

Emily ANDERSON

Tamura Naoomi's *The Japanese Bride*

Christianity, Nationalism, and Family in Meiji Japan

In 1893, Christian minister Tamura Naoomi provoked a heated debate among his contemporaries when he published an English-language book on Japanese family practices titled *The Japanese Bride*. While the book made no controversial or radical theological arguments, and mentioned Christianity only as a framework that could assist in reforming Japanese family practices and the position of women within the home, