Supplemental Chapter: "A Re-examination of Restoration Shinto"

MATSU'URA MITSUNOBU

T HE first of the three chapters in this monograph examined the relationship between Takamasa and Atsutane; the second one discussed Takamasa's view on *kokugaku shitaijin* (the four highly esteemed scholars in the Edo period who specialized in Japanese nativistic learning); and the third one considered Takamasa's thoughts on the Shinto religion. Through a thorough examination in the three chapters, it questioned Takamasa's thoughts on the four scholars of nativistic learning, and argued that, although his views on them are acknowledged as one of several interpretations on the history of nativistic learning, it was only one "narrative." Was his narrative objectively correct? If not, what would a new narrative look like? This essay covers the author's response to these questions.

Hirata Atsutane considered Kada no Azumamaro to be the founder of nativistic learning, even though he had little knowledge of him at the time. According to research on nativistic learning that was conducted before World War II, Azumamaro's theory on Shinto was clearly understood as Confucianism. His theory on Shinto is similar to so-called Juka Shinto (Confucian Shinto). Although Kamo no Mabuchi was Azumamaro's disciple, he was critical of Azumamaro's theory. Furthermore, Mabuchi did not build his theory upon Azumamaro's. It was Keichū who influenced Mabuchi academically, and it is widely known that Keichū's "theory on Japanese classical literature" opened Norinaga's eyes to Shinto. Considering these facts, then Keichū should be regarded as the founder of nativistic learning. In terms of academic and ideological characteristics, it would be suitable to classify Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga as one group, and scholars of Japanese classical literature post-Atsutane as another one. Tentatively, we can call the former "nativistic learning of the first period" and the latter "nativistic learning of the latter period" The characteristics of nativistic learning from the second period are marked by rationality, ethics, and morality. Generally speaking, this period can be referred to as "the stream of Confucianism." Moreover, it is likely that the trend of re-evaluating Azumamaro as nativistic learning`s founder emanated from there. *Fukko Shinto* (Restoration Shinto) is a vast and complex subject. It would be difficult to establish the amount of research materials that remain in existence for it, inclusive of those not written. Today, fact-based history research has been subdivided without any limitations. Therefore, if one continues to thoroughly examine the prior work and research materials in an extensive and microscopic manner only, even highly diligent scholars would only be able to conduct research on a few select thinkers in the Restoration Shinto tradition. Despite these limitations, such research itself is important. While micro-level approaches are used for history research, macro-level approaches are also taken into consideration. There is a tendency

---

toward using the the latter approach in narratives of those outside this field. As a scholar of this field, in terms of the history of ideas, the author would like to attempt to examine and analyze Restoration Shinto using a macro approach.

The concept of Restoration Shinto during the early Meiji period
First, the term Restoration Shinto will be examined. Restoration Shinto has been widely accepted as an academic term by scholars of this field. Furthermore, this term has been covered in many Japanese high school history textbooks, and has been thought of as having a self-evident meaning. However, many of those who have conducted case studies of history (i.e. in terms of science, ideas, religion, etc.) would have the following experience: the more in-depth the analysis, the more boundaries between one concept and another would appear to become blurred. In other words, what was once self-evident is not anymore. The following two questions will be explored: When did the term "Restoration Shinto" begin to be used? What was the original meaning of its use? The following research material is part of a manuscript that the governmental office on Shinto drafted in March of the fourth year of the Keiō era (1868), and it is said to be the first time that the term Restoration Shinto was officially used:[1]

> We have a petition that religion in Japan should be Restoration Shinto; thus, we request an investigation of how many local shrines exist in prefectures and provinces as well as how many parishioners those shrines have.

At that time, members of the Tsuwano school were behind this type of Shinto policy of the new government. The Tsuwano school was a political group with Ōkuni Kunimasa as an assistant judicial officer of the Shinto Worship Bureau. Kunimasa was the leader of the Tsuwano school. The main members within this school were Kamei Koremi, the lord of the Tsuwano Domain, and Fukuba Bisei. Takamasa`s methods in classifying the concepts of Shinto in those days were located in his *Zōnensho* (i.e. written opinions submitted to the government). It was drafted in March of 1868, the same year and month of the aforementioned material. It states as follows: [2]

> *Kaden* Style:
> This is the style of the family tradition passed down among the families of Urabe and Tachibana, as well as Ryōbu Shinto and Yui'itsu Shinto (the Yoshida family). This style is referred to as "old Shinto."

> *Moto'ori* Style:
> This is the type of Shinto initiated by Moto'ori Norinaga from Ise. He stated that both Buddhism and Confucian morality were not found in ancient Japan. He completed the forty-four volumes of the *Kojikiden* (Commentary on the *Kojiki*).

> *Hirata* Style:
> This is the type of Shinto initiated by Hirata Atsutane. He incorporated several passages from both the *Kojiki* and the *Nihonshoki* and modified them according to his own thoughts. This form of Shinto adopted many aspects of Taoism, rather than the Japanese language.

