

Studies of Western Rhetoric in Modern Japan: The Years between Shimamura Hōgetsu's *Shin bijigaku* (1902) and the End of the Taishō Era

Massimiliano TOMASI

Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA, U.S.A.

Western rhetoric was introduced to Japan as a coherent system a few years after the Meiji Restoration. First presented as the art of speech, rhetoric soon gained popularity as a field of study also concerned with composition and literary criticism. However, in the second half of the Meiji period, the rise of Realism and Naturalism and the persistent call for a plain and concise literary style began to seriously undermine the position of rhetoric, causing it to face a probable demise at the end of the 1890s. This study discusses the history of rhetoric in Japan between the beginning of the twentieth century and the end of the Taishō era. It clarifies the crucial role played by rhetoricians Shimamura Hōgetsu and Igarashi Chikara in conceiving a rhetorical theory capable of granting rhetoric a place of continued relevance in the literary debates of the time. Concurrently, the investigation demonstrates the existence of important links between Taishō rhetoric and studies of National Language and Literature, providing evidence that rhetoric continued to be a valid interlocutor for those concerned in the Taishō years with such issues as writing, literature and language policy.

Keywords: RHETORIC, ORATORY, REALISM, NATURALISM, GENBUN ITCHI, RHETORICAL FIGURES

With the Meiji Restoration (1868) and the opening to the West, the Japanese academic community became exposed to social, philosophical and literary theories and ideas that were either gaining ground in the West at that time, or that were considered to be at the foundation of Western thought. Rhetoric was among those sciences, or arts, that were viewed as intimately connected to Western cultural and philosophical heritage. As the art of speech and, by extension, of elegant composition, the discipline soon attracted the attention of many young scholars and intellectuals who saw in the mastering of this

art a shortcut to the understanding of the West.¹

One question often posed by scholars of rhetoric today is whether Japan had a native tradition of rhetorical inquiry prior to the Meiji era (1868-1912). The answer is apparent: evidence of interest in rhetorical communication can be found as early as the classical period. The poetics developed, for example, during the Heian 平安 (794-1185) and Kamakura 鎌倉 (1185-1333) years are already proof of a mature interest in the rhetorical use of language, an interest reflected in the achievement of an unrivaled poetic sensitivity now universally recognized as characteristic of that age.²

Pre-Meiji interest in rhetorical practices was not limited to written discourse but also extended to the domain of oral communication. The Buddhist homiletic tradition and its derived forms of itinerant preaching, storytelling and popular lecturing are clear evidence that the Japanese have also been exposed, at different stages in their cultural history, to the fascination exerted by the power of the spoken word.³ Meiji scholars, however, downplayed such history and considered the Meiji period the true beginning of rhetorical investigation in Japan.

Rhetoric made its first decisive impact as the art of speech. According to tradition, in 1873 scholar and educator Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉 received a Western book on oratory from his associate Koizumi Nobukichi 小泉信吉 (1849-1894), a book which he later translated under the title *Kaigiben* 会議弁 (A Handbook for Meetings).⁴ The appearance of *Kaigiben* spurred interest in the practice of speech-making, playing a significant role in the spread of public speaking in Japan. However, Fukuzawa's contribution to the cause of the art of speech was not limited to the publication of this pamphlet. Stressing the educational aspect of speech-making and debate, Fukuzawa encouraged his colleagues in the Meirokusha 明六社 (Meiji 6 Society) to hold regular oratory meetings and practice sessions, and financed the construction of the Mita Enzetsu Kaikan 三田演説会館, a hall built for the practice of speech, thus contributing in a most concrete fashion to the spread of public speaking among students and intellectuals.⁵ Furthermore, he advocated the importance of speech-making in his well-known *Gakumon no susume* 学問のすすめ (An Encouragement of Learning, 1872-76), in which he reiterated the importance of debate and reaffirmed the need to exchange views and information.⁶

The appearance of several treatises on the art of speech that followed thereafter piqued interest in the field which also began to receive considerable attention in political circles.⁷ In the early post-Restoration years, in fact, times were ripe in Japan for decisive changes that expanded oratory's area of suitability. Public speaking had been until then a prerogative of preachers and teachers, mainly a sort of one-way form of communication that often placed the speaker in a position of superiority in respect to his audience. However, the arrival of oratory from the West changed the dynamics of this relationship. The orator was now required to carefully consider a variety of factors if he was to be successful: the psychology of the audience, the verisimilitude of his arguments, the effectiveness of his language, the dignity of his demeanor, and, of course, the social and political circumstances of the time. Not that these elements had never been given consideration

prior to the modern age; as already mentioned, classical Japanese literature on the one hand and the Buddhist homiletic tradition on the other already constitute evidence of an established native rhetorical tradition. However, this time the premise was different. The concept of persuasion, an essential feature of the rhetorical message, revolutionized the hierarchical configuration that had characterized most of public address in Japan until then. The authority of the speaker was now no longer taken for granted; the orator had to win the confidence of his audience and persuade them of the veracity of his arguments.

In an age that saw the fierce governmental censorship of other forms of discourse such as the press, rhetoric offered a practical and revolutionary model of communication. It provided a framework through which ideas and information could be exchanged. Several members of the Freedom and Popular Rights Movement (*jiyū minken undō* 自由民權運動) distinguished themselves for their oratory skills. Leading figures such as Baba Tatsui 馬場辰猪 (1850-1888) and Ueki Emori 植木枝盛 (1857-1892) criticized governmental censorship and called for social reforms along the models of Western civilization.⁸ Their demand for freedom of expression bestowed a special character on the activity of speech-making, creating political and social expectations that went beyond the original enlightenment goal of pure exchange of knowledge.

Rhetoric left an indelible mark also in the realm of written discourse. As it came to be understood as a discipline concerned with composition, rhetoric was instrumental in compensating for the lack of a consistent native tradition in this area.⁹ The publication of Takada Sanae's 高田早苗 *Bijigaku* 美辞学 (Rhetoric) in 1889 constituted a watershed between the early Meiji popularity of speech-making and the increased concern for written communication that characterized the beginning of the second half of the Meiji era. The scholarship of the 1890s was the response to this increased interest both in writing and in literary criticism. Scholars denounced the lack of manuals of composition and strove to put order to the chaotic state of written communication now increasingly affected by the growing conflict between classical and vernacular styles.¹⁰

The debate over the feasibility of *genbun itchi* 言文一致 (unification of the spoken with the written language) intensified over these very years. The literary world became essentially split into two factions, one supporting the vernacularization of the written style, and the other insisting on the superiority of classically-based modes of expression. Because much of the *genbun itchi* discourse centered on the elimination of superfluous rhetorical elements from the sentence, and because classical language was considered to be synonymous with elegance and refinement, rhetoric soon came to be associated with the traditionalist forces that opposed the excessive vernacularization of literary language. The conservative traits displayed in the scholarship on rhetoric of the 1890s, exemplified by its rejection of colloquial modes of expression in favor of established literary conventions, added to this characterization. Rhetoric was quickly labeled as being antithetical to the more progressive trends of the *bundan* 文壇 such as Realism (*shajitsu shugi* 實寫主義) and Naturalism (*shizen shugi* 自然主義), which had elected the vernacular as their medi-

um of preference.

The somewhat negative characterization that accompanied rhetoric in these years began to take its toll. The call for a literary style devoid of rhetorical elements that was gaining momentum at the turn of the century exemplified this rejection of rhetoric and its precepts. The discipline, now severely removed from the ongoing debate regarding the creation of a modern written language, faced collapse.

This study discusses the developments that took place in the following years. It clarifies how rhetoric survived the theoretical stalemate of the late 1890s and continued to play a relevant role in the academic and literary debates of the time. Focusing on the works of rhetoricians Shimamura Hōgetsu 島村抱月 and Igarashi Chikara 五十嵐力—works still largely unknown to many scholars in the West—this investigation outlines a much needed historical profile of the discipline during the first decade of the twentieth century. It addresses, additionally, the scholarly production of the Taishō era (1912–1926), shedding light on a period in the history of modern Japanese rhetoric that has been hitherto disregarded by most scholars of Japanese language and literature.

SHIMAMURA HŌGETSU'S *SHIN BIJIGAKU*: RHETORIC AS PART OF A GENERAL THEORY OF AESTHETICS

The conservative character of scholarship in the field of rhetoric at the turn of the century caused the discipline to be perceived by many intellectuals and authors as anachronistic and incapable of reconciling its taxonomic nature with the notion of artistic freedom in writing. Rhetoric became subject to strong criticism from the literary coterie that supported the idea of an independent and self-serving literature and of a plain and concise mode of literary expression, based on the vernacular and therefore free from archaic literary constrictions. This dissent towards the rules and precepts of the traditional literary canon had begun to take concrete form in the mid-1880s. In his *Shōsetsu shinzui* 小説神髓 (The Essence of the Novel, 1886-87), Tsubouchi Shōyō 坪内逍遙 (1859-1935) had called for a realistic approach to literature, spurring experimentation towards a new literary language that could describe the subtleties of human life without exaggeration or ornamentation. Experimentation further intensified at the beginning of the twentieth century. Poet and critic Masaoka Shiki 正岡子規 (1867-1902), for example, strove to create a more objective and descriptive mode of expression in his *shaseibun* 写生文 (literary sketches from life or nature). His essay “*Jojibun*” 叙事文 (Descriptive Writing) of 1900 was particularly important for its argument against any form of elaborate expression that might compromise the truthfulness of facts and events. In Shiki's own words, *jojibun* meant to depict facts and things the way they had been heard or seen, without exaggeration or embellishment.¹¹ A few months after the publication of “*Jojibun*,” poet and novelist Takahama Kyoshi 高浜虚子 (1874-1959) postulated that the *genbun itchi*

style was the most appropriate for writing in a realistic manner. He thereby contributed to a firm alliance between two originally separate notions. It came to be taken for granted that a faithful approach to reality in literature could be guaranteed only by the employment of a plain form of expression. Others reiterated this position in the following years.¹² Reflecting this assumption, *genbun itchi* became the dominant style for literary works published after the turn of the century, dealing a major blow to the popularity of studies of rhetoric, which, at least on the surface, represented the antithesis to this call for a plain and concise literary writing.

