A Pioneering Feminist with a Pioneering Writing Style: Shimizu Shikin's "Broken Ring" (Koware yubiwa, 1891)

Joseph Essertier

Among the Japanese women who wrote fiction in the 1890s, Higuchi Ichiyō is by far the most celebrated, but there were other women writing in this period, a time when Japanese modern fiction was taking shape. These include Miyake Kaho (1868-1944), Wakamatsu Shizuko (1864-96), Shimizu Shikin (1868-1933), Nakajima Shōen (1863-1901), Kimura Akebono (1872-1890), Koganei Kimiko (1870-1956), Tazawa Inafune (1874-1896), and Kitada Usurai (1876-1900). Many of their works were well-received by critics at the time and 1895-96 is considered the "year of the *keishū sakka*" (lady writers) by some literary historians.[1] The female-authored works often deal with important and new social phenomena, such as the world of girls' schools, marriage, waka poetry circles, concubinage, alcoholism, rape, and the lives of people in Western countries, so it is not surprising that their works were popular at the time. Yet their works have largely disappeared from public memory. With the exception of Ichiyō, most literary histories trace the origins of modern writing by Japanese women to the 1910s, when there was a second boom in women's writing, set off by the appearance of Seitō (Bluestocking), a magazine begun in 1911 by the very influential and pioneering feminist, Hiratsuka Raichō (1886-1971). It is possible that the works of the 1890s simply have less literary worth than those of the 1910s, but upon closer inspection one finds that, over time, colloquial writing gradually became a respectable written language, and this opened up new possibilities for free literary expression by women.

It is fitting that Shimizu Shikin (1868-1933) was born in 1868, the first year of the Meiji Period (1868-1912), because she was indeed a first, in more sense than one.[2] She was one of the first women writers of modern Japan to write on her own terms, from a woman's perspective. She pioneered new ideas about women's rights. She was one of the first women to write essays rejecting racial and gender discrimination. She was one of the first female orators. And perhaps her least understood and least appreciated achievement was her invention of a new conversational writing style (*danwa tai* or *kaiwa tai*) in her fiction. It is hoped that readers will be able to sense some of the brilliance and originality of that style even in my English translation of her story "Broken Ring" (Koware yubiwa, 1891) below.

Shikin's writings began to appear in the Women's Education Magazine (Jogaku zasshi) in 1889, but she had been active as a promoter of women's rights within the Freedom and People's Rights Movement, led by men such as Nakae Chōmin (1847-1901), from much earlier. Her militancy and strong desire to reform society can be felt, for instance, in her essay "Why are Women Literati Slow to Appear?" (Onna bungakusha nanzo deru koto no osoki ya). This essay reflects the frustrations that one pioneering women's rights activist at that time felt about the lack of women writers.[3] In this essay she admits that there were only a few women writers in antiquity, Sei Shōnagon and Murasaki Shikibu most prominent among them, but that in the Tokugawa Period women writers were even rarer, and that up until the time she was writing (1890), a great woman writer had yet to appear in modern Japan. The voices of the few women writing were too weak and women writers were too few in number, and the problem was not that women as a group were incapable of writing, she explains:

> Long ago in Japan it was considered natural that there were no women literati. It was said that girls must not study books, and that, in fact, girls could hurt themselves by learning from books. Girls were taught how to write as little as possible. Perhaps this is why even for those who possessed natural talent,

there was no path through which they could develop it [...]. Yet now it is the Meiji Period, the road to education for women has already been open more than 10 years, and women's education has been extended beyond the basic education to more or less include literature. When one actually looks at the girl's schools of Tokyo and Yokohama, one sees a very large number of girls who have amassed a level of training that almost compares with that of [male] university students. Yet what are these women doing now? They are dead quiet, not letting out a peep. I ask these sisters of ours why, even after they have so energetically spent so many years with books, and woken up and gone to sleep with books, why, at a time when they have stored up so much learning in their minds, they then hide in the background of public life?[4]

