The juku does more justice to the development of individual students (5).

In contrast, the following negative characteristics were ascribed to schools (gakkō):

• Large and impersonal (6); three authors compare them to a department store or a factory.\(^\text{38}\)
• Too much emphasis on knowledge and worldly success, too little on moral and character training.

Only rarely are weaknesses of juku mentioned, such as success depending very much on the individual teacher, the lack of teachers around,\(^\text{39}\) the small numbers of students, and the possibilities for abuse of the system.\(^\text{40}\) Some authors conceded that the modern school system was not without merits. It was more suited to transmit knowledge to the masses and met the needs of modern society. One author regretfully stated that juku were no longer in line with the times,\(^\text{41}\) and another, the only one, simply dismissed them as anachronistic.\(^\text{42}\) A few authors named certain juku as examples, although they did not know them from personal experience. The juku mentioned by name are nearly always the same: Yoshida Shōin’s Shōka sonjuku (5); Nakamura Masanao’s Dōjinsha (4); Fukuzawa Yukichi’s Keiō gijuku (3). Usually the same author names all three. Two authors name the juku of Sugiuara Jūgō (1855–1924; nationalistic educator and an editor of Nihonjin). The three juku named most frequently are still the most famous today (with the addition of Hirose Tansō’s Kangien), and this alone suggests that they were exceptional.

If the juku had virtually disappeared by the twentieth century, how much experience could someone have who wrote for Nihon oyobiNihonjin in 1938? I found biographical information for 16 of the 24 authors and the age of a further five can be guessed. Most appear to have attended school in the 1880s and 1890s when
"juku," although dwindling, still formed part of the educational scene. Thus it was possible for these authors to have spent some years in a juku, especially if they had been educated outside Tokyo. However, only a few authors had clearly done so. On the other hand, most of them had a reason to be interested in the education of their day. At least 12 were educators and 2 were politicians.

It is perhaps not surprising that they had more interest in the education system of the present than that of the past. So why discuss juku at all? The answer can be found in the historical situation. As part of the increasing state control in all areas of life within Japan, the Ministry of Education too aimed to do its part in mobilizing the people for the nation. Fundamental educational reform was on the agenda since 1935, and in 1937 a new office for educational matters was created (kyōgakukyoku). That same year another commission was created, this time directly under the jurisdiction of the cabinet. The calls for reform had increased, and several private associations had produced draft proposals. Nihon oyobi Nihonjin published several articles on the subject.

The general thrust of educational reform was towards increasing centralization and ideological indoctrination. At the same time, the 1930s were a time of profound structural change. The expansion of secondary and tertiary education, begun in the 1920s, still continued. The system became less elitist, and opportunities for women increased. The education system was changing in different ways; increasing state control on the one hand, expansion with egalitarian tendencies on the other.

These developments are reflected in the articles; the emphasis on moral and character education reflects the government’s efforts in this area, and the criticism of mass education in “factories of learning” can be understood in the context of the expansion. Strong nationalist rhetoric, however, is rare. In only one or two articles is the necessity of training excellent individuals linked to Japan’s ambitions to become a great power. Thus men who had an agenda concerning educational reform used the theme of juku as a pretext for discussing the issues of 1938. Some authors explicitly refrained from relating personal experiences, although they were in a position to do so. One example is Nakayama Kyūshirō (1874–1961; professor of oriental history at Tokyo Imperial University). He attended a juku in his home town in Nagano prefecture, but we learn little about it.
Nakayama states that he does not want to talk about himself, and devotes much more space to Yoshida Shōin’s *juku*.45

One author gives fairly detailed information about his own experience. Hiranuma Yoshirō (1864–1938), the brother of the statesman and later prime minister Kiichirō,46 was a journalist turned teacher and headmaster, and he tells his readers about the schools that he attended, the teachers who influenced him and the teaching methods he encountered. Although we learn about his personal experiences, they do not come to life in his account. The strongest impression is that of the educator giving us his views of education in 1938.

Even the person of the teacher, to whom one supposedly owes so much to (onshi), remains strangely remote and hardly ever comes to life in the authors’ reminiscenses. One author tells two stories which are intended to show his teacher’s character and his role as a model for his students.47 He is said to have been benevolent and slow to anger, yet students could not defy him. Once he expelled all the pupils at once because they had visited a play without permission. Another time he praised his pupils for rising early every morning and being up when he swept the yard. Apparently he had not noticed that they had rinsed their faces with water from the fields rather than at the well, so as not to be seen by their teacher, who would have then known that they had only just crawled out of their futons. Cynical readers of this piece might feel that this teacher did not have his flock under control and attempted desperate measures when he lost his patience.