The gradual shift from Realism to Naturalism that took place in the first decade of the twentieth century further strengthened this alliance. Writers of these schools repeatedly called for the abolishment of affectation in writing and the necessity of depicting things and people in a faithful and concise manner. For example, in the preface to his novel *Hatsusugata* 初姿 (New Year's Finery, 1900), Kosugi Tengai 小杉天外 (1865-1952) strongly rejected the aesthetic values of traditional literature, advocating a type of objective realism that did not seek to please the reader but that was self-serving. This same stance appeared even more forcefully in the preface to his following work *Hayari uta* はやり唄 (Popular Song, 1902), where Tengai argued that the writer "should describe exactly what he observed, and not attempt to please his readers by beautifying his materials."¹³

Despite the widespread anti-rhetorical feeling that characterized the *bundan* of these years, it is essential to note here that rhetoric was by no means exclusively associated with archaic precepts and literary dogma. In fact, at the time of its introduction as the art of speech, rhetoric was hailed as a champion of progress and democracy and was often identified with liberty and freedom of speech. Even later, as a field of study with close ties to literature, rhetoric continued to appeal to a large number of young scholars and intellectuals who were able to discern its importance not only as a means of communication but also as the repository of centuries of Western knowledge. Thus, rhetoric contained the seeds of a latent ambivalence, epitomizing the conflict between old and new that strongly characterized the Meiji years. Shimamura Högetsu's *Shin bijigaku* 新美辞学 (New Rhetoric, 1902) was published at the peak of this ideological conflict and as such constituted an important landmark in the evolution of rhetorical theory in Japan.

Högetsu (1871-1918), a graduate of Waseda University, is widely known for his writings on aesthetics, his activity as literary critic of Naturalism and his contribution to the modernization of Japanese theater. However, he is almost never remembered for his *Shin bijigaku*, a treatise of rhetoric that ironically became the only work he ever completed.¹⁴ His scholarly activity is generally divided into three phases: the first extends from the early part of his career through his trip to Europe, which took place between 1902 and 1905; the second spans the years when Högetsu, now back in Japan, distinguished himself for his writings on Naturalism; the third saw his withdrawal from the forefront of literary debate and his progressive engagement in theater, which lasted until his death in 1918. Written immediately before his departure for Europe, *Shin bijigaku* is thus impor-

tant for at least two reasons: first, because it represented the final product of Hōgetsu's early work in the field of aesthetics and rhetoric under the influence of such scholars as Tsubouchi Shōyō and Ōnishi Hajime 大西祝 (1864-1900); and secondly, because in terminating the tradition of *bijigaku* 美辞学 studies at Waseda University, this treatise also created the premise for the initiation of a new course for the study of rhetoric in Japan.¹⁵

Shin bijigaku was divided into three sections, namely “General Theory,” “Theory of Figures,” and “Aesthetics.” The introduction was comprised of three chapters, in which Hōgetsu defined rhetoric and set the stage for the following discussion of his rhetorical theory. Before defining rhetoric, however, Hōgetsu commented on his choice of the term *bijigaku*. This term had already been employed by Takada Sanae and Tsubouchi Shōyō, who had preferred it to the term *shūjigaku* 修辞学, more widely used outside the Waseda circle. Hōgetsu pointed out that the two terms *bijigaku* and *shūjigaku* were essentially synonyms, but opted for the former on the grounds that it better exemplified rhetoric's close ties to aesthetics. In fact, according to him, rhetoric was “the science of writing that explained the principles through which the (modifying of) words generated beauty.”¹⁶ Writing was a form of art, and rhetoric, as a discipline that explained its principles, was part of a theory of art. The purpose of his treatise was then “to study the beauty in writing through rhetoric, within an aesthetic framework.”¹⁷ Having so postulated, Hōgetsu concluded the chapter by mentioning that rhetoric's scope had been originally limited to public speaking, but that its present major concern was now writing, thereby endorsing the shift of interest from oral to written discourse that had taken place in the second half of the Meiji period. Hōgetsu clarified the object of his study: it was beauty that most concerned him, and, particularly, the aesthetic experience generated by a rhetorical use of language.

The question of beauty had been a central theme in Hōgetsu's early scholarly endeavors. In 1894 he had published a revised edition of his graduation thesis in the journal *Waseda bungaku* 早稻田文学 (Waseda Literature) and had already expressed his strong determination to work as a scholar in the field of aesthetics.¹⁸ Later in life, he often recalled his desire to “stand at the crossroads between philosophy and literature,” reiterating the centrality of beauty in his thought.¹⁹ This search for beauty is, then, at the core of Hōgetsu's entire scholarly production and constitutes an essential premise for the content and understanding of his rhetorical theory. It also defines his *Shin bijigaku*, distinguishing it from preceding scholarship which, with the partial exception of Takada and Shōyō, addressed rhetoric without giving as much consideration to the aesthetics of literary production.²⁰

Having thus elected beauty as the main focus of his rhetorical investigation, in the second chapter of the introduction Hōgetsu defined rhetoric. For him, rhetoric was “the science that studied the source of beauty in words.” The object of rhetoric was the study of rhetorical phenomena, i.e., the phenomena that occurred through the process of “extension of thoughts and emotions.” In his view, rhetorical phenomena were outside the realm of ordinary language, which only aimed at plain communication and was not

concerned with persuasion and the stimulation of emotion. The stimulation of emotion was, however, a crucial step and condition for the production of these phenomena, whose ultimate objective remained the creation of beauty and the realization of an aesthetic experience.²¹ Ultimately, this opening section of the work served the purpose of clarifying the scope of Högetsu's investigation, which clearly lay within the framework of an aesthetic approach to language and literature.²²

The second section of the treatise was divided into three chapters: "Structure of a Theory of Rhetoric," "Figures," and "Style." Högetsu began by describing rhetorical phenomena as being composed of two planes, one of content and one of form, the former being "an extension of thought" and the latter "an extension of linguistic use." He compared the expressions "the face is beautiful" (*kao ga kirei da* 顔が綺麗だ) and "a face like a flower" (*kanbase hana no gotoshi* 顔ばせ花の如し). The former example represented, in his view, a zero degree of the linguistic expression, an expression that did not contain any rhetorical device per se, but that at the same time constituted a necessary condition for further linguistic manipulation. He called this type of expression "plain" and the rhetorical attributes that governed it "passive." On the other hand, the latter expression represented an extension of thought and was, strictly speaking, a type of rhetorical phenomenon. He called this type of sentence "rhetorical" and the rhetorical attributes that governed it "active."²³

Thus, rhetorical phenomena were divided, according to Högetsu, into "passive" and "active." Plain sentences were the realm of passive rhetorical attributes, namely, those attributes traditionally described by syntax and stylistics, like the logical order and the balance of propositions, and the purity and accuracy of words. Rhetorical sentences were those sentences containing devices that added beauty to the sentence, that is, the realm of rhetorical figures. The passive plane was the domain of clarity of thought and appropriateness of language and constituted the minimum prerequisite for the development of the active plane, which was in turn concerned with connotative meanings, i.e., "the extension of thought and the expressiveness of language."

It is along this line of thought that, in the following section, Högetsu developed his theory of figures. The term "figure" refers here to any linguistic device in which meaning is enhanced or changed in order to produce some type of artistic effect or generate unexpected semiotic connotations that can render the linguistic message more forceful or appealing to the reader. At the time of Högetsu's treatise, the literary world still shared mixed views on the meaning of figures and their role in writing. Many among the younger generation of writers did not exactly see them as a means of creating artistic effects, but rather as a synonym for archaic linguistic embellishment that, as such, ought to be eliminated from the sentence. This misguided notion of the nature of the rhetorical process, exemplified in the criticism of figures and rhetorical language, caused rhetoric to be perceived, as already mentioned earlier in this study, as inadequate and anachronistic. Nevertheless, Högetsu's analysis of rhetorical figures remains of historical significance in that it represents a crucial stage in the evolution of rhetorical theory in Japan.

Hōgetsu distinguished two groups of rhetorical devices. The first group, called *sōsai* 想彩, addressed the description of most types of figures, while, the second group, called *gosai* 語彩, addressed the concepts of purity and accuracy. The domain of *sōsai* was the place of traditional rhetorical figures. Hōgetsu partially disregarded earlier classification by Western rhetoricians, dismissing, for example, the differentiation between tropes and figures that had also been accepted by Takeshima Hagoromo 武島羽衣 (1872-1967). He divided figures into four groups, according to the mental processes of comparison (*hiyuhō* 譬喻法), transformation (*kaseihō* 化成法), arrangement (*fuchihō* 布置法) and exposition (*hyōshutsuhō* 表出法). The first of these groups was comprised, for example, of such figures as simile (*chokuyu* 直喻), metaphor (*hiyu* 比喻), synecdoche (*teiyu* 提喻) and so forth. Hōgetsu defined simile as a device used to compare two things bearing some type of resemblance; in Japanese the use of this figure, he noted, was accompanied in most cases by such adverbs as *gotoku* as in the expression “as fast as the wind” (*sono hayaki koto kaze no gotoku* 其の疾きこと風の如く). Metaphors, on the other hand, omitted the use of these adverbs as in the expression “a woman with a sword in her heart” (*kokoro ni tsurugi o fukundaru onna* 心に剣を含んだる女). Examples of synecdoche included such phrases as “it is the will of the Japanese people” (*Nihon teikoku no ishi nari* 日本帝国の意志なり) where the term “empire” (*teikoku* 帝国) represents the whole standing for the part “Japanese people” (*kokumin* 国民).

As for the remaining groups, Hōgetsu identified, for instance, hyperbole (*kōchōhō* 誇張法) under the category of transformation, climax (*zensōhō* 漸層法) under that of arrangement, and litotes (*kyokugenhō* 曲言法) under that of exposition. He provided a significant number of examples from literary works which were however drawn exclusively from the pre-modern period, discussing, overall, a total of twenty-nine figures, the most in any treatise written in modern Japan until then. In fact, Takada Sanae had stopped at twenty, Ōwada Takeki 大和田建樹 (1857-1910) at thirteen, and Takeshima Hagoromo at twenty-three, while Shōyō had not discussed them at all. The number of pages required by this section totaled more than forty per cent of the whole treatise, which illustrates the high priority given by Hōgetsu to the discussion of these devices.