---

[1] Mori Mizue, "Fukko Shinto," Kokugakuin Daigaku Nihon Kenkyūsho, *Shintō jiten* (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1994).

[2] *Gonsaikōhōmu yōsho zanpen*, reprinted. Owned by Kōgakkan Daigaku Shinto kenkyūsho. According to Nishikawa Masatami, the original book is *Kamei ke shozōbon* (owned by the Kamei family), and the previous owner of the reprint was Harada Toshiaki.

Okusetsu (a theory based on conjecture) Style:
The *Kaden* Style is "old Shinto" whereas the Moto'ori Style, the Hirata Style, and the *Okusetsu* Style should be called "new Shinto." The last one is something like fluorescence. In regards to "new Shinto," this type of Shinto differs from both the Moto'ori and Hirata Styles. It is based on their own ideas and opinions, such as the Kurozumi sect from Bizen and this author's; namely, the *Okusetsu* Style. [3]

Takamasa divided Shinto into four categories, and we understand that in terms of their content, these can be broadly divided into two eras: "old Shinto" and "new Shinto." Chronologically-speaking, the three styles since Moto'ori Norinaga would be collectively referred to as "new Shinto," while the style before him would be referred to as "old Shinto." If that is the case, then "new Shinto,", mentioned by Takamasa, signified the meaning and content of the term Restoration Shinto during that time. Therefore, during that time, Restoration Shinto referred to "new Shinto ideas initiated after Norinaga's time."

The four great figures of kokugaku and the study of kokugaku history during the modern era
Takamasa opined that Norinaga's academic ideas marked the division of Shinto history into two eras, which could present a valid view. Norinaga's views of Shinto seem to be complete from the viewpoints of both learning and thought. Yet as a matter of course, it is not that his thoughts on Shinto suddenly appeared in complete form within Shinto history. In a sense, a possibility may have existed that Norinaga's complete thoughts on Shinto came to fruition only after a gradual development. Here a question has arisen: if Norinaga marks the turning point, then how far can the flow of his thoughts on Shinto date back? In other words, how could the history of Restoration Shinto have been narrated? This must have been an important subject to scholars of nativistic learning at that time. Nonetheless, Takamasa himself seemed to recognize it, for he had already prepared his own response to it more than ten years prior to *Zōnensho*. The mainstream history of nativistic learning is to regard the four great figures starting with Kada no Azumamaro followed by Kamo no Mabuchi, Moto'ori Norinaga, and finally Hirata Atsutane. However, an additional, but well-known term, was noted. It was believed that that the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning was first presented in *Gakutōbenron*. This book was written by Takamasa when he was 66 years old, and is in the library at Hadahachimangū Shrine. [4] It can be said that *Gakutōbenron* is a systematically well-written book as an early stage-survey of the history of nativistic learning. Needless to say, Takamasa did not write this with a sense of objectivity specific to modern history. The author believes that Takamasa wrote it in order to situate his own study as part of the mainstream of nativistic learning history, and to assert such a position. For in another *Gakutōbenron,* which is different from the *Gakutōbenron* included in *Ōkuni Takamasa Zenshū* (the Collection of Ōkuni Takamasa's Writings), the view of five great figures of nativistic learning, rather than four, was introduced at the end. Takamasa wrote as follows:

I do not equal those four great figures of nativistic learning nor do I have their talent. Yet my disciples, whom I consider to be my own children, adore me as the fifth great figure of nativistic learning based on their feelings towards me like a parental figure.[5]

---

[3] Ibid. This *Zōnensho* is reprinted in *Kokka to shūkyō*, vol.5, *Kindai nihon shisō taikei* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1988); however, two letters were not read but kept blank, the reprinted book of fn. 2 was used as the source book here. In addition, *Zōnensho* was newly reprinted based on the fn.2 and included in a supplement to *Zōho Ōkuni Takamasa zenshū*, Numbered: Ho 201-3.
[4] See Section 1 in Chapter 2 of this book.
[5] *Hirata Atsutane, Ban Nobutomo, Ōkuni Kunimasa*, vol. 50, *Nihon shisō taikei* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1973),

In the last sentence, Takamasa referred to the fifth figure as "himself," which must have confused some scholars in the field. But, as it is not uncommon to find this type of strong self-love in notorious historical figures, such aspects about Takamasa should be unquestioned here. What is academically important is that the basic characteristics of his views of the four great figures of nativistic learning should be the main objective, rather than his personality. Takamasa's interpretation of history based on his opinions is, in other words, a "narrative" on the basis of his judgment. Just because it could be considered an influential viewpoint, it cannot be said that it is a reasonable view, even through objective consideration.