Only one author, Sono Toyoko, limits herself to merely relating her memories without expressing any judgements on *juku* in general. It is perhaps significant that hers is the only article by a woman.48 She attended the *juku* of Hio Naoko (1829–97; Chapter 4), where she was a boarder from around 1878, and describes the daily routine. Some 80 boys and girls between 8 and 18 were taught reading, writing, Confucian ethics and *waka* poetry. We can only speculate that Sono took the editors at their word and wrote her contribution with no axe to grind.

In sum, only a minority of the authors had spent a significant part of their school days in a *juku* and even fewer described their experience in a meaningful way. Instead, they addressed educational issues of their day. Moreover, they were not the only ones to invoke *juku* as a model at the time. The late 1920s to the early 1940s saw several publications praising the virtues of *juku* and of *kangaku*, the subject most *juku* taught. Some compared
Confucian education with education in other countries, including Nazi Germany, in order to prove that it was both traditional and universal. In all these publications similar characteristics of *juku* are stressed and the same examples cited.49 By 1938 *juku* education had long become an ideal, an object of nostalgia, invoked when the education system of the day was criticized.

The fashioning of the *juku* myth began early, as the extract from *Footprints in the Snow*, quoted in the introduction, shows. There, in 1901, we already have all the elements we find again in the articles of 1938. Moreover, this image of the traditional *juku* moves people to this day and provides a contrast to the “factory of learning” of the modern school system. Thus, the high school teacher Tsunetō Toshisuke, in the preface of his book about his grandfather’s *juku* Zōshun’en (published in 1991) contrasts Zōshun’en (Kangien and Shōka sonjuku are also mentioned) with the present education system. He even admits, in his postscript, that his study of *juku* is something of a flight from the present:

> It would be an exaggeration to speak of a breakdown, but for a while I often, exhausted as I was by a reality which I cannot change, fled into the world of the past. When I could find the time I would pass my days avidly reading, with a dictionary in one hand, material about the *juku* of the Edo period.50

Frustrated by the present, this educator seeks guidance in a bygone age, from his predecessors (*senpai*), as he calls Yoshida Shōin and Hirose Tansō. He devotes an entire chapter at the end of the book to his thoughts on the education system of his day. Nor is he the only one to look to *juku* for inspiration in the 1990s. Two articles on traditional *juku* in journals devoted to family matters and children’s education respectively, hold up Hirose Tansō’s *juku* as a shining example.51 Dōmon Fuyuji, a writer of popular history, wrote a book on famous *juku* of the Edo period for the PHP Research Institute, whose publications are intended to furnish their readers with knowledge they can apply to their lives.52 For Dōmon, the *juku* represented a strand of scholarship that could be applied to people’s lives, living scholarship in contrast to the “dead” scholarship at the official (domain) schools. The masters of *juku* had developed their personal standpoint; students sought out teachers according to their needs.
With the demise of the historical juku an ideal image of a juku came into being, which influenced collective memories. Societies construct memories according to their needs, and such memories are a product of relationships between private memory and public representation, between past experience and present concerns. Personal recollections often fit themselves into the framework of this constructed memory, even if the experience of the individual was in fact different. This is what appears to have happened with the authors of the articles in Nihon oyobi Nihonjin. The way they remembered juku shows how personal experience of juku fades into the background, while the public juku-image and the concern with the contemporary crisis in education dominates their discourse. Yet this “juku myth” developed a dynamic of its own, as the examples of private schools inspired by it shows; nor has it lost its power today.

CONTINUITIES
The juku held its ground for many years after a modern, standardized school system, which privileged public schools, had been introduced. Despite government efforts to increase control and to promote public at the expense of private education, private schools still play an important role in Japan’s education system today, in contrast, for example, to Germany and France.

The word juku today can describe a variety of institutions, including the cram school. Does this mean that there are continuities from the juku of the Edo period to the present day? They have certainly not disappeared without trace. As has been shown, some made the transition to a private school within the new system and for a long time retained something of their original character. To this day Nishōgakusha, the only kangaku juku to become a university, is devoted mainly to the study of Chinese and Japanese humanities subjects.