In the following chapter, Hōgetsu discussed the types and properties of style. While the treatment of style could be found in earlier works of rhetoric such as Takada Sanae's *Bijigaku* or Takeshima Hagoromo's *Shūjigaku* 修辞学, Hōgetsu's discussion of the relationship between elegant and vulgar language was new and particularly poignant, since this conflicting relationship had been one of the causes of the multiplicity of written styles still extant during the Meiji period. In an earlier section of *Shin bijigaku*, and precisely in the second chapter of the introduction, Hōgetsu had touched on the *genbun itchi* issue, the first to do so in almost a decade.²⁴ There, he had advocated the importance of rhetorical devices in the sentence, thus reasserting the basic view held by rhetoricians on the centrality of rhetoric in a theory of composition. However, at the same time, he had endorsed the possibility of creating a style based entirely on the vernacular. That position was, in a way, contradictory and new, if one considers that the dichotomy

“rhetorical devices versus vernacular” had been one of the main arguments in the theoretical conflict between classical and contemporary vernacular styles. However, according to Hōgetsu, the acceptance of a literary style entirely based on the vernacular implied the commitment to “the creation of rhetorical devices particular only to the spoken language.”²⁵ Now, at the end of the second section, Hōgetsu once again discussed the relationship between vulgar and elegant styles, reiterating that the difference between the two was not one of “quality” or “prestige,” but rather one between spoken and written language. He acknowledged the vernacular as an independent language system that had its own mechanisms and rules and that, as such, was neither superior nor inferior to classical language. It was simply necessary, in his view, to refine it and turn it into an appropriate tool for literary production.

The section on aesthetics completed the treatise. This third part is said to have been hastily written because of Hōgetsu’s upcoming departure to Europe.²⁶ In this last segment, Hōgetsu once again dismissed the notion of rhetoric as being part of logic or ethics and reiterated its place within a general theory of aesthetics.

The significance of this point has not been addressed and deserves special attention. The 1890s had been a period of remarkable achievements in the field of rhetorical investigation, but those same years had ironically contributed to the characterization of the discipline as an obsolete system of rules. To those who at the time strongly emphasized the independence of literature as a form of artistic achievement, a discipline such as rhetoric, so inevitably confined within the boundaries of its pragmatic goal of persuading the audience or appealing to the reader’s emotions, seemed to have no intrinsic value. Its own heteronomous nature prevented rhetoric from coexisting with the common idealistic and romantic sentiment that saw literature as an absolute artistic expression beyond time and social conventions.²⁷ Hōgetsu’s inclusion of rhetoric within a theory of aesthetics was his effort to reclaim its autonomy and sanction its pertinence to the major literary debates of the period. This convergence within a theory of art assured rhetoric of an artistic dimension that justified its reason for being and proposed it as a partner for a dialectical exchange with other disciplines on a variety of linguistic and literary issues.

In short, Hōgetsu developed a rhetorical theory capable of reconciling the extremes of the debate over the creation of a new literary language, while bringing forth an acceptable compromise between the notions of elegance and truth in writing. He viewed rhetoric as related to aesthetics and defined the domain of the rhetorical experience around the concept of beauty, bringing rhetoric within the boundaries of a theory of art. His theory of figures revealed itself to be quite original when compared to those of his predecessors. Unfortunately, his extensive treatment of these contributed to making the discipline intimidating to the non-scholar, turning it into a corpus of notions difficult to apply to problems of ordinary writing. His rhetoric was, in a few words, scholarly coherent but still removed from the needs of the popular literary and pedagogical worlds. Yet, it contained the seeds for a future theoretical compromise, a compromise that was reached just a few years later.

IGARASHI CHIKARA'S *SHIN BUNSHŌ KŌWA*: FROM BEAUTIFUL TO ACCOMPLISHED WRITING

The years following Hōgetsu's *Shin bijigaku* were crucial for modern Japanese literature. Despite a period of decline in the 1890s, the *genbun itchi* movement made a successful and decisive comeback in the first decade of the twentieth century. Several leading literary figures reiterated the need for a plain and direct language in literature, thus postulating the existence of a crucial theoretical link between a realistic style and the use of the vernacular. Tayama Katai 田山花袋 (1871-1930) was among those in the *bundan* who contributed most to the shift toward a more objective interpretation of literature. Katai strongly criticized any writing that sought to compensate for the lack of content with stylistic embellishment, urging writers to describe things the way they are seen and heard, in an unadorned and unaffected manner.²⁸ Others such as critic Hasegawa Tenkei 長谷川天溪 (1876-1940) called for an unembellished art that was capable of depicting truth in life. Tenkei denounced traditional art as unable to capture reality and concurrently called for an art without ornaments and embellishments.²⁹ Several articles that appeared in the journal *Bunshō sekai* 文章世界 (The World of Writing) likewise supported this call for a language devoid of unnecessary ornament. For example, critic and historian Miyake Setsurei 三宅雪嶺 (1860-1945) observed that the literary world was now prioritizing content over form and affirmed that "writing is not artistry but rather the faithful presentation of thought."³⁰ Critic Katagami Tengen 片上天弦 (1884-1928) wrote that the age when one wrote just for the sake of writing and when form was just for the sake of form was over; writing now aimed at the free and bold expression of the self through the use of a free language.³¹ The demand for truth in content was thus presented as a demand for a truthful form, in other words, one from which all artificial elements of embellishment had been eliminated.

At Waseda University, scholars such as Igarashi Chikara continued to be engaged in studies of rhetoric. Igarashi had entered Waseda (at the time still known as Tōkyō senmon gakkō 東京専門学校) in 1892 and studied mostly under Shōyō and Ōnishi, just as had Hōgetsu, who was his senior by one year. He graduated in 1895, and after working among the staff of the journal *Waseda bungaku*, he was appointed lecturer at his alma mater in 1901. Igarashi was in close contact with Hōgetsu, having shared the same teachers, friends, and club activities; their close relationship is evidenced not only by the epigraph he wrote on Hōgetsu's tombstone at the time of his death, but also by many other instances in which he played a key role in matters important to Hōgetsu's private life.³²

Interestingly, despite their close interaction and exposure to the same teachers and ideas, Igarashi eventually developed a rhetorical theory quite different from that of Hōgetsu, one that changed the course of rhetorical investigation in Japan for years to come. As will be discussed later, Igarashi refuted the aesthetic aspect of Hōgetsu's theory and brought forward a "simplified" rhetorical theory that addressed the crucial issue of

how to write at a time when stylistic chaos ruled the *bundan*.

While Igarashi wrote extensively on rhetoric, he is certainly best remembered for his *Shin bunshō kōwa* 新文章講話 (New Lectures on Writing), a study published in 1909 and regarded by many scholars as one of the greatest achievements of Japanese scholarship on rhetoric in modern times.³³ *Shin bunshō kōwa* was the revised version of an earlier work, *Bunshō kōwa* 文章講話 (Lectures on Composition), a book that had been published in 1905, only three years after the publication of Hōgetsu's *Shin bijigaku*. *Shin bunshō kōwa* could be partially considered an outgrowth of that work with which it certainly shares important methodological premises and objects, such as a distinctively psychological approach to rhetoric, inherited from the British tradition, or the attempt to establish rhetoric within the framework of studies of National Literature. However, it also boasts significant differences from his earlier work, making it the most important study among Igarashi's overall scholarly production on the subject.

In the opening pages of his treatise, Igarashi observed that “our written language and more generally all the fields of art and literature have been experiencing a great revolution.”³⁴ This observation was followed by a discussion of some of the major disputes of the Meiji period, such as the relationship between art and truth, form and content, and expression and thought. It was the first true acknowledgement in a rhetorical treatise of the profound changes the literary world was facing in those years. A “rhetoric of silence” had in fact been the common trait of earlier scholarship in the field, which hardly ever discussed the significance of the new current of thought among younger writers and scholars who called for a radical simplification of literary style. Breaking with this tradition of reticence, Igarashi finally addressed the issue. He began his discussion by noting a new trend in writing that shunned embellishment and favored a plain and direct style, without ornamentation or exaggeration. In his view, this new style was realistic in nature and, as such, refused the authority and prestige of old classical conventions in favor of a colloquial usage of language that best conveyed the subtleties of modern life. Examples from leading contemporary authors such as Tayama Katai, Futabatei Shimei 二葉亭四迷 and Natsume Sōseki 夏目漱石 illustrated the potential of this new style and with it the new status of the vernacular, which had now gained ground not only in the dialogical but also in the discursive portions of the literary text. In Igarashi's view, the following passage from Tayama Katai's *Ippeisotsu* 一兵卒 (One Soldier, 1908) was representative of a new style that was simple, direct and did away with embellishment and rhetorical flourishes.

頭脳がぐらぐらして天地が回転するようだ。胸が苦しい。頭が痛い。脚の腓の所が押し付けられるようで、不愉快で不愉快で仕方がない。ややともすると胸がむかつきそうになる。不安の念が凄じい力で全身を襲った。と同時に、恐ろしい動搖がまた始まって、耳からも頭からも、種々の声が囁いて来る。この前にもこうした不安はあったが、これほどではなかった。天にも地にも身の置き所が無いような気がする。

His head reeled, and heaven and earth seemed to spin around him. His chest hurt. His head hurt. His calves felt as if they were being squeezed, and it was horrible, really horrible. He felt he was going to be sick at any moment. Feelings of anxiety invaded his whole body with a terrible force. At the same time, the dreadful lurching started again, and all kinds of voices came whispering into his ears, into his head. He had experienced this sort of anxiety before, but nothing as bad as this. He felt as if there was no refuge for him anywhere.³⁵

Igarashi openly supported the establishment of this new form of expression but also sought to correct the crucial misunderstanding that had characterized the debate on the creation of a modern literary style:

[b]ecause writing without affectation has become the password of the new written style, having misunderstood its meaning, many are now advocating that rhetorical devices are unnecessary, but this is a groundless theory. Writing without affectation means abolition of unnatural ornaments and classical conventions, it does not mean that all elaborate devices should be considered as unnecessary in writing.³⁶

According to Igarashi, the difference between the old and new styles did not lie in the presence or absence of rhetorical devices, but in the very nature of those devices.³⁷ After all, Igarashi pointed out, writing without rhetorical devices was itself an extreme rhetorical artifice.³⁸

Thus, in the opening statement of his book, Igarashi provided an essential description of the developments that had recently taken place in the literary arena, namely the shift towards a literary style that while still replete with rhetorical features shunned affectation for the sake of clarity and truth. He thereby created for the first time a link between rhetoric as a field of study and the world of Japanese literature. In fact, except for Högetsu's *Shin bijigaku*, none of the treatises published previously had been able to create this link, and they thus contributed to the depiction of rhetoric as "foreign" and not applicable to issues of native language and literature.