From Shikin's perspective, thinking about why there were so few women writing in her day, i.e., in the mid-Meiji Period, there were at least a few reasons, among them the fact that many women's names were not noted (*na nori izuru*), so readers were deceived about the gender of the writer. But perhaps setting aside the objective limitations on women's writing imposed by patriarchy, she focuses mainly on the restrictions that educated women place upon themselves. Her fellow women are failing, she laments, to "learn what has been learned" and do what can be done: "You have not gotten away from the old-fashioned customs that are supposed to constitute women's virtue. The reason why you only read what is written in books is because you have not had any idea how to read the living things of the living world."[5]

She urges women to take action, continuing:

> As I stand here before you ladies, what I am hoping you will do is not to expand your experience with books, but to read in a lively way the living things of the living world. You should not simply consider [the words of some] ideal literary scholar, but actually do the work of literature that is necessary in today's

> Japan. Not saying something when it should be said and not standing up when it is necessary to stand up is not good-tempered or ladylike. [Those who do this] are, in truth, cowardly and timid. I think that you ladies are contaminated with humility and cowardice, so in spite of carrying treasures [of talent], I fear that you may wind up decaying before you have produced anything [...].[6]

The act of writing for Shikin is akin to the act of standing up. A writer should not sit and read the works of literary scholars, but actually create literature by boldly "reading" the living world. Women do not stand up and write because they are "contaminated" (konkō) with humility and cowardice. Overcoming such contamination and "old-fashioned customs" is the key to the emergence of women literati for her.

One sees here and elsewhere in Shikin's writing the enunciation not only of new ideas about women and their role in society but also a new kind of writing and speaking—"standing up" or "standing out" (*okitsu*) and speaking to other women. The Chinese character with which she writes the word "stand up" here carries the nuance of "stand out" and "move" or "act." In her essays as well as her short story, "Broken Ring," she frequently addresses her readers as if she were standing and delivering a speech, as she does here and in the final paragraph of this two-page essay: "Shoshi ni mukatte" (Standing before You, My Sisters).

She begins her story "Broken Ring" (Koware yubiwa, translated below) with the word "you," as if she were actually speaking directly to the reader. In these works, the words "I" and "you" are frequently used, emphasizing a relationship of speaker to listener. Indeed, she ends this essay excitedly inviting, or perhaps even pleading, with women to write as women and for women, emphasizing the word *warawa* (female word for "I") and *kimi* ("you"):

> Where is the Musasaki Shikibu of today hiding? Where is the Sei Shōnagon of Meiji? I am waiting for you! I am waiting for you! Nay, even more than I, the world continues to wait for

you![7]

In this essay by Shikin that displays her advanced thinking, she tells us that while some women with elite educations had at last achieved a level of literacy comparable to that of well-educated men, women were still following old-fashioned customs. Women's education and women's customs, or perhaps "habits," were out of sync. Many women were too timid, "contaminated" with humility in her words. In short, many women did not have the disposition necessary to write. They were able to read books, but could not read the "living things of the living world." Here Shikin is calling for a new approach to the world by women that would make it possible for them to write about the contemporary, "living" world as women saw it.

She emphasizes the fact that there were many highly educated women than in previous periods of history, but one must put this new increase in women's literacy in perspective. The numbers of women equipped with the literacy necessary to become a writer were far fewer than today. In order for a woman in the Meiji Period to gain recognition as a great writer, she would need a very high level of literacy, but only 18 percent of the girls in Japan were receiving four years of primary education in 1875.[8] By 1900 this number had reached 72 percent. One can extrapolate from this that, although there was a major improvement in the literacy level of girls in this 25 year period, during the period that this chapter focuses on (the early 1890s) perhaps as much as one third of all girls were still not acquiring even the bare minimum of literacy skills. It must not be forgotten that the reading and writing skills of such children were probably inferior to those of fifth grade elementary school students today. This is because teachers spent a large portion of those four years of basic schooling teaching children calligraphy, the forms of the characters in use then were more complex than today's characters, and therefore, the characters then were more difficult to learn to read and write than today. Yet the number of characters in use in newspapers, magazines, and books was far greater than today, so it could easily be argued that four years of primary education in Japan today enable a person to access a greater range of information through the written word