Scholars educated at least in part at kangaku juku continued in influential positions well into the twentieth century, most obviously in the fields of Chinese and Japanese history and Chinese literature and philosophy at universities. Some were the heirs of juku masters; Yasui Bokudō and Makino Kenjirō have been mentioned. Shionoya On (1878–1962), a professor at Tokyo University who had studied in China and Germany, was a descendant of Shionoya Tōin and Suzuki Torao (1879–1963) of Suzuki Bundai, the founder of Chōzenkan.
The study methods of 

_kangaku_ influenced those of Western learning; early textbooks of English had reading aids (_kudokuten_) and Japanese words written under the English text, just like an annotated _kanbun_ text. The heavy reliance on reading and translation in teaching contemporary, spoken languages may well be a continuation of the _kangaku_ tradition, just as the “grammar translation method” in the West originated in the study of Latin and ancient Greek.\(^{55}\)

The _juku_, however, however, is not remembered for the teaching methods in a narrow sense, but for the personal relationships between master and students and among the students themselves. But in looking for continuities in this area, however, we face two difficulties. One is the difficulty of distinguishing between the historical _juku_ and the nostalgic image of it, which influenced educators from the start. The other is that there is little reason to assume that the relationships said to characterize the _juku_ are peculiar to the _juku_ alone. Indeed, the propagators of the “_juku_ myth” in the 1930s were often influenced by a range of ideas on education and attempted to show the universal nature of the “_juku_ spirit” by drawing comparisons with the West.

Takebe Tongo (1871–1945), professor of social science and one of the authors in the _Nihon oyobi Nihonjin_ series, wrote about the importance of cultivating relationships at university.\(^{56}\) He himself kept an open house for students and colleagues once a week for 21 years and organized special events and meals. He also mentioned a study group with a special interest in character education, which met once a month. Referring to student associations and a boarding school in Germany, _cercles_ in France and Eton in England, as well as Japanese associations of students from one region, he states that such institutions can fulfill the function of a _juku_.

To this day the social ties at Japanese universities appear, intense, at least to someone coming from a German “mass university”. From what I observed as a student at Tokyo University, ties between professor and student and between students were much closer than anything I had experienced. Students would sit together in the same seminar group of the same professor for several years, from when they first specialized as undergraduates until they left after their postgraduate studies to take up academic appointments. There were regular meals or drinking sessions, parties to mark events in the members’ lives
and occasional overnight outings, and often members stayed in touch long after leaving. In some cases the professor even acted as their official go-between when they married. The numerous university clubs, with their hierarchies, strong group ties and often strict regimes, may also fulfil some of the functions of the communal life in the former juku. The proliferation of kenkyūkai, informal study groups devoted to research in a specified area, may do the same. Besides, given the indifferent reputation of teaching at some universities, it may well be that real intellectual stimulation occurs there rather than in the formal teaching sessions. Could this be another example of the preference for informal study over official schooling?

During my work in Japan in 1999 I was fortunate to be introduced to the Kyōikushi kenkyūkai, a study group for the history of education, which met once a month in the Kendō bunko, the private library of the late Ishikawa Ken and his son Matsutarō, both eminent scholars in the history of education. The library is open to the public on certain days of the week, and several study groups meet there regularly. A member gives a presentation of their work in progress, which is then discussed over tea. This is the pattern of study groups elsewhere, too, but this one takes place in the extension of a private home and Professor Ishikawa presides over it. On occasions when the group consists mainly of younger members who receive advice from him, it is easy to imagine, that the juku may have been something like this for older students.

The examples just mentioned do not represent a conscious attempt to revive the juku. Other initiatives explicitly link themselves to the idea of the juku, for example at the private universities mentioned earlier in this chapter. Reitaku University (its name comes from a passage in the Yi Jing or I Ging), the successor of Hiroike Chikurō’s juku, is now part of an educational complex including a high school, a middle school, a branch school in Gumma prefecture, the Institute of Moralogy, a kindergarten, a business section with a publishing department, accommodation and catering services, a shop, a mail order company, a golf club and an overseas development organization. The chancellor of the university is Hiroike Mototada, presumably Chikurō’s descendant. In 1991 a new Senkōjuku was founded. Its education is based on developing the individual, combining knowledge with morality, studying in a self-governing community and practicing mutual service and
gratitude to one’s teachers, whether ancient sages or contemporaries. Its motto is: “By taking up the spirit of Hiroike Chikurō, following the rules of nature, studying the true principles and practicing virtue, let us contribute to world peace and the happiness of humankind.”

Matsumae Shigeyoshi’s Bōsei gakujuku has also been revived. In 1976 a Matsumae Shigeyoshi youth judo juku was opened. In 1983 the Bōsei lectures were started as a continuation of Matsumae’s lecture activity. Bōsei gakujuku is part of Tōkai University and offers continuing education. Although the acknowledged inspiration for Bōsei gakujuku is the Danish folk high school, the name still reminds us of its origins as an informal study group in Matsumae Shigeyoshi’s home. The connection between Tōkai University and the idea of the juku was drawn more explicitly in 1971, when the journal of the Tōkai Education Research Institute published the special issue on juku men-tioned at the beginning of this chapter.