After this first chapter, which served to lay the groundwork for a dialogue between rhetoricians and writers, Igarashi went on to define writing. The purpose of writing was, first, to communicate, and, second, to appeal to the reader's emotions. This definition was simple and unpretentious; more importantly, it deemphasized the notion of "beautiful writing," adamantly brought forward by Högetsu, in favor of a more general concept of "accomplished writing."³⁹ Here lay the major difference between Igarashi's work and that of his predecessors at Waseda. The primary object of rhetoric was no longer the production of beauty in writing, but rather that of skillful composition. Rhetoric was no longer an abstract entity, having complicated links to aesthetics, logic and philosophy, but simply a corpus of practical rules that could lead to the achievement of effective writing. Igarashi's new vision limited the study of rhetoric to the understanding of basic stan-

dards and principles that could help improve one's writing skills.

To fully understand the magnitude of this statement it is necessary to consider not only the naturalistic trend sweeping the *bundan* in those years, but also the relationship which bound this work to the earlier *Bunshō kōwa*. There, Igarashi had maintained that "the ideal writing [was] beautiful writing."⁴⁰ That is to say, beauty appeared in Igarashi's definition of writing as if to indicate the continuity between his approach and that offered by Takada, Shōyō, and Hōgetsu before him. *Bunshō kōwa* was evidently still conceived within that framework, insofar as the examples given were from pre-modern literature and inevitably written in a classically-based literary style, this being a feature common to all the works of rhetoric published to this point. By contrast, *Shin bunshō kōwa* included a large number of works written in *genbun itchi*, including authors such as Futabatei Shimei and Kunikida Doppo 国木田独歩.

This transition was also reflected in the fact that *Shin bunshō kōwa* did not contain a complex definition of rhetoric as had been the case in some of the preceding works. Instead, the only definition provided related to "writing," and thus the work's main concern seemed to lie more in the explanation and assimilation of useful rules for composition. Given the chaotic status of the Japanese written language at the time, such a change of direction was likely most appealing to reformers, teachers, and experts on language policy. In fact, as discussed earlier, Hōgetsu had succeeded in creating the premise for a compromise, opening new possibilities for a solution to the conflict between new and classical modes of literary expression. However, the complexity of his rhetorical theory had at the same time deepened the gap between the discipline and the fast-changing needs of the Japanese literary world. Igarashi now faced the hard task of proposing a new rhetoric, a rhetoric not confined to or dominated by the ideals of beauty, prestige, and authority, but with the clear goal of achieving proficiency in written communication.

As a rhetorician, Igarashi understood that the partial criticism of "rules" and "precepts" was a next necessary step in promoting a climate of acceptance for rhetoric. Rules had been the cause of the conflict between rhetoric as a pre-ordered system of values and the rise of new ideas modeled after the concept of free artistic expression. Now more than ever, rules represented a direct attack on the freedom of the writer who strove to go beyond the boundaries of the linguistic form, to achieve what centuries of Japanese literary tradition had not allegedly been able to achieve: the expression of the inner self. Thus, Igarashi openly refuted the notion that rules could transform anyone into a gifted writer. This very argument revealed itself to be a successful strategic move in that it struck at the very heart of the criticism of the discipline that had been coming from the younger generation of writers. Once rhetoricians became willing to acknowledge writing as an art independent from any form of categorization or classification, the ideological conflict came to assume completely different characteristics.

Having thus concluded his "Introduction," in the following section of the book, Igarashi addressed the clarity and accuracy of meaning and the purity of writing, including a treatment of dialects, foreign words and special terms. Here, he also cautioned

against the indiscriminate mixing of *gabun* 雅文 (high style) and *zokubun* 俗文 (low style).⁴¹ In the second section, he discussed rhetorical figures. According to Igarashi, figures were “the embellishment of words, a change in the way things are expressed, that is to say, a form of expressing one’s thoughts in a way different from the ordinary, in order to appeal to people’s emotions.”⁴² This definition was not very different from that of earlier works, which mostly emphasized the notion of a creative “deviation” from a certain norm. Igarashi went on to divide rhetorical figures according to eight different principles that, in his view, reflected the mental process of interpreting reality. He provided a significant number of examples from contemporary literary works such as the following two passages, both of which are instances of metaphor.

我が心は合勸という木の葉に似て、物触るれば縮みて避けむとす。我が心は処女に似たり。

I felt like the leaves of the silk-tree which shrink and shy away when they are touched. I felt as unsure of my self as a young girl.⁴³

二人は忽ち愛の奴隸になって了ったのです。僕はその時初めて愛の楽しさと悲しさとを知りました。

Before we knew it, we had become slaves of love and it was then for the first time that I knew the joy and misery of love.⁴⁴

Igarashi discussed a total of fifty-three figures, providing the most detailed treatment of figures in the history of modern Japanese rhetoric. Paradoxically, however, his elaborate treatment seemed to contradict the ideas set forth in the opening pages of the book. In fact, the initial chapters comprising the introduction of *Shin bunshō kōwa* had represented and supported a major change in the perception of rhetoric, promoting its acceptance as a simple and straightforward assemblage of rules for composition. The elaborate discussion of rhetorical figures which followed seemed to be in disagreement with this original purpose, especially given the high technicality of its content. But, perhaps, it was precisely because of the new framework in which rhetoric was being discussed that a relatively detailed and taxonomic approach to rhetoric continued to be accepted. While *Shin bunshō kōwa* remains unsurpassed in its detailed explanation of figures, several works that followed similarly gave considerable space to the treatment of these devices.⁴⁵

Among the remaining sections of the book, the third and fourth dealt with the organization and the psychological and emotional elements of writing, while the fifth with the various types of style. Of particular interest was section seven, where Igarashi discussed the history of writing in Japan, providing an informative survey of the styles in use since the early developments of a writing system. Such a treatment was an important and welcome new addition to the treatises of rhetoric in Japan, which now began to be

an integral part of the studies of National Language and Literature.

In conclusion, after Igarashi Chikara's *Shin bunshō kōwa*, rhetoric was no longer the antiquated and rigid discipline that had bloomed in the first half of the Meiji era, but rather a changing field of study which lent itself to assimilation and compromise. As Italian scholar Luciano Anceschi once put it, rhetoric once again proved to be a variable historical disposition that now and then seeks to codify, through norms and principles, the causes and reasons of the literary and artistic movements arising at different ages and times. Thus, there is a rhetoric of Romanticism, a rhetoric of Realism, and so forth.⁴⁶

Hōgetsu and Igarashi were instrumental in changing the course of rhetoric at the beginning of the twentieth century. Both scholars were aware that the new developments in the literary world would inevitably sanction the end of the discipline as it had been perceived in the 1890s. Both sought, therefore, to provide the necessary theoretical latitude to guarantee its survival among the next generation of writers. Hōgetsu characterized rhetoric as a discipline concerned with the aesthetics of literary production, thus reasserting its utility as a tool of literary investigation. He did so by reclaiming its place within a general theory of aesthetics. But his contribution did not end there: he conceived a new relationship between rhetoric and modern literary language, opening a new range of possibilities for the employment of the vernacular in literature.

Igarashi, on the other hand, remained faithful to his training as a rhetorician, refining, in his work, what had now become a twenty-year-old tradition of scholarly achievements in the field of rhetoric at his home institution. His most representative treatise, *Shin bunshō kōwa*, contained the fruits of those achievements and further consolidated Waseda University's leadership in the field. However, it also broke from tradition, reconciling the taxonomic nature of the discipline with the anti-rhetorical sentiment that pervaded much of the *bundan*. Rhetoric, now devoid of the archaic character that had characterized it at the time of its introduction, slowly began to forge a new course within the Japanese academic world.

THE LATE MEIJI PERIOD AND THE TAISHŌ YEARS

After the publication of Igarashi Chikara's *Shin bunshō kōwa*, rhetoric entered the final phase of the fifty-year progression that characterized its history as a field of study in Japan since its introduction in the early 1870s. This last phase, which spanned throughout the Taishō years, has been largely dismissed in the past as merely one of decline for the discipline. Nishio Mitsuo 西尾光夫 was among the first to observe the existence of a crucial gap between rhetoric's formalized approach to writing and the call for a literary style free from archaic constrictions that by the end of the Meiji era had taken root among writers. These writers rejected the notion of writing as something that could be described or taught through a preordered system of rules. As Akutagawa Ryūnosuke 芥川龍之介 once put it, Japanese authors were so pressed by the challenging task of creating a

viable tool for literary expression that they hardly had room for digressions on the nature of rhetorical language.⁴⁷ This decline of interest in rhetorical studies was furthermore reflected, Nishio noted, in the modest number of works published in the field; the scholarly production of the period was essentially limited to Sassa Seiichi's 佐々政一 *Shūjihō kōwa* 修辭法講話 (Lectures on Rhetoric) and Watanabe Kichiharu's 渡邊吉治 *Gendai shūjihōyō* 現代修辭法要 (Essentials of Modern Rhetoric), while only a handful of writers authored works that dealt with writing or composition.⁴⁸

While it is a fact that publications including the term "rhetoric" in their title decreased considerably following the end of the Meiji era, the Taishō years witnessed the appearance of a large number of works that drew from the Western rhetorical tradition. The importance of rhetorical inquiry during these later years should not therefore be minimized. In terms of popularity, the mid-Meiji years certainly represented the apex of rhetoric's popularity in Japan: from the publication of Takada Sanae's *Bijigaku* to that of Igarashi Chikara's *Shin bunshō kōwa*, Meiji rhetoricians rode the wave of an increased interest in issues of native prose style and literary criticism, which contributed to the remarkable growth of interest in the field. By contrast, the Taishō years were characterized by a decline in the number of rhetorical treatises, which inevitably set this era apart from the splendors of the preceding age. Such a decline was actually a reflection of a process of adaptation to the changes that had been taking place both in the literary world and the social life of the nation. Taishō scholarship mirrored these changes.