than four years of such education in Meiji. The vast majority of girls and women must have been essentially cut off from the world of newspapers, books, and correspondence. Furthermore, if the number of women enrolled in women's high schools, whose educational standards were lower than those of regular high schools (only for males), was a mere 12,000 in 1900 out of a female population of 20 million or more, then the women who possessed full literacy in the early 1890s must have been a tiny, elite minority indeed.[9] That is to say, the situation that women faced was severe and the number of women who not only aspired to write but were also equipped to write were extremely few. One should keep this in mind when considering Shikin's criticism, especially if one were to ask how much women of the time could be blamed for their "silence" in terms of publishing.

Finally, as a way of hinting at Shikin's significance, let us compare her writing style very briefly with the writing style of "the" woman short-story writer of the period, Higuchi Ichiyō (1872-1896). Ichiyō started publishing her most successful short stories, such as "Takekurabe" (Child' Play, 1895-96) just slightly later than Shikin. As mentioned, there existed only a small women's readership, so that the number of women who could have appreciated her work must have been small indeed. It goes without saying that initially most of those who read her novels were men, as is probably true for all other women writers of the time, but for we who live in societies in which most women have the skills to, for example, read a newspaper, it may be difficult to imagine the difficulty that women writers faced in Meiji. Ichiyō's usual style, the one found in her best known novels, is classified as "gazoku setchu" (classical-vulgar compromise) in Yamamoto Masahide's taxonomy, but Seki Reiko and Nishikawa Yūko refer to it as "gikobun" (faux classical Japanese), and others sometimes refer to it as "wabun" (native Japanese classical style). However one classifies it, it is important to remember that it was closely identified with Ihara Saikaku's style and was part of the 1890s Saikaku Revival. In this style, the narration was written in a classical style and the dialogue in a style that was very close to a certain brand of colloquial speech, although somewhat different from the

colloquial style of a Futabatei Shimei (1864-1909).

Yamamoto Masahide described the early 1890s (specifically 1890-94) as the "Period of Stagnation."[10] (For him this was stagnation because he consistently views the new colloquial style, usually referred to as "genbun itchi" in Japanese, as a positive step forward in Japan's modernization process). During this period the Saikaku-esque *gazoku setchū* (mixed elegant-vulgar) style of Kōda Rohan, Ozaki Kōyō, and Ichiyō was dominant in the world of novels, but other styles such as the colloquial of Wakamatsu Shizuko (1864-96) and the "three-style mix of Japanese, Chinese, and Western" elements (*wakanyō santai*) seen in Ōgai's "Maihime" were also being written. From around 1888/89 a nationalistic and conservative movement for "national preservation" (*kokusui hozon*) against the West and the colloquial style began to emerge. (It was conservative in the sense that it preserved the styles of the past). We should also note that Tsubouchi Shōyō and Futabatei Shimei were no longer writing fiction at this point, and very few works in colloquial styles were being written. Wakamatsu Shizuko, a translator of English literature and a writer, and Shikin were the two main women writers who were writing in colloquial styles at this time. Considering that so few male writers continued with the modernization of style that had begun just a few years earlier in the latter half of the 1880s and that it was falling out of favor, it is significant that these two women writers chose to continue experimenting with it.

Perhaps even more important to keep in mind when considering Shikin's style in "Broken Ring" is that hers is a very rare colloquial type of style, in fact. It is, strictly speaking, a "conversational style" (*kaiwa bun*), very different from the celebrated colloquial style of Futabatei Shimei. And unlike the other woman writer, Ichiyō, the narrator of Shikin's "Broken Ring," does not speak or write from a lofty position vis-à-vis the reader with a classical tone. Shikin's narrator speaks in an everyday Tokyo dialect (the Yamanote Dialect, upon which the most standard speech and writing in the language today is based). This is why Shikin's style in this story is easy to read today. It is very close to today's standard spoken Japanese.