If the juku as an idea still holds its own at university level, what about those institutions that are most commonly associated with the word juku today, the private establishments which children of school age attend outside school hours? The assumption that no direct continuity exists between today’s juku and the juku of Tokugawa and Meiji Japan appears largely correct. Still, today, as in the nineteenth century, there is great diversity between the institutions that call themselves juku. There are juku for sports, arts and crafts (keiko juku). Among those that offer academic subjects (gakushū juku), some help students to catch up with school work (hoshū juku), while others—the ones that most closely fit the cram school image—prepare younger students (grades one through nine) for entrance examinations (shingaku juku). The yobikō (“preparatory schools”) prepare the older students (tenth grade and above). Juku can be large and part of a chain, but most often they are small, sometimes taught by a single teacher, and cater for neighbourhood children. Some function as daycare centres where students do homework and review lessons under supervision, an important aspect at a time when women increasingly seek careers outside the home. A preparatory course for entrance to a private middle school can be an effective way of keeping a child out of mischief after school until a parent comes home. Whether large or small, juku are often places where schoolchildren experience the most meaningful social relationships. Sometimes the teaching methods
are more innovative and appealing than at the public schools. Many children therefore enjoy going to juku.

Thus there are some elements characteristic of the earlier juku: the average juku is a casual business, often in the teacher’s home; it can be a source of income for students, who teach part time at juku; for the pupils the social dimension is as important as the school work covered. Some juku, mainly those catering for the most ambitious, have turned to “traditional practices” to set themselves off from the competition and to attract parents who believe the public system to be too “liberal”.64 Pre-war ideas about the importance of character building and “spiritualism” (seishin shugi) are popular, and practices include long hours, corporal punishment, zazen and militant rhetoric. Although life in the juku of the nineteenth century could be Spartan and include long hours of study and harsh punishments, and although character training was an integral part of juku education, there is little real continuity from education at the old juku to today’s piecemeal application of “traditional” elements. Perhaps the main similarity is the importance given to mutual encouragement and friendly competition, the old idea of sessa takuma. The concentrated experience of group effort to meet challenges in today’s juku has resulted in some juku having alumni organizations. But the simultaneous emphasis on an egoistic drive for personal success would have shocked scholars like Ikeda Sōan.

If modern juku illustrate a “misalignment between public policy and private conduct”65 is that also something that links them to the juku of Meiji Japan? Public schools in post-war Japan were influenced by the democratic and egalitarian ideals introduced during the Occupation. Reforms have often reflected an effort to decrease the hold of the examination system, but individual parents want their children to succeed, which requires passing examinations. So they send them to juku. In Akita in the 1870s and 1880s public policy was to ensure that children were enrolled in the new schools that taught a curriculum heavily biased towards Western learning. But parents perceived the education offered by the juku as more relevant to their needs and continued to send their children there. Unlike today’s parents, who invariably deplore the necessity for juku, the parents of Akita would not have shared the public policy view. Besides, in their day the juku may well have offered a more “humanistic” education compared to the utilitarian approach of the modern
schools; they were not (yet?) part of a system linking education to worldly benefits. In contrast, today’s juku represent a pragmatic approach to education, while the public schools are influenced by a more idealistic attitude.

The juku in its original form became extinct in the late nineteenth century. There is no direct continuity linking the two images evoked by the word juku, described in the introduction. Yet there are individual strands that can be followed from the nineteenth century into our own time. The traditional juku, moreover, still has the power to inspire. Is it true that no institution in Japan really dies, but instead lives on in some other form? If so, then the juku’s legacy would seem to illustrate this.
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Conclusion

THE HISTORY OF THE JUKU INTO THE MEIJI PERIOD tells us things about education in Meiji Japan that the conventional narrative focusing on the public system does not. Education in early Meiji was characterized by a diversity of educational institutions, and individuals often showed considerable initiative and dedication in providing and acquiring education. Their thoughts did not always conform to those of the policy makers and did reflect some of the tensions that resulted from living through a period of rapid and profound change. The people of Akita distrusted the new schools and continued to send their children to juku. Ikeda Sōan lamented over the pressure to turn his juku into a commercial operation. These episodes, besides revealing the actual experiences that lay behind the debates and policies, also suggest some of the general conflicts that expressed themselves in the history of education: government control versus private initiative; central control versus regional independence; new and foreign education versus traditional education. For many, the new schools may well have been the first place where they were confronted with Western civilization. Illustrations of schools in the Meiji period often depict the children sitting on chairs at desks in purpose-built classrooms, with a teacher in ill-fitting Western dress standing at the front and pointing with a stick at a board or wall chart with characters and illustrations. The teacher and children look ill at ease (see Figure 10). In contrast, scenes from terakoya (or tenarai juku) appear relaxed and familiar (see Figure 8 or the cover illustration, for instance).