However, after Takamasa, Japanese academics have been confined by his view of the four great figures of nativistic learning. For example, *Keichō irai kokugaku ka ryakuden* (Kokkōsha), written by Ozawa Masatane, published in the 33rd year of the Meiji era (1901), includes a chart of the academic lineage titled "kokugaku dentō ryakufu." At the beginning of this chart, the name of Kada no Azumamaro is presented as the first figure. Obviously, this is based on the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning. Similarly, *Keichō irai kokugakusha shiden* (Aoyamadō shobō), written by Henmi Nakasaburō, published in the 15th year of the Taishō era (1926), includes a chart of the academic lineage titled "kokugaku gakutō ryakufu" at the beginning. (It is included in the original Japanese version but not in this English version.)

At a glance, it can be understood that this chart of the academic lineage is based on the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning. At that time, his view had already become the firmly accepted view in Japanese academia. This situation did not change after the Shōwa era began in 1926. For instance, *Kokugaku hattatsushi*, written by Kiyohara Sadao and published in the 2nd year of the Shōwa era (1927), contained the following chapter settings: [6]

> Introduction
> Chapter 1 Kokugaku before the Tokugawa Era
> Chapter 2 Pioneers of Kokugaku during the Early Modern Period
> Chapter 3 Kada no Azumamaro and his Period
> Chapter 4 Kamo no Mabuchi
> Chapter 5 Mabuchi's Disciples
> Chapter 6 Moto'ori Norinaga
> Chapter 7 Norinaga's Disciples
> Chapter 8 Hirata Atsutane
> Chapter 9 Atsutane's Disciples
> Conclusion

What should be noted here is that this book begins with a chapter titled "Kada no Azumamaro" and ends with a chapter titled "Hirata Atsutane." This kind of chapter setting did not change in *Kokugaku zenshi* written by Nomura Hachirō; published in the 3rd year of the Shōwa period (1928) and revised in the 15th year of the Shōwa era (1940). Its chapter settings are as follows:[7]

> Chapter 1 Outline
> Chapter 2 Pioneers of the Art of Waka Poetry: Toda Mosui
> Chapter 3 Keichū's Mentor: Shimokōbe Chūryū
> Chapter 4 The Founder of New Studies on Ancient Texts: Monk Keichū

---

480. See also Section 2 in Chapter 2.

[6] Kiyohara Sadao, *Kokugaku hattatsushi* (Tokyo: Rokubunkan, 1927).

[7] Nomura Hachirō, *Kokugaku zenshi* (Marui Shoten, 1940, First edition, Tokyo: Kanshoin, 1928).

Chapter 5 The Founder of Kokugaku: Kada no Azumamaro
Chapter 6 Supporter of the Ancient Times (Nara Period?): Kamo no Mabuchi
Chapter 7 Noble Families around Norinaga's Time: Tanikawa Kotosuga and Fujitani
　　　　Nariakira
Chapter 8 One Who Perfected Kokugaku: Moto'ori Norinaga
Chapter 9 Noble Families around Atsutane's Time: Tachibana Moribe, Kagawa Kageki,
　　　　and Kamochi Masazumi
Chapter 10 One Who Values the Ancient History of Japan: Hirata Atsutane
Chapter 11 Conclusion

This book also regards Kada no Azumamaro as "the founder of nativistic learning" and ends with Hirata Atsutane. Overall, it can be said that the historical awareness of either book was restricted by the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning.

  After World War II, such an overview of the history of Japan that was systematically described like the aforementioned has not been found, as far as this author knows. This could have been the case because after World War II, this kind of inductive study based on primary sources diminished, while a type of deductive study based on theories brought from outside Japan increased. As a whole, this situation was caused by outlying factors such as Japan`s defeat in World War II and a pervasive view, caused by the defeat, to negate Japanese studies including academia, journalism, and education. In this environment, the historical role that nativistic learning played became something that "forced the people to give up political involvement and encouraged them to obey and sacrifice."[8] In short, a negative evaluation of nativistic learning's historical role as a feudal ideology became a commonly accepted view, and soon many scholars who grew up in this kind of environment were to take their argument a step further. To these modern scholars, the history of modern Japan appeared to be concerned with the history of "invasion," "discrimination," and "suppression." Due to these negative connotations, they appeared to only look at the negative side of things. In other words, rather than a broad overview of the history of nativistic learning (i.e. *kimongaku* or *mitogaku*), they only looked at the perceived negative aspects. An example would be to assume that someone is a criminal based on assumptions and prejudices, rather than fact, and that after being charged, evidence to find that person guilty would be sought after later. In a sense, it is simple, and in some way, it can be said that they fall into an ideological trap. Either way, with such an approach there seems to be a factor which differs from academic study.

  As a result, a lack of logical development between a process to prove and a conclusion is quite often found among such scholarly works. This might be the result of certains cholars unconsciously preparing a subjective conclusion before investigating primary historical sources. Needless to say, after World War II, a significant number of scholars have been doing research in a different way from the aforementioned way. But it was not possible for even those scholars to confront the atmosphere dominating an entire academic world alone. Most of them chose to conduct research on literary materials. This could be because they tried to resist such an atmosphere with an ideological intention to denounce nativistic learning.