The tone of indignation that marks "Broken Ring" weakens in Shikin's later works, which did not highlight the injustice and hypocrisy of male privileges, such as those of keeping concubines and buying prostitutes. She also later discontinued writing in genbun itchi and switched to a mix of "translation style" (*honyaku tai*) in some works and to a classical Japanese style in her "Strange Recollections of One Youth" (Isseinen iyō no jukkai) that is not unlike the style found in Ōgai's "Maihime." She chose an almost archaic style for her story "Imin gakuen" (Immigrant School).[11] Thus her choosing this style for a pioneering feminist short story shows underscores the significance of the style, and it may not be a coincidence that her retreat from a more militant feminist stance was later accompanied by a return to classical styles, moving her writing voice closer to Ichiyō's. As part of the debate over whether literature was declining or advancing ("Bungaku gokusui ronsō") in 1889-90, a conflict between advocates of older *yomihon* with their "large-scale plots" and those of newer psychological and realistic fiction, there was also a struggle in the field of literature between newer and older forms of cultural capital, I would argue. It is usually accepted that the colloquial style was associated with the West, realism, and oral communication, but for the period that Shikin was writing in, we should also consider the implications for female subjectivity, as I discuss below.[12]

Already hinted at, it is probably true that for many women, the specific colloquial style that Shikin used in "Broken Ring" was far easier to read and write than the classical styles, and even easier than Futabatei's pioneering colloquial style in *Floating Clouds* (Ukigumo, 1886-89). For children who were fluent in the Yamanote dialect, the kind of style used in "Broken Ring" was one that could be relatively quickly learned. Eventually, both male and female students were taught how to read and write in the new standard colloquial styles based on the Yamanote Dialect, and it became a gender-neutral style, unlike classical Chinese, which continued to be associated with masculinity, and unlike classical Japanese, which tended to be the sole classical style available to women. In this sense, the

dissemination of skills the new standard colloquial may have contributed to shrinking the sex-based literacy gap; and in that sense, too, it was easy.

For obvious reasons, the new standard colloquial, one that was close to Shikin's style in "Broken Ring," was also easier to use than classical Japanese when writing about contemporary topics and in contemporary settings. Writing in classical styles, writers would have difficulty depicting modern life, new technologies, or new concepts. A switch to a colloquial style for women who were native speakers of the Yamanote dialect would remove many hurdles from their strivings to acquire an education and become literate, and thus equip them with writing skills more quickly than in periods before Meiji. (For women, of course, who were not speakers of this dialect, especially those who spoke distant dialects, a switch to the new standard would not necessarily improve their chances of becoming literate vis-à-vis men. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that the switch to the new standard must have played a significant role in cultivating the relatively large numbers of women writers who achieved recognition and even inclusion in the literary canon during and after the Taishō Period [1912-25]).

Over a span of several decades, the new colloquial standard rose in status and acceptability (especially after the Sino-Japanese War) and classical Chinese fell in status, losing its former prestige and authority. It seems likely that the sheer difficulty of acquiring high-level skills in classical Chinese played in favor of male authority, and that as that one form of difficult-to-acquire cultural capital lost its value and as more girls were taught to write in the same style as boys (i.e., in the colloquial), greater numbers of women would have acquired the ability to write in a style that carried an authoritative tone, the tone of a legitimate writer. In these senses, the eventual dominance of genbun itchi and near "death" of classical Chinese as a viable style must have made life easier for many women writers.

At the same time, it must be noted that for women writers who, like Ichiyō, Shikin, and Wakamatsu, had come of age during the early 1890s and

who had received training in classical styles, the colloquial probably entailed a whole new way of writing (not only new vocabulary and grammar). Switching to it must have been difficult, even while the style was easier than classical styles. Seki Reiko conjectures that even for Shikin it must have been an "artificial" language, in fact.[13] Even so, her style was described as "natural" by Mori Ōgai.[14]