Contrasting the kangaku juku with the modern schools makes them appear as outdated institutions, the demise of which was a matter of time. Outdated they may have been, but some of the successes the modern education system is credited can be with
equal justification attributed to the *juku*. Government policies
aimed to spread education, but it was often the *kangaku juku* and not just the new schools that gave people access to education. Likewise, the strengthening of national identity cannot be attributed to the modern schools alone. The *kangaku* curriculum, however varied its application in the different *juku*, represented a common culture, and as more people received education in *juku* or schools where they were taught by *kangaku* scholars, more people shared in that culture than previously. Not until the Western civilization transmitted in the new schools had been absorbed by most of the population did *kangaku* lose this role. Even then Confucian ethics, assimilated into the new national ideology, constituted the basis of moral education in the new schools.

*Kangaku*, which formed the core of what most *juku* taught, was transformed in a similar way as the study of classics in Europe, from an amateur pursuit for those with capital and leisure to an academic discipline among other disciplines. At the same time (and again comparable to Europe) the position of *kangaku* changed from being the source of all learning and the way to absolute truths to being a field of study among others, where methods of textual criticism were applied to contextualize and to discover true facts.¹ Education at the traditional *juku*, with its synthesis of intellectual and moral training was closely related to the former concept of *kangaku*. Thus the transformation of *kangaku*, which became manifest in the 1890s, the spread of modern schools and social changes caused *juku* to become obsolete.

As we have seen, although *juku* education left its mark in different ways after the disappearance of the *juku* itself, the most enduring legacy is perhaps the way it is remembered and what I have called called the “*juku* myth” (Chapter 6). The idea of the *juku* inspired and still inspires educational initiatives and debates. The warm relationships between teacher and students and the students themselves are contrasted with the cold, factory-like atmosphere and the lack of attention to the individual in “mass-education”. Education of the whole person, including character training, is contrasted to the one-sided attention to intellectual education and passing examinations to gain worldly benefits. Thus the image of the *juku* offers an alternative with which to challenge the system of the day. Also, unlike the main stream education system imposed on an initially hostile population, the *juku* is perceived as uniquely Japanese.
IS THE JUKU UNIQUE?

This begs the question, in what way, if at all, is the juku unique? A comparative study is beyond the scope of this book, so only a few observations will be made. The fact that kangaku came from China and that Japan’s earliest educational institutions followed Chinese examples, with scholars returning from China opening the first private academies, does not mean that the juku was a wholesale imitation of a Chinese institution. The word juku (Chinese shu, originally meaning a small room in a home where children were educated) is not commonly used in China to describe the kind of institution examined here. A kajuku (Ch. jiashu) was a clan school with the primary purpose of preparing clan members for the state examinations. The private academy in Chinese education emerged in the ninth century and was known as shuyuan (Japanese shoin), the private study and library of a scholar, which became a place where students gathered to learn. It represented the “Confucian search for scholarly and moral enlightenment outside the state’s supervision or control”.\(^2\) Private academies flourished during the Song period (960–1279). Under the Yuan dynasty (1279–1367) they were encouraged by the government, but at the same time became more institutionalized and “officialized” as they increasingly turned into places where students prepared for the civil service examinations. Under the Ming (1368–1644) this trend intensified as the government strove to subjugate them under a government system. By the late Ming period education was so completely dominated by the civil service examinations that there was hardly any scope for innovation. Thus, although private academies started as places where learning was enjoyed for its own sake and for personal and moral cultivation, they could not separate themselves from the aspirations for social mobility of their students, who needed to pass examinations to succeed. Consequently, “after the thirteenth century, the history of education is basically a history of its subjugation to the destructive influences of the civil service examinations”.\(^3\)

The absence of an examination system which determined social advancement on the basis of academic achievement is one of the main differences between Tokugawa Japan and imperial China. Birth, not academic merit, determined one’s social position, and study at a juku did not, apart from a few exceptions, lead to social advancement. It provided an outlet for
people with leisure and material resources at their disposal in a society where their freedom and scope for participation in the government was limited. Ikeda Sōan’s example illustrates how learning and self-cultivation gave someone like him, born into a social class excluded from political participation, personal fulfilment. As long as there was no merit system based on academic achievement, masters and students at a juku were free to pursue learning independently of worldly benefits, even though study at a juku could be both competitive and examination-driven (as at Kangien).  