  For reference, there was a scholar who continued Itō Tasaburō's academic achievements and attempted to re-evaluate ideas of nativistic learning from a social history viewpoint; his name was Haga Noboru. Although he amassed a significant quantity of academic achievements based on both primary sources and secondary ones, he did not analyze them closely. As a result, his analysis was rather disorderly.[9] Moreover, when his entire works are considered, he also adopted external

---

[8] Matsumoto San'nosuke, *Kokugaku seiji shisō no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Yūhikaku, 1957, Reprint, Miraisha, 1972), 136.
[9] For example, Section II of Chapter 5 "Suzuki Shigetane to Hirata-tō: Suzuki Shigetane ansatsu no haikei," in Haga

value judgments, similar to overall studies conducted after World War II.

   Above all, such an attempt to inwardly grasp the history of nativistic learning based on materials was scarce. As a result, when one systematically describes nativistic learning, the conventional view of the four great figures of nativistic learning has survived to this day. For example, when we take a look at the most widely used textbook of Japanese history today, titled *Nihonshi B Nihon no rekishi*, the four figures, starting with Azumamaro, are written in gothic font in the section about nativistic learning. Its longevity has been quite surprising.[10]

A question to the view of the four great figures of kokugaku
I have discussed Takamasa's ideas on the four great figures of nativistic learning and its longevity since the end of the Edo period to the present day. The question that should be raised is whether this view should be modified or not, and if so, how should it be modified? Despite being a rough sketch, this authorwould like to present an outline and receive critiques from the reading audience.

   One particular issue will be examined: Should "Kada no Azumamaro" be acknowledged as the "founder of nativistic learning?" The author feels that this view should be modified. Initially, it was Hirata Atsutane who regarded Kada no Azumamaro as "the founder of nativistic learning." Atsutane stated his opinions in his book titled *Tamadasuki*, vol. 9, which Takamasa passed down and spread. However, did Atsutane have much knowledge pertaining to Kada no Azumamaro? It was actually noted that Atsutane did not know much about him. Miyake Kiyoshi, who is said to have conducted "the most systematic and comprehensive study" [11] about Azumamaro, noted that "(Atsutane's) study on Azumamaro was said to have been based only on *Shunyōshū*." [12] Perhaps, this was a correct assumption, based on Miyake`s credentials.

   In other words, Atsutane, had accepted Azumamaro as the founder of nativistic learning without any critique. As a result, no other viewpoints (of Azumamaro as the founder of nativistic learning) carried any weight. This kind of evaluation on Azumamaro was to continue from the end of the Tokugawa Shogunate, when the school of Hirata and Ōkuni reached its peak, to the Taishō period. It was only in the Shōwa period that a serious re-examination of Azumamaro, as the founder of nativistic learning, began. The aforementioned work of Miyake Kiyoshi was its representative work. In the 17th year of the Shōwa period, Miyake published an extensive book with more than 600 pages titled *Kada no Azumamaro*, which finally revealed all of Azumamaro's academic ideas. For instance, Miyake stated Azumamaro's ideas on Shinto as follows:

> It can be said that Azumamaro saw the depth of the volumes of the ages of kami of the *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki*.... Azumamaro's morality is not only fundamentally close to the concepts of China or Confucian thought but also was largely influenced by Chinese texts through reading his explanation for each case. [13]

   After World War II, scholars such as Miki Shōtarō and Ueda Genji continued empirical studies on Azumamaro. Miki's view is that "Azumamaro's entire thoughts on Shinto cannot be included

---

Noboru, *Kinsei chishikijin shakai no kenkyū* (Tokushima: Kyōiku shuppan sentā) includes *honkoku* (deciphered reproduction) of the entire "konotekashiwa." When the author of this article compared it with a manuscript owned by Toyohashi City Library, three mistakes were found whereby several sentences had been moved to an unrelated section. Numerous misinterpretations were also found. Therefore, the *honkoku* of "konotekashiwa" in question is quite rough overall, and should be deemed asacademically unreliable.

[10] Kodama Kōta, *Nihon shi B Nihon no rekishi* (Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppan, 1995), 220.
[11] Ueda Kenji, *Kokugaku no kenkyū sōseiki no hito to gyōseki* (Tokyo: Daimeidō, 1981), 84.
[12] Miyake Kiyoshi, *Kada no Azumamaro* (Tokyo: Unebi Shbō, 1942), Introduction 1.
[13] Ibid., 291-293.

in such a theory of Shinto that was built upon a nativistic learning approach." [14]

Ueda also states as follows:

> Azumamaro learned "universality" from the knowledge of *kangaku* (the study of Chinese classics). It can be said that both his rationality found in his understanding of the volumes of the *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki*, the accounts of the era of kami, and his sense of grasping learnings coherently as a theorist were obtained through *kangaku*. [15]

It can be regarded that these reviews on Azumamaro by both Miki and Ueda supported Miyake's view. In this way, it became clear that Azumamaro's thoughts on Shinto were built on Confucianism. In other words, the more studies on Azumamaro advanced, the more it has been confirmed that his academic ideas were "not nativistic learning."