The colloquial was also a language of equality, but that equality was not realistic or representative of human relations in everyday life. It was inevitably an artificial kind of equality since relations between people in Japan were not egalitarian and, just like today, the hierarchical relationships between its speakers were reflected in the forms of verbs, adjectives, and nouns that they used. The hierarchy was effectively "built in" to the language. As Masao Miyoshi has written, the "neutral" level invented for the genbun itchi style was designed for fiction, and was itself a fiction.[15]

In real life, speakers tended to speak either in a deferential way or in a condescending way to their listeners. Since it is usually thought that advocates of colloquial styles aimed for writers to write as they spoke, one might expect the most natural colloquial style to be one that preserved the hierarchical language of everyday life. Yet the colloquial style (the specific, standard style referred to as "the *genbun itchi*" style) was originally "invented," to borrow Miyoshi's expression, in order to translate Western novels, in which non-hierarchical, neutral forms of language appeared. With the great influx of Western literature in the form of translations to the Japanese literary world and the authoritative and influential critiques of native forms of literature, the Western novel and Western poetry became the new model, the standard against which Japanese literature was to be measured. Most of the early pioneers of the colloquial, whose works set the standard that was later to be followed, such as Futabatei, struggled to create a new egalitarian language that would be appropriate for the new society, which many believed would become, or had to become, an egalitarian one.[16] The standard colloquial was a language of equality in

at least two important senses: the narrator did not condescend to the reader and the characters in the story tended to not use condescending or deferential language towards each other.

Thus while there is no question that this equality in the colloquial was artificial, this aspect of it probably made it easier for readers to imagine non-hierarchical relations and non-hierarchical ways of speaking between people, including relations between men and women. For women writers aiming to speak woman-to-woman in less hierarchical ways, as Shikin had her narrator do in "Broken Ring," or for novelists wishing to portray male and female characters engaged in egalitarian modes of speech, even in hitherto un-heard-of and un-realistic egalitarian relationships, colloquial styles would be useful. This may be a good example of what Bunch had in mind when she emphasized how literacy sometimes makes it possible for women to "think for themselves" and to conceive of alternatives to the status-quo gender relations that they find in society.[17]

Finally, a major difference between Shikin's style in "Broken Ring" and Ichiyō's classical Japanese is that Shikin's style was viewed as something of Western origins, while Ichiyō's as something native. The fact that Ichiyō's style would have been viewed as native seems indisputable, especially when one reads passages such as the following about her "Child's Play" in Danly's In the Shade of Spring Leaves:

> ...same kind of stage setting to be found in Saikaku. [...] [...] The brilliant command of rhythm and wordplay... [...] The Edo storyteller's baroque language and learned allusions naturally appealed to the classical bent in Ichiyō. [...] Ichiyō studded the opening of "Child's Play" with *kakekotoba*, or pivot words.[18]

Her style came mainly out of a native tradition, and although a little colloquial vocabulary was employed, one reads little about an influence from foreign literature. Nevertheless, the implications of this distinction between the nativeness of her style versus the foreignness of Shikin's style in "Broken Ring" may not be obvious. For instance, given the role that cultural tradition plays in modern nationalism, when Ichiyō's style is

celebrated as the last cry of classical Japanese and she is viewed as one of the last great writers of a native tradition, it is more likely that an image of her face will appear on a five thousand yen bill than an image of a Shikin or Wakamatsu. Moreover, if the style of Shikin's "Broken Ring" had a foreign sound to it, it would be more likely that this short story would be forgotten, and less likely that Shikin would be granted the status of a "great" writer belonging to the canon of national literature.

There are other implications of this distinction. Seki Reiko has referred to faux classical Japanese (*gikobun*) as a "women's clothing style," inasmuch as it was viewed as the proper style for women to write in, and in fact highly literate women did use it regularly in their diaries and in correspondence.[19] In other words, it was probably thought of as the proper dress for a cultured woman's thoughts, statements, and communications to appear in, and it, therefore, became the dominant style among women writers at the time. This would have made it more likely that the colloquial style of Shikin's "Koware yubiwa" would be viewed as non-native, un-traditional, and un-Japanese and may even have been viewed as off-limits to women.