This situation changed fundamentally once the Meiji government began to take control of education, although the change was not immediately apparent. The Education Law of 1872 laid the foundations for a direct link between education and social advancement, which in the following years took the shape of a system of schools and examinations regulating the path to success. While this system was in the making, one of the most notable characteristics of education in early Meiji was the gap in provision between elementary education and entrance to higher education. This gap was filled by private institutions, including juku, which thus often functioned as preparatory schools long before the word juku was used specifically to describe an establishment where students prepared for entrance examinations. At the same time not all who attended juku aspired to the highest echelons of society, so for many the juku could still be a place where learning was pursued for its own sake. This was particularly true of many rural juku or of the very small and informal juku in Tokyo of scholars who, as their main occupation, taught at the new schools.

In sum, the traditional juku was a product of specific historical circumstances, and in this sense it was unique. Can this, however, be said of the individual characteristics which are perceived as typical of the juku? Of these, the master-student relationship and perhaps the role of community life and the emphasis on moral as well as academic training are most often praised. These ideals were part of the Confucian view of education. Can they also be found elsewhere, namely in educational traditions in Europe?

Histories of education in Europe generally take as their starting point the education of ancient Greece and Rome. The classical form of education reached its completion in the Hellenistic period from the generation following Alexander the Great and Aristotle and retained its dominance until the end of the Roman Empire.
and the Byzantine Empire respectively. After the end of the ancient system of education, much of it was taken into Christian education, which began to spread from the fourth century.

Of the teacher-student relationship in ancient Greece, it is said: “In Athens, as nowhere else in the world, the personal relationship of master and disciple, which was one of the most characteristic features of old Greek education, retained all its ancient virtue”. The same author describes “a one-way relationship between master and pupils or master and apprentice” as “characteristic of education in pre-industrial societies”. Centuries later, a close relationship between teacher and pupil is still perceived as the ideal context for education; in Emile, Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–78) has the boy Emile placed under a tutor who has complete charge over him. Traces of a concept of education dominated by the close relationship between teacher and student can even be found in the German “mass universities”, where the supervisor of a doctoral thesis is known as Doktorvater.

Theorists of education seem to have had less to say about the role of the community of students, perhaps because it “just happened” when several students studied with the same teacher, rather than being consciously introduced. In the ancient academies of Athens disputation between the students was part of the process of learning, and Plato’s academy is described as a kind of brotherhood where members felt deep friendship for each other. Competition between students appears to have played a significant role in Jesuit colleges. Community life and competition play an important part in boarding school education, although to what degree varies.

Finally, the importance of education in a wider sense than just filling young brains with knowledge was accepted or even taken for granted throughout the history of education in Europe before the emergence of the modern school in industrial society. An early example is Aristotle (384–322 BC), the last and possibly most influential of the great educators in ancient Greece; for him, education involved training the body, the character and the intellect. The purpose was to provide good citizens for the state and to prepare the individual for the right enjoyment of leisure and the development of the soul. Aristotle’s pursuit of disinterested knowledge in order to cultivate virtue and his contribution to the growth of the seven liberal arts influenced Western education for centuries. Only in recent times have
secularization, the industrial revolution and the rise of state education systems brought us to largely equate education with schooling and schooling with instruction.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{THE IDEA OF JUKU EDUCATION TODAY}

All this suggests that, apart from a particular combination of characteristics in a certain historical situation, very little about the \textit{juku} is unique. Moreover, even for the perpetrators of the \textit{“juku myth”} in the 1930s, the alleged Japaneseness of the \textit{juku} was of secondary importance. Some even attempted to show the universal appeal of the \textit{“juku spirit”} by referring to examples in other countries. In fact, they saw the \textit{juku} through the lenses of what they knew about European education. Names like Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart and others were well known to them, as were the famous English public schools, shaped by Thomas Arnold’s (1795–1842) insistence on moral and religious education, training in the classics and the importance of a healthy school community.\textsuperscript{13} Washizu Kōun, praising \textit{juku} education in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century, quoted Rousseau, not Japanese or Chinese authorities. Matsumae Shigeyoshi, the founder of Bōsei \textit{juku}, acknowledged the influence of Christian education and of the Danish folk high schools. Viewed from this perspective, it is only logical that the modern heirs of Senkō \textit{juku} and Bōsei \textit{juku}, and the universities they are part of, stress their institutions’ internationality on English language web pages and engage in activities involving international exchange.

The link between the \textit{juku} and continuing education is equally logical. At its best, the \textit{juku} was a place for independent, adult learners who pursued learning for its own sake. Since there were no strict criteria for entering or leaving, no tightly organized courses and no examinations, learning could be, and often was, flexible and free. These are features which are often associated with continuing education today, where it is not vocational.