Among the developments that were most significant for Taishō rhetoric was the definitive establishment of a modern form of written language. By the end of Meiji, the *genbun itchi* style had become the predominant form used in novels. On the one hand, this undermined rhetoric's position, given its past role as advocate of classically-based literary styles. On the other, it opened the way for a dialogue with neighboring fields such as Studies of National Language (*kokugogaku* 国語学) and Studies of National Literature (*kokubungaku* 国文学). With the establishment of *genbun itchi* and a partial solution to the conflict between elegant and vulgar styles, rhetoric was no longer stereotypically associated with classical modes of expression, but came to be simply perceived as a science, or art, that explained the principles of communication. In these new terms, rhetoric was able to hope for a place in current and future scholarly efforts, tackling the linguistic issues that were crucial for the modern Japanese state.

Another important change taking place in the Taishō years was the renewed interest in the practice of public speaking. After its overwhelming popularity during the early Meiji period, interest in and opportunities for speech-making considerably declined in the late 1880s and 1890s. However, the turn of the century saw a decisive comeback of speech-making in Japanese political and cultural life. This revival had important ramifications for the history of rhetoric in the final phase of its progression.⁴⁹

As discussed earlier, the publication of Igarashi Chikara's *Shin bunshō kōwa* had sanctioned the end of *bijigaku* studies. Igarashi's call for a rhetoric that was concerned with accomplished, rather than elegant, writing opened the way to a reassessment of the

object and purpose of the discipline along those lines. The works published thereafter shared the rejection of the aesthetic nature of rhetoric and advocated its employment as a system of rules for composition and proficient communication.

This approach could already be observed at the end of Meiji, when scholars Haga Yaichi 芳賀矢一 (1867-1927) and Sugitani Torazō 杉谷虎藏 (1874-1915) published their *Sakubun kōwa oyobi bunpan* 作文講話及文範 (Lectures on Writing with Model Compositions).⁵⁰ Written in *genbun itchi* style, a rare occurrence among preceding works, this study was a practical guide of composition intended for the use of teachers and students. In the preface, the authors denounced the lack of an adequate pedagogy for the instruction of composition, which was in their view essential in an age of transition such as the Meiji era when colloquial and classical styles were often used indiscriminately, causing confusion and grammatical inconsistencies. Haga and Sugitani called for the unification of the numerous literary styles, encouraged people to avoid the constraints of classical conventions, and maintained that modern literature had to be based on the vernacular. In doing so, they separated earlier notions of rhetoric which were only concerned with the aesthetic aspect of literary production from the more practical view that, beginning with Igarashi's *Shin bunshō kōwa*, had begun to break from the earlier tradition of rhetorical studies. Accordingly, the object of their work was the treatment of writing in general and not literary production per se; communication, rather than beauty, was the final goal of their investigation.

Sakubun kōwa oyobi bunpan consisted of fourteen chapters and an appendix. Several parts of the book dealt with material already discussed by earlier treatises of rhetoric. For example, Chapter One reviewed the purpose of written communication in society, calling for the need for each individual to improve one's writing skills; Chapter Two discussed the differences between literary versus non-literary pieces; Chapter Five covered general notions of clarity, correctness and appropriateness; Chapter Nine devoted itself to the structure of the sentence. Other chapters were innovative in terms of content and also with regard to the context in which they were discussed. Chapter Four, in particular, was a treatment of the various styles still used in written Japanese at the time. It included examples of cases in which influence from Western languages had led to the coining of literary expressions otherwise nonexistent in the Japanese language.⁵¹ This discussion was a welcome new addition to the treatises of the time, since, except for Igarashi's *Shin bunshō kōwa*, no other work of its kind had addressed the issue in any detail.

Sakubun kōwa oyobi bunpan showed that the new ideas spread by Igarashi had also found some sort of continuity among scholars outside the Waseda University circle. Haga and Sugitani contributed to divesting rhetoric of its authority over styles, instead proposing it as a valid system of rules for composition. They acknowledged the basic differences between elegant and plain, but rejected the idea of beauty as the primary goal of writing at the expense of effective communication. Rhetoric had thus relinquished the aesthetic motives that had characterized its development during much of the Meiji period.

Utsumi Kōzō 内海弘藏 (1872-1935), a graduate of Waseda University, embraced a notion of writing that was also far from that brought forth by earlier generations of rhetoricians. His *Bunshō jūkō* 文章十講 (Ten Lectures on Writing), published in 1910, was, according to the preface, the response to a growing concern for students' generally poor composition skills. The lack of an appropriate manual of composition had prompted Utsumi to devise one. The work was concerned exclusively with the practical aspect of writing: divided, as the title itself indicates, into ten lectures, *Bunshō jūkō* dealt with rhetoric only in a very marginal fashion, confirming the trend at the end of the Meiji era to downplay the importance of the discipline in the elaboration of an effective methodology for the teaching of composition. In particular, Utsumi denounced the inappropriate use of rhetorical figures and criticized rhetoricians' claim of rhetoric as being absolutely indispensable to writing.⁵²

Among other authors, Mizuno Yōshū 水野葉舟 (1883-1947) was also extremely critical of the discipline. Discussing the various trends that had characterized the debate on writing in the preceding years, Yōshū criticized rhetoric for being a field of study of no practical use, and accused rhetoricians of having totally misunderstood the essence of the writing process.⁵³ Kayahara Kazan 茅原華山 (1870-1952) echoed this sentiment, stating that Meiji rhetoricians had indeed put too much stress on the formal and aesthetic aspects of writing. In doing so, he said, rhetoricians had overlooked the fundamental fact that writing ought to have as a priority a fusion of content and form, rather than emphasize the purely external aspect of literary production. Kazan acknowledged the importance of rhetoric but reiterated that it was far from being an indispensable tool for writing.⁵⁴ Others joined them in dismissing the relevance of the discipline as it had been defined over the preceding decades.⁵⁵

The two major works of rhetoric of the time, Sassa's *Shūjihō kōwa* and Watanabe's *Gendai shūjihōyō*, essentially ratified this viewpoint. Sassa (1872-1917) indicated that rhetoric was no longer concerned with the discernment of beauty in writing or with the criticism of literary works, but rather with the practical knowledge necessary to write proficiently. Rhetoric's goal, he stated, was the attainment of fine writing, a statement that strongly resembled Igarashi's earlier definition of the discipline.⁵⁶ Similarly, Watanabe (1894-1930) essentially refuted the separation between "elegant" and "ordinary" styles, arguing that the scope of rhetoric was to be found in writing in general and not only in literature.⁵⁷

As was reasonable to expect, this continued attack on rhetoric, and in particular the criticism of rhetoricians' propensity toward taxonomy and dogmatism, resulted in a rejection of the very canon that best exemplified rhetoric's taxonomic character: elocution. The treatment of figures, a recurrent feature of Meiji rhetoric, declined among Taishō scholarship, totally disappearing in more than a few cases.⁵⁸ This does not mean, however, that rhetoric was completely ousted from the debates taking place within academic circles with respect to writing and composition. Several works acknowledged the importance of rhetoric's precepts, and some even strove to articulate convincing argu-

ments in favor of figures and their employment in writing.⁵⁹ Such a partially positive assessment of rhetoric might seem incompatible with the somewhat anti-rhetorical climate that resided at the time among scholars, intellectuals and educators, but it was not. On the contrary, it reflected the current ambivalence of rhetoric's reputation—praised on the one hand for the universal validity of its principles, but criticized on the other for being obsolete and lacking in methodological flexibility.⁶⁰ Moreover, such an anti-rhetorical climate was very different from the one that two decades earlier had opposed rhetoric in favor of the new trends of Realism and Naturalism. The anti-rhetorical sentiment of those years had been more extreme, to the extent that rhetoric had often been perceived as antithetical to any attempt toward literary modernization—be it with respect to language, themes, or ideology. By contrast, Taishō scholars accepted the relevance of the discipline to the endeavors of writing and communication, providing a conclusion to the endless debate over the definition and function of refinement in literature. The manuals of composition and the few works of rhetoric of the period reflected the resolution of this debate, acknowledging, albeit not unconditionally, the importance of rhetorical refinement as a necessary aspect of the newly-born literary language. The question was no longer whether to use rhetorical devices but which devices to use. This left rhetoric enough latitude to negotiate a role in the literary experimentations that followed in those years.

This partial acceptance of rhetoric was also facilitated by the widespread effort to incorporate the discipline into the studies of National Language.⁶¹ The aforementioned *Sakubun kōwa oyobi bunpan* and *Bunshō jūkō* were representative of this endeavor. The former work showed clear ties to Meiji rhetorical inquiry. From the discussion of figures to the treatment of style and the discussion of the four traditional forms of discourse (description, narration, exposition, and persuasion), the extensive coverage of typically rhetorical topics is evidence that Haga and Sugitani regarded rhetoric as an essential premise to the treatment of the linguistic and literary issues that followed in the appendix—the correct use of kana characters, verb conjugations, particles and so forth. These and other works contributed to creating an important link between rhetoric and those studies that sought to address questions of language and literature through the theoretical framework of Western scholarship.⁶²

Sassa's treatise also reflected this trend. Sassa had already published *Shūjihō* 修辭法 (Rhetoric), a translation of Adams Sherman Hill's *The Principles of Rhetoric*, in 1901. Now, sixteen years later, as an established scholar of rhetoric with over twenty years of experience teaching students composition, he had decided to undertake the compilation of his own manual. The book was divided into two parts and an appendix. Part One, "General Theory of Rhetoric," covered a variety of topics, from the definition of rhetoric, to language and the elements of good writing. Part Two dealt with the various styles of discourse. As for the appendix, it was also divided into two sections, which dealt, respectively, with "Epistolary Style" and "Composition." The latter section provided an informative picture of the state of the field during the mid-Taishō years. Sassa

observed that the Japanese had downplayed the importance of composition over the centuries, particularly after the Heian period. It was true that a number of Edo scholars such as Ogyū Sorai, Itō Jinsai 伊藤仁斎, Kamo no Mabuchi and Motoori Norinaga had discussed the topic in some fashion in their works, but these amounted more to sporadic treatments rather than an established pedagogical tradition. Composition grew into an accepted area of study only after the Meiji Restoration. As Sassa eloquently put it, the overlapping of classical and contemporary language in writing represented one of the greatest obstacles to the formulation of a successful methodology for composition. His analysis showed, for example, how auxiliary verbs and particles were often mistakenly used and indicated the steps to follow in order to correct students.