Seki suggests that Wakamatsu Shizuko's colloquial style, with its *masenkatta* at the end of sentences—a form of Japanese associated with Yokohama and the "babbling" of foreigners—provided her expressive freedom and evoked in her readers a sense of repose, joy, and warmth as if she was talking directly to them.[20] This was one of the possible benefits of colloquial styles for women writers. For Shikin too, the fact that the colloquial (*genbun itchi*) was associated with Western cultures, i.e., foreign cultures, probably gave her some expressive freedom and allowed her to speak to her reader in an intimate way in "Broken Ring." This does not mean that expressive freedom was impossible in faux classical Japanese. Ichiyo successfully portrayed modern life with that sort of style. One could say that she portrayed modern life through a pre-modern medium of communication. Comparing the possibilities of the faux classical Japanese style with colloquial (*genbun itchi*) styles around 1890, however, there was

a difference: the colloquial was an entirely new style without a fixed set of conventions and patterns, and it was foreign and experimental compared to Ichiyō's style. Ichiyō's faux classical Japanese was considered both native and as a proper language for a woman to write in. Again, one must keep in mind that most of her readers were men, and the femininity of her style must have been a strong selling point.

Shikin's colloquial style, compared to other colloquial styles, must have felt especially foreign and artificial. As a comparison and as a reference point for her style, one can peruse Miyake Kaho's Western-style novel, *A Songbird in the Grove*. Mentioned above, this novel was modeled after the writing of Tsubouchi Shōyō's (1859-1935) *The Characters of Modern Students* (Tōsei shosei katagi, 1885-86). Tsubouchi was, in fact, one of the main proponents of modern novels and use of the colloquial in fiction, and one of the best known scholars advocating Western literary ideals in Japan. Kaho must have been viewed as a student of Tsubouchi and as a Western-style author, but unlike Shikin, Kaho does not use colloquial for the narrator's voice. In that sense, Shikin's style was probably viewed as even more Western than Kaho's. The writers who used colloquial both for dialogue and for the narrator's voice were viewed as being particularly vulgar by Ōgai. Futabatei, the recognized modernizing novelist of the Meiji Period, was one such writer.

Moreover, Shikin's style employs past tense consistently in "Broken Ring." This is something she shares with the narration style found in many Western novels, and it is something not found in other colloquial works, such as Futabatei's *Floating Clouds*. There, he tended to follow the native convention of shifting into the present tense after initially setting the narration in the past with an explicit past-tense marker at the beginning of a passage.

Finally, in terms of rhythm, too, Shikin's style seems particularly foreign. Tsubouchi did not get away from the classical 5-7 rhythm in *The Temper of Students of Our Time*, but Shikin does in "Broken Ring."[21] All in all, then, not only did Shikin employ a colloquial style but invented one, and the one

she invented could have been perceived as even more foreign than the other colloquial styles then available.

Although genbun itchi tended to be perceived as foreign, it opened the way for new expressive possibilities. At this stage in the colloquialization movement, women could, in a sense, put on clothing that was gender neutral, rather than specifically feminine; they could try out foreign "clothing" and play with various dialects, even the "babbling" of foreigners like Wakamatsu; and they could get away from the sort of "women's clothing" style of an Ichiyō, thereby setting aside the heavy baggage of native traditions. In Japan, as in many modern societies, women have often been, more than men, charged with the duty to defend tradition (however recently invented or re-formulated) from the incursions of foreign modernity. Writing in a colloquial style, especially in a relatively unregulated style such the one invented by Shikin, one free from various confines, including the sort of modern grammarian censorship of later periods, could allow women to envision and represent human relations in the world in new ways. As I have briefly outlined, Shikin's style was an easy-to-read style, it allowed for the imagining of new egalitarian relationships between men and women (however artificial that may have been), and it carried a foreign scent with it. These three characteristics allowed women writers to express themselves more freely and challenge stereotypes and customary expectations of women's roles.

---

[1] Rebecca L. Copeland, Lost Leaves: Women Writers of Meiji Japan (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000) 217.