However, in spite of this, Miyake, Miki, and Ueda did not raise any questions about Azumamaro`s status as a scholar of nativistic learning and never considered excluding him from this category (i.e. scholars of nativistic learning*)*. Because Azumamaro had been a Shinto priest before, this fact may have influenced their decisions. As a result, Azumamaro's morality found in his academic thoughts might have been too appealing for them to ignore. Or perhaps a possibility existed that the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning became a deep-rooted concept to those scholars in the past. Objectively speaking, would it not be impossible to stick to such a view anymore?

This author believes that it is appropriate to categorize Azumamaro, in current academic terms, as a "Confucian Shintoist." Therefore, Azumamaro should not not be included as a mainstream scholar of nativistic learning. Needless to say, whether we recognize Azumamaro as a Confucian Shintoist or not does not impact on his historical importance. Recognizing that Azumamaro was a scholar/theorist similar to Deguchi Nobuyoshi, Yoshikawa Koretari, or Yamazaki Ansai would not have any negative impacts. In addition, this author assumes that such recognition, in this latter group, would help scholars to better understand Azumamaro`s academic thoughts.

For more than one hundred years since Takamasa's *Gakutōbenron*, or for nearly two hundred years since Atsutane's *Tamadasuki*, we have been familiar with the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning. [16] However, the author thinks that it is time to think more freely about the past concepts concerning academic ideas on nativistic learning. Thus, we should not only be constrained to the opinions of the four great figures of nativistic learning.

The concept of nativistic learning history starting with Keichū
Questions have continued to be asked in regards to nativistic learning. Perhaps the biggest question would pertain to our understanding of "Mabuchi as Azumamaro's disciple." In fact, Miyake has already opined on this:

> The formation of the Mabuchi school was, in essence, separation from the Azumamaro school…regarding the structure of the Mabuchi school's academic content,….the structure organizing it systematically as an academic study was not produced by the Azumamaro

---

[14] Miki Shotarō, "Kada no Azumamaro no shinten kenkyū to shintōsetsu", *Kōgakkan Daigaku kiyō* 12 (1974). This article was included later in *Nihonshiōshi no shomondai* (Ise: Kōgakkan Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1989), 87.

[15] Ibid., *Kokugaku no kenkyū sōseiki no hito to gyōseki*, 163.

[16] A section of the seventh year of the Bunsei era (1824) includes a passage, "I revised a draft of Tamadasuki and discarded the old draft." This is included in vol. 6, *Shinshū Hirata Atsutane zenshū* (Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1977), 612.

school. [17]

Perhaps, this view was based on the following description of Mabuchi himself:

(1) Azumamaro was a man of talent with broad knowledge who began to study since he was young; however, he misinterpreted the meaning of the ancient Japanese people. This was because he did not study poetry or literature. [18]
(2) My teacher (Azumamaro) focused on building a path (new Shinto), but that was a mistake. [19]

In short, Mabuchi stated that his study was formed not by following Azumamaro's school of thought but by negating it. On this point, this author suggests looking at details in an aforementioned book, *Kada no Azumamaro*. In order to proceed, a question needs to be addressed: who initiated nativistic learning or Restoration Shinto? Iwahashi Koyata believed that "*kokugaku* was initiated by Mabuchi." [20] Yet, the author questions whether Iwahashi's view is appropriate or not.

What we should verify here is what nativistic learning is in the first place, or in other words, what are the distinct features, exclusively found in nativistic learning, in terms of academic and ideological characteristics. The following features are not necessarily found in nativistic learning only, such as the idea of reverence for kami and the emperor, the negation of the *ekisei kakumei* (an ancient Chinese political concept that incumbent emperors can be overthrown by decree of Heaven), a belief in the afterlife, and the uniqueness and supremacy of Shinto compared to ideas from overseas. As these features also overlap with other types of Shinto such as Confucian Shinto, it cannot be said that these features are exclusively specific to the academic and ideological characteristics of nativistic learning.

Based on Norinaga's academic ideas that the author regards as the complete form of nativistic learning, there are mainly two factors to identify the academic and ideological characteristics specific to nativistic learning:

A. In terms of interpretations of Japanese classical literature, in particular, literary works, a unique standard of values independent from ethics and morality exists, and such a standard is highly evaluated. This leads to such an attitude that an ethical or moral interpretation, or in the end, a rational interpretation is excluded in terms of a study of "the volumes of the ages of kami of the *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki*."
B. An academic base builds on a study of the Japanese language. This leads to the appreciation of the language and its beauty, which creates an atmosphere to avoid arbitrarily interpreting etymology for the study of "the volumes of the ages of kami."