Watanabe's *Gendai shūjihōyō* also reflected the new developments seen with respect to the rise of a new literary language. In a treatise that symbolically condensed much of Meiji rhetorical tradition into an accessible manual written for the students attending his lectures, Watanabe, a scholar of aesthetics, became one of the first to show, within the context of a rhetorical treatise, the new character of the relationship between rhetoric and writing. Since rhetoric was concerned, in his view, with the actual rules needed in order to write effectively, his analysis, he stated, could only rely on contemporary pieces, which incidentally all employed either the copula だ or である. Watanabe drew largely from literature, demonstrating that the modern literary language had evolved to the point that it provided sufficient material for rhetorical analysis. In his treatment of figures, in particular, he quoted extensively from such authors as Natsume Sōseki and Shimazaki Tōson 島崎藤村 but also from such philosophers as Abe Jirō 阿部次郎 and Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎, providing evidence that their language, too, was replete with rhetorical devices. The vernacular had thus developed its own rhetorical features.

The years spanning the end of Meiji and the Taishō era were thus marked by intense negotiations aimed at redefining the role and scope of rhetoric in light of the new developments seen in the literary world. Rhetoricians became engaged in a sort of rescue operation that would enable rhetoric to survive the demise of interest observed at the end of the nineteenth century following the rise of Naturalism and the increasing popularity of the *genbun itchi* style. Shimamura Hōgetsu and Igarashi Chikara were instrumental in this process. The former reclaimed rhetoric's place within a general theory of aesthetics and brought forth the notion of a mutual relationship of necessity between rhetoric and modern literary language. The latter reconciled the taxonomic nature of the discipline with the anti-rhetorical sentiment that pervaded the *bundan*, granting rhetoric a continued relevance in the literary debates of the time.

Although in the early Taishō period several educators and writers continued to challenge rhetoric's authority, they de facto conceded the importance of the treatment of such areas as figures, language and style that were clearly part of rhetoric's domain. Rhetoric continued to be a valid interlocutor for those who were concerned with writing, literature, language policy, and so forth. Many of the works published in the Taishō years were in fact largely indebted to the scholarship of the previous era and faithfully reflected

the widespread effort to incorporate the discipline into the studies of National Language and Literature. Thus, contrary to what has been thought thus far, the development of studies of rhetoric in modern Japan was not a phenomenon limited to the Meiji period, but rather one that extended into the following era, causing important ramifications on a number of issues of a linguistic, literary, and also socio-political nature.

Notwithstanding this continuation of studies of rhetoric into Taishō, it would be a misrepresentation to argue that such studies did not show signs of decline at this time. Treatises of rhetoric certainly became rare. However, new developments were already discernable on the horizon during the early Shōwa period (1926-1989). In 1934 a then young Hatano Kanji 波多野完治 predicted the rebirth of the discipline following the growing interest in the psychological aspects of individual linguistic production.⁶³ In the same year, Tanizaki Jun'ichirō 谷崎潤一郎 addressed the problem of writing in his *Bunshō tokuhon* 文章読本, thus initiating a new genre that would be later perpetuated by such authors as Kawabata Yasunari 川端康成 and Mishima Yukio 三島由紀夫. And a decade later, Kobayashi Hideo's 小林英夫 *Buntairon no kensetsu* 文体論の建設 laid the theoretical foundation of stylistics in Japan. These and other developments reflected a latent interest in rhetorical investigation, an interest that would continue to grow during the mid-to-late Shōwa years when new advances in the field of linguistic and literary investigation placed renewed emphasis on rhetorical figures and the mechanisms of rhetorical communication.

REFERENCES

Anceschi 1960

Luciano Anceschi. *Barocco e Novecento: con alcune prospettive fenomenologiche*. Milano: Rusconi e Paolazzi, 1960.

Baba 1885

Baba Tatsui 馬場辰猪. *Yūbenhō* 雄弁法. Bunshōdō, 1885.

Bunshō Kōshūkai 1916

Bunshō Kōshūkai 文章講習会. *Shinshiki bunshō sahō tebiki* 新式文章作法手引. Tōseidō, 1916.

Chibbett 1983

David G. Chibbett. *River Mist and Other Stories by Kunikida Doppo*. Tenterden, Kent: Paul Norbury Publications Limited, 1983.

Fowler 1988

Edward Fowler. *The Rhetoric of Confession: Shishōsetsu in Early Twentieth-Century Japanese Fiction*. University of California Press, 1988.

Fujii and Komuro 1914

Fujii Mokuzō 藤井木像 and Komuro Yoshizō 小室由三. *Gendai nijū meika bunshō sahō kōwa* 現代二十名家文章作法講話. Mangandō, 1914.

Fukuzawa 1874a

Fukuzawa Yukichi 福沢諭吉. *Kaigiben* 會議弁. In vol. 3 of *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福沢諭吉全集. Iwanami Shoten, 1959.

Fukuzawa 1874b

Fukuzawa Yukichi. *Gakumon no susume* 學問のすすめ (1874). In vol. 3 of *Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū* 福沢諭吉全集. Iwanami Shoten, 1959.

Fuzanbō 1892

Fuzanbō 富山房. *Bunshō soshikihō* 文章組織法. In vol. 19 of *Futsūgaku zensho* 普通学全書. Fuzanbō, 1892.

Haga and Sugitani 1912

Haga Yaichi 芳賀矢一 and Sugitani Torazō 杉谷虎藏. *Sakubun kōwa oyobi bunpan* 作文講話及文範. Fuzanbō, 1912.

Hagino 1892

Hagino Yoshiyuki 萩野由之. *Sakubunpō* 作文法. Hakubunkan, 1892.

Hara 1994

Hara Shirō 原子朗. *Shūjigaku no shiteki kenkyū* 修辭学の史的研究. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1994.

Hasegawa 1906

Hasegawa Tenkei 長谷川天溪. “Genmetsu jidai no geijutsu” 幻滅時代の芸術. In vol. 57 of *Nihon kindai bungaku taikei* 日本近代文学大系. Kadokawa Shoten, 1972.

Hasegawa 1908

Hasegawa Tenkei. “Genjitsu bakuro no hia” 現実暴露の悲哀. In vol. 57 of *Nihon kindai bungaku taikei* 日本近代文学大系. Kadokawa Shoten, 1972.

Hatano 1990

Hatano Kanji 波多野完治. “Retorikku no saisei” レトリックの再生 (1934). In vol. 1 of *Hatano Kanji zenshū* 波多野完治全集. Shōgakukan, 1990.

Hattori 1891

Hattori Motohiko 服部元彦. *Shūjigaku* 修辭学. Kokugo Denshūjo, 1891.

Hayamizu 1988

Hayamizu Hiroshi 速水博司. *Kindai Nihon shūjigakushi* 近代日本修辭学史. Yūhōdō, 1988.

Henshall 1981

Kenneth G. Henshall. *The Quilt and Other Stories by Tayama Katai*. University of Tokyo Press, 1981.

Hisamatsu 1882

Hisamatsu Yoshinori 久松義典. *Taisei bendan tenkei* 泰西弁談典型. Gangandō, 1882.

Igarashi 1905

Igarashi Chikara 五十嵐力. *Bunshō kōwa* 文章講話. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1905.

Igarashi 1909

Igarashi Chikara. *Shin bunshō kōwa* 新文章講話. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1909.

Inagaki 1912

Inagaki Kunisaburō 稲垣国三郎. *Kokutei tokuhon kyōjuyō shūjibō oyobi toriatsukai* 国定読本教授用修辞法及取扱. Dōbunkan, 1912.

Ishikawa 1932

Ishikawa Mikiaki 石河幹明. *Fukuzawa Yukichi den* 福沢諭吉伝. Vol. 2. Iwanami Shoten.

Iwamachi 1978

Iwamachi Isao 岩町功. *Hyōden Shimamura Hōgetsu* 評伝島村抱月. Iwami Kyōdo Kenkyū Konwakai, 1978.

Iwasa 1998

Iwasa Sōshirō 岩佐壮四郎. *Hōgetsu no beru epokku: Meiji bungakusha to shinseiki yōroppa* 抱月のベル・エポック－明治文学者と新世紀ヨーロッパ. Taishūkan, 1998.

Kaneoka 1989

Kaneoka Takashi 金岡孝. *Bunshō ni tsuite no kokugogakuteki kenkyū* 文章についての国語学的研究. Meiji Shoin, 1989.

Kawazoe 1987

Kawazoe Kunimoto 川副国基. *Shimamura Hōgetsu: hito oyobi bungakusha to shite* 島村抱月－人及び文学者として. Nihon Toshō Sentā, 1987.

Kayahara and Oda 1919

Kayahara Kazan 茅原華山 and Oda Masanori 小田政賀. *Gendai bunshō kōwa* 現代文章講話. Nihon Hyōronsha, 1919.

Keene 1984a

Donald Keene. *Dawn to the West*. Vol. 3. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Keene 1984b

Donald Keene. *Dawn to the West*. Vol. 4. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Kikuchi 1879

Kikuchi Dairoku 菊池大麓. *Shūji oyobi kabun* 修辞及華文(1879). In vol. 20 of *Meiji bunka zenshū* 明治文化全集. Nihon Hyōronsha, 1928.