Today many call for a change in our conception of learning; words like lifelong learning, independent learning and calls for more flexibility and freedom of choice are common. In \textit{The Age of Unreason}, Charles Handy introduces his concept of the \textit{“shamrock school”}, offering a core curriculum and devising and organizing an individual educational programme for each child.\textsuperscript{14} Subjects not in the core curriculum would be contracted out to independent suppliers and taught in \textit{“mini schools”}, which
would be monitored by the core school. Most funding would go to individuals rather than institutions, and students would have far more choice in putting together flexible programmes. In early Meiji there were elements reminiscent of such a pattern, but things were far less organized; there were the mainstream schools, which did not offer or did not offer enough of certain subjects or courses at secondary level, and there was a variety of juku and other small educational institutions filling the gap in provision. Students put together their own educational programme, attending different schools and juku as they (or their parents, if they were younger) saw fit. This “patchwork quilt” education reflected a transitional period marked by a lack of effective organization and discrepancies between policy and reality, supply and demand. Once the general situation changed, educational careers became more uniform.

In drawing attention to (superficial) similarities between Meiji Japan and present-day concepts of education, my intention is not to claim that the juku was “modern” (it was not), nor to call for a return to the juku. As this study has shown, the links made between the juku as it existed from the Edo into the Meiji period and the ideas formulated in response to the educational challenges of a later age are tenuous. Nevertheless, study of the juku in Meiji Japan reminds us that the public, state-controlled education system we take for granted, and the idea that we must progress steadily through a graded system of schools until we have graduated and “finished” our education, are as much a product of certain historical circumstances as was the juku. This system and the assumptions it reflects must therefore be open to challenge.

NOTES

1 See Christopher Stray, Classics Transformed: Schools, Universities and Society in England, 1830–1960 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998). In the context of education, “classicizing” seems to offer a better concept for comparison than “orientalizing” (Stefan Tanaka, Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993). The transformation of kōshōgaku was accelerated by the import of Western academic disciplines and their methods, but the widening of what was studied and the development of the kōshōgaku school of textual criticism in the late Tokugawa period suggest, that Western
influence was not the decisive reason. On this transformation see also Margaret Mehl, “Chinese Learning (kangaku) in Meiji Japan (1868–1912)”, History (85) 2000:48–66.

2 Thomas H.C. Lee, Education in Traditional China. A History (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 13. Incidentally, this monumental work does not include the word shū either in the index or the glossary. See also Linda Walton, Academies and Society in Southern Sung China (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1999); Walton points out that there exist parallels between the Song academies, medieval European universities and Islamic madrasa. On one of the most famous academies, the White Deer Grotto Academy of Zhu Zi, see also William Theodore the Bary, “Chu Hsi’s Aims as an Educator”, in Neo-confucian Education: the formative Stage, ed. William Theodore de Bary and John W. Chaffee (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1989), 186–218.

3 Lee, Education in Traditional China, 13.

4 Amano Ikuo, Education and Examination in Modern Japan, tr. William K. Cummings and Fumiko Cummings (University of Tokyo Press, 1999), 32.


7 Boyd, The History of Western Education, 297.

8 This of course raises interesting questions, when, as is sometimes the case today, the supervisor is in fact a woman; Doktormutter is sometimes used, but it hardly has the same ring.

9 Marrou, Geschichte der Erziehung, 139.

10 Amano, Education and Examination, 32–34.

11 Boyd, The History of Western Education, 42.

12 See Boyd, The History of Western Education, 469–470; 487–488.
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explained, 113 n.28
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commemorated, 98, 212, 215
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Shigeno Yasutsugu (Seisai; 1827–1910), 11, 25, 67, 111, 120–120, 121–122, 123, 155, 162, 208
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Shikyō (Shi jing; Book of Odes), 68, 78, 83, 94, 132, 133
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Shimane prefecture, 51, 118
Shimoda Utako (1854–1936), 82, 218
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Shinozaki Shōchiku (1781–1851), 61
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Shinsaku tsugi,132, 132
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Shōka sonjuku,12, 147, 222, 224, 225, 227
Shokyō (Shu jing; Book of Documents),78, 83, 94, 132
Shoshi (writings of the sages),100
Shōwa juku,217
ShōwaShōin juku,217
Shūbunkan,51, 118, 139–144
Shūeki (Zhou yi; Book of Changes). See Ekikyō
Shunju (Chunqiu, Spring and Autumn Annals),68, 83, 86, 95, 100, 132, 153
Shunju Sashiden (Chunqiu Zuo shi zhuan; commentary on the Spring and Autumn Annals),77, 83, 86, 94, 132, 133, 149
shushigaku,62, 70, 93
shuyuan. See shoin
Sōchōsha,51, 120
dodoku (simple reading). See juku, teaching methods
Sōma Kyūhō (1801–79),89, 90, 93
Sonshi (Sun zi),78, 153
Sōshi (Zhuang zi),78
specialist schools. See senmon gakkō
Spring and Autumn Annals. See Shunju
students. See juku, students
students’ careers187–198
Suematsu Kencho (1855–1920),47, 103, 109, 111, 187–188, 212
Sugiiura jūgō (1855–1924),224
Suiaisen,41, 103–111, 128, 193
commemorated,212
name,124
students,146, 149, 151, 157
Suishō gakusha,85–86.
See also Miwada Masako
Suiyūdō,121, 154–155, 188–189.
See also Oka Senjin
Suzuki Bundai (1796–1870),134,
136–137, 147, 160
Suzuki Gengaku (1868–1918),163
Suzuki Shien (1861–87),134
Suzuki Tekiken (1836–96),131, 134,
137–138
Suzuki Torao (1878–1963),218