If we regard these two as appropriate views, it concludes that "nativistic learning began not with Mabuchi," but, as expected, with Keichū. It is known that Keichū had a unique standard of values independent from ethics and morality through the fact that he wrote *Genchūshūi* as a commentary on *The Tale of Genji*, which had been criticized as an immoral book. In addition, he was also respected for his significant research achievements on the Japanese language. It is also well-known

---

[17] Ibid., *Kada no Azumamaro*, 596-606.
[18] See a letter dated June 18 of the fifth year of the Meiwa era (1768) sent from Kamo no Mabuchi to Saitō Nobuyuki, vol. 23, *Kamo no Mabuchi zenshū* (Tokyo: Zoku gunsho ruijū kanseikai, 1992), 149.
[19] See a letter dated July 18 of the fifth year of the Meiwa era (1768) sent from Kamo no Mabuchi, ibid., 156.
[20] Iwahashi Koyata, "Kada no Azumamaro no kokugaku," Kokugakuin zasshi 42:3 (1936).

that Keichū's unique Shintoism was established based on his studies.

Two popular passages from Keichu are identified:

a. Japan is a sacred land of kami. Therefore, kami come first in historical works and court ceremonies, and matters about people come after. In ancient times, Japan was governed by Shinto only. As the Japanese people were simple and did not have a written language at that time, the tradition of Shinto was orally passed on through the generations, and Shinto did not form a theory like the way Confucian texts or Buddhist texts preached.[21]

b. Whether kami fits reason or not is beyond human understanding.[22]

Besides these passages, a significant number of phrases from Keichū that convince us that Norinaga's knowledge built upon Keichū's works. Needless to say, his rejection of Confucianism and Buddhism was not found, but the following passage from Norinaga pertainingto Keichū shows that Keichū's academic thoughts itself was the basis of Restoration Shinto:

As for my early study of Shinto, I read the volumes of the ages of kami of the *Nihonshoki* and *Kojiki* as well as various classical or recently written texts. Although I was ambitious I did not particularly begin what I had intended to when I was twenty years old. Yet when I went to Kyoto, I wanted to seriously learn and solidifymy aspirations. I understoodthat while Keichū explored the essence of ancient imperial Japan through following the study of Japanese classical literature, the theories of those who called themselves Shintoists were all quite different. As I understood this in the early stage of my learning and did not have anyone whom I respected as my master, I was deeply concerned about how I should seek the truth of ancient Japan….[23]

When Norinaga lived in Kyoto to study, he read Keichū's works on Japanese classical literature and realized that the theories of "those who called themselves Shintoists" were "all quite different". This is a widely-known article, but this author believes that it should be read more closely. Norinaga stated that through "his study on poetry," Keichū opened his eyes not to the study on Japanese classical literature but to the study of "Shinto." In this regard, the author cannot help but think that those scholars of the modern period lacked understanding on this.

In the modern period, because academic studies have been subdivided without any limitations, we tend to regard fields of study as completely separate disciplines such as literature, the humanities, science, religion, politics, etc. and to examine a matter with such a premise. However, if we trace the origin of each field of study, it must have had one common origin. If we follow this line of thought, the foundation of Norinaga's thoughts on Shinto, as the article suggests, should be "found withinin Keichū's academic thoughts."

Origuchi Shinobu had acknowledged Kobayashi Hideo in the following passage: "Mr. Kobayashi, the base of Moto'ori's thought is, indeed, *The Tale of Genji*."[24] Considering what we have discussed so far, Origuchi's words are truly interesting. We should not regard fields of study as separate, such as the humanities, science, religion, politics, Shinto, literature,linguistics, and history. Furrthermore, we should take into account the original foundations as well. If we do not apply a comprehensive and essential way of thinking , we may end up analyzing only the surface

---

[21] "Manyōdaishōki sōshaku," vol.1, *Keichū zenshū* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1972), 158.

[22] Ibid.

[23] "Tamakatsuma," vol.1, *Moto'ori Noinaga zenshū* (Tokyo: Chikukma Shobō, 1968), 85-86.

[24] Kobayashi Hideo, *Moto'ori Norinaga* (Tokyo: Shinchōsha, 1977), 4.

of the academic ideas of nativistic learning, and as a result, would not be able to understand its full characteristics .

Conclusion
Now that I come to think of it, there seems to be a common flow of ideas among Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga. They all have research achievements on *The Tale of Genji* such as Mabuchi's *Genji monogatari shinshaku* and Norinaga's *Genji monogatari tama no ogushi*, which is not simply a coincidence. If that is the case, it might be a very interesting research topic to examine a way in which each of the scholars who specialized in Japanese classical literature understood or evaluated *The Tale of Genji*. The author thinks that their evaluation or understanding of *The Tale of Genji* could be used as a general standard to identify those nativistic learning scholars' academic and ideological characteristics.