Kō 1880

Kō Ryōji 高良二. *Taisei ronbengaku yōketsu* 泰西論弁学要訣. Shōshodō, 1880.

Kuroiwa 1882

Kuroiwa Dai 黒岩大. *Yūben bijihō* 雄弁美辞法. Yoronsha, 1882.

Marra 2001

Michael F. Marra. *A History of Modern Japanese Aesthetics*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 2001.

Matsumoto and Yamamuro 1990

Matsumoto Sannosuke 松本三之介 and Yamamuro Shin'ichi 山室信一. *Genron to media* 言論とメディア. Iwanami Shoten, 1990.

Matsumura 1881

Matsumura Misao 松村操. *Enzetsu kinshin* 演説金針. Shiseidō, 1881.

Matsuzaki 1998

Matsuzaki Kin'ichi 松崎欣一. *Mita enzetsukai to Keiō Gijukukei enzetsukai* 三田演説会と慶應義塾系演説会. Keiō Gijuku Daigaku Shuppankai, 1998.

Mattioli 1983

Emilio Mattioli. *Studi di poetica e retorica*. Modena: Mucchi, 1983.

Miyake 1906

Miyake Setsurei 三宅雪嶺. "Bunshō higikōron" 文章非技巧論. *Bunshō sekai* 文章世界 1:7 (September 1906), pp. 2-5.

Miyazaki 1922

Miyazaki Haruyoshi 宮崎晴美. *Gendai bunshō kōwa oyobi bunpan* 現代文章講話及文範. Nihon Shoin, 1922.

Mizuno 1917

Mizuno Yōshū 水野葉舟. *Gendai bunshō sahō* 現代文章作法. Bakuaisha, 1917.

Morioka 1963

Morioka Kenji 森岡健二. *Bunshō kōseihō* 文章構成法. Shibundō, 1963.

Nishida 1992

Nishida Naotoshi 西田直敏. *Bunshō, buntai, hyōgen no kenkyū* 文章・文体・表現の研究. Izumi Shoin, 1992.

Nishio 1951

Nishio Mitsuo 西尾光雄. *Kindai bunshōron kenkyū* 近代文章論研究. Tōkō Shoin, 1951.

Ōkubo 1976

Ōkubo Toshiaki 大久保利謙. *Meirokusha kō* 明六社考. Rittaisha, 1976.

Ōwada 1893

Ōwada Takeki 大和田建樹. *Shūjigaku* 修辞学. Hakubunkan, 1893.

Ozaki 1877

Ozaki Yukio 尾崎行雄. *Kokai enzetsuhō* 公会演説法 (1877). In vol. 1 of *Ozaki Gakudō zenshū* 尾崎豈堂全集. Kōronsha, 1956.

Ozaki 1965

Ozaki Hirotsugu 尾崎宏次. *Shimamura Hōgetsu: Nihon kindaikei no sōshishatachi = I* 島村抱月－日本近代劇の創始者たち = 1. Miraisha, 1961.

Rimer 1994

J. Thomas Rimer. *Ōgai: Youth and Other Stories*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.

Sadoya 1980

Sadoya Shigenobu 佐渡谷重信. *Hōgetsu Shimamura Takitarō ron* 抱月島村瀧太郎論. Meiji Shoin, 1980.

Sassa 1901

Sassa Masakazu 佐々政一. *Shūjihō* 修辞法. Dai Nihon Toshō, 1901.

Sassa 1917

Sassa Masakazu. *Shūjihō kōwa* 修辞法講話. Meiji Shoin, 1917.

Sekiyama 1973

Sekiyama Kazuo 関山和夫. *Sekkyō no rekishiteki kenkyū* 説教の歴史的研究. Hōzōkan, 1973.

Shimamura 1898

Shimamura Hōgetsu 島村抱月. “Shōsetsu no buntai ni tsuite” 小説の文体について. *Yomiuri Shinbun* 讀壳新聞, 9-10 May, 1898.

Shimamura 1902

Shimamura Hōgetsu. *Shin bijigaku* 新美辞学. Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1902.

Shimamura 1918

Shimamura Hōgetsu. “Saikō shita koro no Waseda bungaku” 再興した頃の『早稻田文学』. In *Yomiuri Shinbun* 讀壳新聞, 25-27 July 1918.

Takada 1889

Takada Sanae 高田早苗. *Bijigaku* 美辞学. Kinkōdō, 1889.

Takeshima 1898

Takeshima Hagoromo 武島羽衣. *Shūjigaku* 修辞学. Hakubunkan, 1898.

Tomasi 1995

Massimiliano Tomasi. “Shimamura Hōgetsu ni okeru shūji saihi no mondai” 島村抱月における修辞採否の問題. *Nihon bungaku* 日本文学44:2 (1995), pp. 31-38.

Tomasi 1999

Massimiliano Tomasi. “Quest for a New Written Language: Western Rhetoric and the *Genbun Itchi* Movement.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 54:3 (1999), pp. 333-60.

Tomasi 2000

Massimiliano Tomasi. “Studies of Western Rhetoric in Modern Japan: The Years Between Takada Sanae’s *Bijigaku* and the Turn of the Century.” *Journal of the Southwest Conference on Asian Studies* 2 (2000), pp. 145-67.

Tomasi 2002

Massimiliano Tomasi. “Oratory in Meiji and Taishō Japan: Public Speaking and the Formation of a New Written Language.” *Monumenta Nipponica* 57:1 (2002), pp. 43-71.

Tsubouchi 1893

Tsubouchi Shōyō 坪内逍遙. “Bijironkō” 美辞論稿(1893). In vol. 11 of *Shōyō senshū* 逍遙選集. Daiichi Shobō, 1977.

Uchiyama 1913

Uchiyama Shun 内山舜. *Jisshū bunshō kōsei shūjhō* 実習文章構成修辞法. *Jitsugyō no Nihonsha*, 1913.

Utsumi 1910

Utsumi Kōzō 内海弘藏. *Bunshō jukkō* 文章十講. Bunseisha, 1910.

Watanabe 1926

Watanabe Yoshiharu 渡邊吉治. *Gendai shūjihōyō* 現代修辭法要. Jinbo Shoten, 1926.

Yamamoto 1978

Yamamoto Masahide 山本正秀. *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei: hassei hen* 近代文体形成史料集成(發生篇). Ōfūsha, 1978.

Yamamoto 1979

Yamamoto Masahide. *Kindai buntai keisei shiryō shūsei (seiritsu hen)* 近代文体形成史料集成成立篇. Ōfūsha, 1979.

Yatsunami 1914

Yatsunami Norikichi 八波則吉. *Oyō shūjigaku kōwa* 應用修辭學講話. Keibunkan, 1914.

Yoshida 1926

Yoshida Kurō 吉田九郎. *Bunshō sahō genri* 文章作法原理. Bunshūdō Shoten, 1926.

NOTES

¹ In this study, the term rhetoric refers to the system of rules for effective speaking that was developed originally in ancient Greece and that later came to be applied to the domain of written communication. Consequently, the term refers to the various parts into which classical rhetoric was traditionally divided, namely “invention,” “arrangement,” “elocution,” “memory,” and “delivery,” and the general principles regarding the effective use of language, including the classifications of rhetorical figures. Further connotations of rhetoric, most of which originated well into the twentieth century, are not considered here.

² See, for example, the works of such critics and poets as Ki no Tsurayuki 紀貫之 (ca. 872-945), Fujiwara no Kintō 藤原公任 (966-1041), Fujiwara no Shunzei 藤原俊成 (1114-1204) and Fujiwara no Teika 藤原定家 (1162-1241).

³ For a discussion of the crucial links between Buddhist preaching and the development of oral arts in Japan, see Sekiyama 1973.

⁴ This translation was divided into three parts: a preface, instructions on how to hold a conference, and the constitution of the Mita Enzetsukai 三田演説会 (Mita Oratorical Society); see Fukuzawa 1874a. For information on the Mita Enzetsukai and its activities, see Matsuzaki 1998.

⁵ Public speaking was not initially contemplated in the constitution of the Meirokusha; it was only after an amendment in May 1875 that regular meetings for this purpose were formally recognized. On this point, see Ōkubo 1976, p. 21. The cost for the construction of the building, which remains a landmark in the history of public speaking in Japan, was over two thousand yen; see Ishikawa 1932, p. 239.

⁶ See Fukuzawa 1874b.

⁷ See, for example, Ozaki Yukio, *Kōkai enzetsuhō*; Kō Ryōji, *Taisei ronbengaku yōketsu*; Matsumura Misao, *Enzetsu kinshin*; Kuroiwa Dai, *Yūben bijihō*; and Hisamatsu Yoshinori, *Taisei bendan tenkei*.

Kikuchi Dairoku's well-known translation *Shūji oyobi kabun* also appeared in these years, but this was not, strictly speaking, a treatise of oratory. See Ozaki 1877; Kō 1880; Matsumura 1881; Kuroiwa 1882; Hisamatsu 1882; and Kikuchi 1879.

⁸ Baba is also the author of *Yūbenhō*, a study on oratory which appeared in 1885: see Baba 1885. As for Ueki, one of his most well-known pieces is certainly *Genron jiyū no ron* 言論自由ノ論, published in 1880: see Matsumoto and Yamamoto 1990, pp. 44-60. For a discussion of public speaking in Meiji and Taishō Japan, see Tomasi 2002, pp. 43-71.

⁹ Meiji rhetoricians were among the first to indicate the lack of a native tradition in studies of composition. Shimamura Hōgetsu argued that no tradition of rhetorical study existed, except for a few treatises on waka and haiku poetry, and the works by such Confucian scholars as Ogyū Sorai 萩生徂徠 (1666-1728), Rai San'yō 賴山陽 (1780-1832), and Saitō Setsudō 斎藤拙堂 (1797-1865); see Shimamura 1902, p. 200. Likewise, Igarashi Chikara indicated Kūkai's 空海 *Bunkyō bifuron* 文鏡秘府論 as the only work worth mentioning and maintained that, as far as native prose was concerned, only during the Tokugawa period could one see significant works by such scholars as Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697-1769), Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730-1801) and Tachibana Chikage 橘千蔭 (1735-1808); see Igarashi 1909, p. 593. A few years later, Sassa Masakazu confirmed this view, and addressing the question of composition, criticized scholars of Japanese studies for having traditionally considered prose a mere appendix of poetry; see Sassa 1917, p. 102.