Tachibana Hatarō (Shinbun gakusha),193
Taiwan kyōiku gakkō. See Takushoku University
Taka Otozō (student),155, 162
Takahashi Korekiyo (1854–1936), 155
Takebe Tongo (1871–1945),229
Takushoku University,217
Tanahashi Ayako (1839–1939),82, 218
Tani Kanjō (1837–1911),67, 148, 149
Tatemori Manpei (Kō, Chūkai, Hiroshi; 1863–1942),11, 155 teachers. See juku, teachers
Tekijuku,13, 127, 147, 155, 207, 214 tenarai juku,3.
See also terakoya
terakoya (private parish schools),3, 16, 38, 39, 41, 48, 84, 219, 237
Tetsugakukan,23–24 textbooks. See juku, curriculum
Tōkai University,221–222, 231
Tōkaku gakkō,179–180
Tokutomi Kenjirō (Roka; 1868–1927),xvi, 32, 147–148, 190
Tokutomi Sohō (1862–1957),xvi, 21, 128, 189
Tokyo,44–48, 146, 154, 160
Tōō gijuku,55
Tōshisen (Tang shi xuan; Selection of Poetry from the Tang Dynasty),77
Tōso hatsukabun (Tang-Song bā da jia wen, Eight Masters of Archaic Prose of the Tang and the Song Dynasties),95
Tōso hatsukabun. See Tōso hatsukabun
dokuhon,83, 86, 100, 132, 133
Tsubouchi Shōyō (1859–1935),156, 194
Tsuigan seidoku,132
Tsuishī,132
Tsunetō Seisai (1842–95),102–103
Tsunetō Seisō (1803–61),13, 60, 96, 98–103
Tsunetō Toshisuke (b.1944),160, 213, 227
tuition fees. See juku, fees
Uchimura Kanzō (1861–1930),221
Uchimura Rokō (1821–1901),120, 123, 208–211
Uemura Tamaki (1890–1982),157 universities,16, 229
imperial,17, 18, 50, 79, 158, 187, 196, 197, 198
private,22
Wakayama prefecture,6
Wang Yangming. See yōmeigaku
Waseda University (Tōkyō senmon gakkō),18
Washizu Kōun (1870–?),133, 186, 243
Western education, Western learning,16–17, 47, 48, 175, 189, 190
in education system,27, 29, 32, 192, 196, 199
juku for,20–21, 45
Nisho gakusha and,71–72, 73, 78
women,84–85, 123.
See also education, female; juku, females
commemorated,5, 120, 214
students of,70, 71, 151, 157
Yamada Jun (1867–1952),79, 127, 131, 135, 151
Yamamoto Shōheita (student),148–149
Yamashita Tomigorō. See Miwada Motomichi
Yamamura Benzai (1836–1907), 118, 123, 127, 136, 139–144, 157–158, 211
Yanagawa Kōran (1804–79),82
Yanagawa Seigan (1789–1858),82
Yasui Shōtarō (Bokudō),68–69, 127, 164, 200, 228
Yasui Sokken (1799–1876),60–68, 81, 120, 124, 127, 146, 160, 161, 162
yōgaku. See Western learning
yōmeigaku,70, 71, 93
Yōsei juku, 140, 145
Yoshida Shōin (1830–59), 12, 21, 70,
93, 183, 184, 217, 224, 225, 227
yūgaku (travelling for study), 14,
15, 16, 28–29, 45, 159
Yūrinsha, 52, 133

Zhu Xi. See shushigaku
Zōshun’en, 41, 98–103, 107, 111,
147, 151
commemorated, 212–213, 227
Zukan kōmoku, 100