In contemporary academia, the issue of an "academic lineage" of nativistic learning has been thought of as too superficial. For example: a certain master gave a lecture and a disciple was educated; they actually met or not; a letter was received or not; a disciple's name was recorded on "a list of disciples" or not. Indeed, an investigation on whether such outward contacts actually happened or not might be necessary. However, that is not the only means to examine an "academic lineage." In addition, something, not outwardly visible but rather referred to as inward contact (i.e. spiritual), should be considered in future research on academic lineage.

Even if someone has never met nor corresponded with another person, there is a possibility that through reading that person's writings, one could spiritually interact with that person. Furthermore, there might be the case that even by means of writings would not be needed. The author believes that only conducting research on their words or deeds could induce a spiritual relationship with them. In relation to this, Hiraizumi Kiyoshi wrote an essay titled "*Rekishi o tsuranuku meimei no chikara*." [25] Perhaps, Hiraizumi expressed both such a spiritual contact beyond time and space, and academic and ideological power produced by such a contact as "*mei mei no chikara*." In other words, it is a so-called " lineage of spiritual perception." If the history of ideas as a field of study includes such powerful and deep thoughts, an "academic lineage" should be considered important. Based on what has been discussed, this essay identifies Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga as "a group of thoughts" in the history of the study of Japanese classical literature. This term, "a group of thoughts," is used by stressing its ideological characteristics. This essay suggests that this term fits more to each figure's academic and ideological nature rather than the views of the four great figures of nativistic learning. Furthermore, Mabuchi was familiar with Keichū's literary works since his adolescence and was influenced by them. This was verified by past studies, but this essay adds further thoughts to this theme. [26]

A book titled *Santetsu shōden*, was repeatedly reprinted during the Edo period since the first year of the Bunsei period. It was originally compiled by Ryūgō, while Ezawa Tokinaga enlarged and published it. In this book, Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga were regarded as "*santetsu*" (three great figures), and their biographies and waka poems were compiled. [27] This essay's conclusion corresponds to the view of *Santetsu shōden*. Moreover, it is "the view of santetsu" that preceded the view of the four great figures of nativistic learning and the first "narrative" in the history of nativistic learning. To conclude, this essay makes one additional remark. If we accept the view of Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga as "a group of thoughts," how should Atsutane and nativistic learning from the end of the Edo to the Meiji periods be interpreted? As this essay previously mentioned, Atsutane's thoughts differ from those of Norinaga's in nature, so therefore nativistic

---

[25] See Hiraizumi Kiyoshi, *Kokushigaku no shinzui* (Tokyo: Shibundō, 1932).
[26] See Inoue Yutaka, Kamo no Mabuchi no gakumon (Tokyo: Yagi Shoten, 1943).
[27] See Section 1 in Chapter 2 of this book.

learning from the end of the Edo to the Meiji periods should be recognized differently. If we decide to follow a method of dividing the period by Mito school, the period of Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga can be called "the first half of the period of nativistic learning," while the period from Atsutane's era to the Meiji period can be called "the second half of the period of nativistic learning."

For the latter, as space has been exhausted, only key words, which this essay characterizes as "the first half of the period of nativistic learning," are listed here. They are rationality, ethics, and morality. "The first half of the period of nativistic learning" contains these features, and if this essay integrates them into one concept, then it can be referred to as the Confucianism of nativistic learning. Actually, this essay contends that this "flow of Confucianism" was an important factor that led to the re-examination of Azumamaro as the founder of nativistic learning.

Additional Notes

The original work of this chapter was presented at the 45th conference of Shintoshi Gakkai on June 5, 1999. The title of this conference was "Sho shintōsetsu kenkyū no genjō to kongo no kadai" (The current understanding of various theories on Shinto, and outstanding issues), and this author covered "Fukko Shinto." At the conference, besides material for the author's presentation, "Fukko Shinto kankei shuyō bunken mokuroku" (A catalog of main resources related to Fukko Shinto) was distributed. After each presentation was completed, a discussion session was held by the presenters. The catalog and the record of the session were included in *Shintō shi kenkyū* 47:3, 4 (July, October 1993). This did not include the catalog, but the author's comments at the session were summarized as follows:

1. In response to the chairman's question to each presenter whether they had any additional comments:
   During a short break after the author's presentation, the author received constructive comments and questions from several individuals. These additional comments were given as a result.

   In regards to the relationship between Azumamaro and Mabuchi, the author did not imply any absence of relations between the two. For example, taking into account the author's presentation materials, Mabuchi referred to Azumamaro as "master." However, Mabuchi stated that his "master" "misinterpreted the ancient Japanese peoples' meaning." Therefore, the author pointed out that a different issue existed between respecting a teacher and accepting their well-considered academic thoughts.