¹⁰ Works published between Takada Sanae's *Bijigaku* and the end of the nineteenth century include Fuzanbō's *Bunshō soshikihō*, Hattori Motohiko's *Shūjigaku*, Tsubouchi Shōyō's "Bijironkō," Ōwada Takeki's *Shūjigaku* and Takeshima Hagoromo's *Shūjigaku*. See Hattori 1891; Fuzanbō 1892; Tsubouchi 1893; Ōwada 1893; and Takeshima 1898. For a discussion of the scholarship of this period, see Tomasi 2000, pp. 145-67.

¹¹ Masaoka Shiki, "Jojibun," *Nihon* 日本 (January-March 1900); in Yamamoto 1979, pp. 203-9.

¹² Takahama Kyoshi, "Genbun itchi" 言文一致, *Hototogisu* ホトトギス3:7 (1900). See also Sakamoto Shihōda 坂本四方太, "Shaseibun sadan" 写生文瑣談, *Bunshō sekai* 文章世界2:2 (1907), and Itō Sachio 伊藤左千夫, "Shaseibunron" 写生文論, *Shumi* 趣味2:7 (1907). All reproduced in Yamamoto 1979, pp. 229-30, pp. 624-28 and pp. 665-76.

¹³ Keene 1984a, p. 226.

¹⁴ Several studies have been published on Hōgetsu in Japan in recent years; see, for example, Ozaki 1965; Kawazoe 1987; Iwamachi 1978; Sadoya 1980; and Iwasa 1998. None of them, however, thoroughly address Hōgetsu's work as a rhetorician. For a discussion of Hōgetsu's *Shin bijigaku*, see instead Hayamizu 1988, pp. 190-203 and Hara 1994, pp. 62-70. In the West, very little has been written on Hōgetsu thus far; for some information on his thought, see Keene 1984b, pp. 531-45; and Fowler 1988, pp. 93-102. For a discussion of Hōgetsu's contribution to the debate over the creation of a modern literary language, see Tomasi 1995, pp. 31-38 and Tomasi 1999, pp. 352-55.

¹⁵ The term *bijigaku* became a trademark of studies of rhetoric at Waseda University.

¹⁶ Shimamura 1902, p. 1.

¹⁷ Shimamura 1902, p. 2.

¹⁸ See Sadoya 1980, p. 189.

¹⁹ Shimamura 1918.

- ²⁰ For an overview of Hōgetsu's aesthetic thought, see Yamamoto Masao, "The Aesthetic Thought of Shimamura Hōgetsu," in Marra 2001, pp. 107-113.
- ²¹ Shimamura 1902, p. 126.
- ²² The section ended with a survey of the history of Western rhetoric, from its conception in ancient Greece to its further development in Rome, and, through the centuries, to the more recent theories of British rhetoricians such as Campbell, Blair, and Whateley. Overall, Hōgetsu demonstrated a familiarity with Western scholarship that was new among the treatises of rhetoric published in Japan. In fact, earlier works had generally been strongly indebted to a select number of Western works such as Alexander Bain's *English Composition and Rhetoric* and George Payn Quackenbos' *Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric*. In contrast to his predecessors, Hōgetsu was able to draw broadly from several fields such as linguistics, logic and philosophy, lending increased credibility to his work.
- ²³ Shimamura 1902, p. 203.
- ²⁴ Hattori Motohiko's *Shūjigaku* and Hagino Yoshiyuki's *Sakubunpō* had been the only major works of rhetoric to address the *genbun itchi* issue, even if only in a very superficial fashion. See Hattori 1891, p. 11; and Hagino 1892, p. 30.
- ²⁵ Hōgetsu had already brought forward this notion in his article "Shōsetsu no buntai ni tsuite." See Shimamura 1898.
- ²⁶ The final editing and proofreading of the book were eventually carried out by Tsubouchi Shōyō.
- ²⁷ For an interesting discussion on the relationship between rhetoric and aesthetics, see Mattioli 1983, pp. 208-28.
- ²⁸ Tayama Katai, "Rokotsu naru byōsha" 露骨なる描写, *Taiyō* 太陽 10:3 (1904); and Tayama Katai, "Sei ni okeru kokoromi" 『生』における試み, *Waseda bungaku* 34 (1908). See Yamamoto 1979, pp. 516-19 and pp. 761-67.
- ²⁹ Hasegawa Tenkei, "Genmetsu jidai no geijutsu," (1906); "Genjitsu bakuro no hiae" (1908). See Hasegawa 1906, pp. 220-29 and Hasegawa 1908, pp. 230-43.
- ³⁰ Miyake 1906, pp. 2-5.
- ³¹ Katagami Tengen, "Shōsetsu no bunshō no shinmi" 小説の文章の新味, *Bunshō sekai* 3:1 (1908), in Yamamoto 1979, p. 737.
- ³² Igarashi was among those, for example, who acted as executors of Hōgetsu's will at the time of his death. See Sadoya 1980, pp. 169-86.
- ³³ See Igarashi 1909. Other works on rhetoric by Igarashi include *Jōshiki shūjigaku* 常識修辞学 (Bunsendō, 1909); *Jisshū shinsakubun* 実習新作文 (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1910); *Sakubun sanjūsan kō* 作文三十三講 (Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1913); and *Shūjigaku taiyō* 修辞学大要 (Shibun Shoin, 1923). For a discussion of *Shin bunshō kōwa*, see Hayamizu 1988, pp. 224-40; and Hara 1994, pp. 105-41.
- ³⁴ Igarashi 1909, p. 1.
- ³⁵ Igarashi 1909, pp. 4-5. English translation in Henshall 1981, p. 152.
- ³⁶ Igarashi 1909, pp. 10-11.
- ³⁷ Igarashi 1909, p. 17.
- ³⁸ Igarashi 1909, p. 38.
- ³⁹ Igarashi 1909, p. 37.

⁴⁰ Igarashi 1905, p. 15.

⁴¹ Igarashi 1909, p. 142.

⁴² Igarashi 1909, p. 185.

⁴³ Mori Ōgai 森鷗外, *Maihime* 舞姫 (The Dancing Girl, 1890); see Igarashi 1909, p. 218. English translation by Richard Bowring in Rimer 1994, p. 11.

⁴⁴ Kunikida Doppo, *Gyūniku to bareisho* 牛肉と馬鈴薯 (Meat and Potatoes, 1901); see Igarashi 1909, p. 13. English translation in Chibbett 1983, p. 144.

⁴⁵ See the following section for a discussion of this point.

⁴⁶ See Anceschi 1960, p. 231.

⁴⁷ Quoted in Nishio 1951, p. 174.

⁴⁸ Nishio 1951, p. 174 and p. 181. Several other scholars concur with this view. See, for example, Morioka 1963, p. 379; Kaneoka 1989, p. 209; and Nishida 1992, p. 52.

⁴⁹ The revival of public speaking during the Taishō period is not addressed in this study; for more information on this aspect of rhetoric's history in modern Japan, see Tomasi 2002.

⁵⁰ See Haga and Sugitani 1912.

⁵¹ For example, according to Haga and Sugitani, expressions such as *iikaereba* いいかえれば and *aru imi ni oite* ある意味において had been coined as direct translations of the English "in other words" and "in a sense." Haga and Sugitani 1912, p. 63.

⁵² See Utsumi 1910, pp. 311-12.

⁵³ See Mizuno 1917, p. 9.

⁵⁴ Kayahara and Oda 1919, p. 22 and p. 93.

⁵⁵ See, for example, Miyazaki 1922, p. 1.

⁵⁶ Sassa 1917, pp. 1-2.

⁵⁷ Watanabe 1926, pp. 7-9.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Uchiyama 1913; Bunshō Kōshūkai 1916; Mizuno 1917; and Kayahara and Oda 1919.

⁵⁹ Among the works that retained a discussion of figures, see, for example, Haga and Sugitani 1912; Fujii and Komuro 1914; Yoshida 1926. Haga and Sugitani, in particular, brought forth the idea that figures were necessary for good writing. The goal of figures was to express one's thoughts and feelings in a non-affected fashion. No other work until then had gone so far as to use this concept in a definition of rhetorical figures. On the contrary, simplicity had been a key word in the arguments of more progressive currents of thought such as Realism and Naturalism against the pomposity of style of classical modes of expression. Haga and Sugitani must have felt comfortable using this term in such a context, which illustrates how at the very end of the Meiji period, the conflict between affectation and simplicity in writing, while still ongoing, had lost much of its power.

⁶⁰ Mizuno Yōshū, and Kayahara and Oda, for example, also partially acknowledged the importance of rhetoric: see Mizuno 1917, p. 23; Kayahara and Oda 1919, p. 92.

⁶¹ Something similar had already happened, for example, in the U.S. where rhetoric was now considered a part of English departments at several institutions around the country.

⁶² See, for example, Inagaki 1912 and Yatsunami 1914.

⁶³ Hatano Kanji, "Retorikkusu no saisei" (1934). See Hatano 1990, pp. 7-23.

要旨

近代日本における修辞学の流れ —島村抱月『新美辞学』（1902年）から大正末期まで—

マシミリアーノ・トマシ

西洋修辞学が日本に導入されたのは明治初期の頃である。通説では、主に演説法として最初の姿を見せた修辞学は、徐々に変質し、明治後期になってから作文教育・文学批評に影響を及ぼす学問として注目を浴びた。しかし、その後、写実主義・自然主義が文壇を風靡したことにより、衰退し消滅の危機を迎えることとなった。

本論文では、明治後期から大正末期までの日本の修辞学研究を分析することにより、若手文学者に批判されるにも関わらず、島村抱月及び五十嵐力がどのように修辞学研究の発展に貢献したかを明らかにする。さらに、大正時代の修辞学研究にも焦点をあて、その研究が国語学・国文学への応用という点において大きな役割を果たしたことを探る。