[2] For an in-depth introduction to Shimizu Shikin's significance as a writer and as a feminist, see Rebecca L. Copeland, Lost Leaves: Women Writers of Meiji Japan (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000).

[3] "Onna bungakusha nanzo deru koto no osoki ya?" in Shimizu Shikin, Shikin zenshū, 1 vol. (Tokyo: Sōdō bunka, 1983) 294-95. This originally appeared in Jogaku zasshi on November 29, 1890.

[4] Shimizu, Shikin zenshū 294.

[5] Shimizu, Shikin zenshū 295.

[6] Shimizu, Shikin zenshū 295.

[7] Shimizu, Shikin zenshū 295.

[8] Joan E. Ericson, "The Origins of the Concept of 'Women's Literature'," Paul Gordon Schalow and Janet A. Walker, eds., The Woman's Hand: Gender and Theory in Japanese Women's Writing (Stanford: Standford UP, 1996) 82.

[9] Joan E. Ericson, "The Origins of the Concept of 'Women's Literature'," Schalow and Walker, eds., The Woman's Hand: Gender and Theory in Japanese Women's Writing 83-4. The gap between men's and women's literacy was not unique to Japan of course. According to Houston, "One of the constants of early modern literacy [in Europe] is that men were far superior to women" in terms of the percentage of men who were literate versus that of women. Illiteracy in Southern and Eastern Europe among women was much more common than among men. An extreme case, e.g., would be Madrid in the 1790s, where only 17 percent of males were illiterate versus 64 percent of females. R. A. Houston, Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education 1500-1800, 2nd ed. (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2002) 144.

[10] Yamamoto Masahide, Kindai buntai hassei no shiteki kenkyū (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1965) 45.

[11] Shimizu, Shikin zenshū 211-32.

[12] Seki Reiko is of a similar opinion in regard to Wakamatsu Shizuko and Tamura Toshiko. Seki Reiko, "Shin jidai no josei bungaku," Henkaku ki no bungaku III, vol. 11, Iwanami koza Nihon bungakushi (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996) 236.

[13] Seki, "Shin jidai no josei bungaku," 239, n13.

[14] Sasabuchi Tomoichi quotes Ōgai as writing in "Koware yubiwa no hyō" (Review of "Koware yubiwa") that her "writing style is the so-called 'genbun itchi' [colloquial] style. Similar to the style of writers such as Bimyō, it does not have any kind of set grammar and similar to Saganoya Omurō's writing there are no modifiers. Rare [for Japanese literature] there are many natural words." Sasabuchi Tomoichi, Meiji Taishō bungaku no bunseki (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 1970) 122. Ōgai's opinion of Bimyō and Saganoya's writing was less than favorable, however, such as when he writes that, "The [writers] who use the new grammar without any distinction between narrative and dialogue, who change between "da" and "desu" in the dialogue according to what is appropriate and stick to one or the other in the narrative are Yamada, Futabatei, and Saganoya...," and as we saw in the previous chapter, he was very critical of such writers of "New Diction," so his noting the naturalness of her language could just as well have been criticism as praise. Katō Shūichi and Maeda Ai, eds., Buntai, vol. 16 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1989) 97.

[15] Masao Miyoshi, Accomplices of Silence: The Modern Japanese Novel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) xiv.

[16] Taguchi Ukichi (1855-1905), although not a novelist, also is remembered as a pioneer of the colloquial, and he emphasized equality more than anyone. Also see Miyoshi, Accomplices of Silence: The Modern Japanese Novel 4.

[17] Charlotte Bunch, "Feminism and Education: Not by Degrees," Quest: A Feminist Quarterly 5 (Summer 1979) (1979): 15-16.

[18] Danly, In the Shade of Spring Leaves: The Life and Writings of Higuchi Ichiyō, a Woman of Letters in Meiji Japan 118.

[19] Seki, "Shin jidai no josei bungaku," 236-37.

[20] Seki, "Shin jidai no josei bungaku," 237.

[21] Karatani Kōjin, Origins of Modern Japanese Literature, Post-contemporary Interventions (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993) 54.