   Academic thoughts cannot be handed out as gifts by just saying "please have them." The author suggested that what a student learns from their master or what not eventually is related to what the student later creates based on this knowledge. In short, each student's uniqueness is attributed to their own feelings on the subject matter. In the author's view, this aspect should be examined in greater detail.

   Next, remarks were made on the relationship between Japanese literature and Shinto. Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga studied *The Tale of Genji*. However, the *Tale of Genji* aimed to preach morality to people which was next to impossible in the author's opinion.. On the other hand, the actual true nature of human beings can only be expressed in such a "form." The common denominator of these three figures is that they all valued true human nature.

The author would like to add that Norinaga balanced out his academic ideas in a difficult way. Unfortunately, he was unable to mentor someone who could pass on his academic ideas in such a way to integrate both the fields of the ancient path and morality and the fields of poetry and literature. This was a difficult situation, because the students who followed poetry focused on it, while those who followed the ancient path focused on that. Hirata Atsutane wrote in a letter: "there is something I could not tell others, but I am poor at poetry. If I am teased for that, I have no choice but to belittle myself." The author believes that these were his honest feelings in the letter. Thus, after Norinaga, no one was able to continue his vast academic thoughts as a whole, and those who continued work on the ancient path and morality became mainstream historians. This was not a negative situation since such historians were required during that period. However, in the author's opinion, current historians should seek such meanings about these historical processes..

2. In response to the chairman's request to make further comments on the author's previous ideas: "Many of those who have conducted case studies of history (i.e. in terms of science, ideas, religion, etc.) would have the following experience: the more in-depth the analysis, the more boundaries between one concept and another appear to become blurred. In other words, what was once self-evident would not be so anymore." When we speak in academic jargon, we use various kinds of concepts. However, is a concept such an example that we use for the time being due to convenience only? Furthermore, if we do not use it, it would be difficult to discuss a matter and organize a line of discussion, so first defining a concept would be essential. On the other hand, in setting a definition on an object at the moment of defining it something about the object is missing due to the definition. This could be connected to a fundamental problem between man and language. Unless we use a language, we cannot understand things. However, at the moment, when we think we have understood it, something important is lost. Despite our awareness about it, we have to define a concept. In this regard, we are compelled to do it. If we forget that "we are compelled to do it," would we not have an illusion that if we construct concepts like building blocks, academic thought would be formed, or if we link concepts, a flow of academic thought would be shaped? An individual's academic thoughts or the link of several scholars' academic thoughts should not be such. There must be individuals who look at objects of study like building blocks as rational. However, this author believes that this is an assumption of modern scholars.

3. In response to the chairman's question to each presenter about each theory of Shinto views on the relationships between the court and the shogunate, as well as between an emperor and a shogun: In fact, thd author entered the study of *kokugaku* because of his interest in these political ideas. In regards to this question, the author discussed this in his article titled "Bakumatsu kokugakusha no henkaku shisō," in vol. 43, *Kikan nihon shisōshi.* The author regards the issue in question as highly significant, but unfortunately does not have enough time to explain it in greater detail. Therefore, a condensed version follows. Arai Hakuseki compared Ieyasu's unification of Japan to "*tōbu hōbatsu*" (a theory in ancient China about expelling a disqualified prince). In other words, its logic is that as Ieyasu received the will of Heaven, he unified Japan. This a view describes the existence of the shogunate as the will of Heaven. However, Norinaga's contrasting view is the so-called "*taisei inin ron*." Basically, this theory explains that Amaterasu entrusted an emperor to rule Japan, and the emperor entrusted a shogun to rule it. As a result, the shogun ruled the country. This was

in significant contrast to Hakuseki's theory about the existence of the shogunate as the will of Heaven. However, *taisei inin ron* was not linked to the Meiji Restoration. The ideas of Keichū, Mabuchi, and Norinaga were not related to the overthrow of the shogunate. Rather, something like the change of the theoretical framework itself was needed. It was during the very end of the Edo period that it was clearly recognized that in the ideas of *kokugaku* this change had happened.

A scholar of *kokugaku*, Takeo Masatane in Mikawa at the end of the Edo period, was the author of a book titled *Oshibinomitama.* In this book, Takeo distinguished the emperor himself as "Heaven" and the imperial order as "the will of Heaven." This meant that *kokugaku* at that time finally released themselves from *taisei inin ron*. This led to the theory that a government which disobeyed or lost the emperor's trust should be expelled like Kecchū (the tyrants of ancient China). This theory on the overthrow of the shogunate was similar to Zhu Xi's "*ekisei kakumei*" (an ancient Chinese political concept) with distinct Japanese characteristics. Thus, this demonstrates that the "the flow of Confucianism" of *kokugaku* is found in political ideas as well. Details can be found in this author's aforementioned article.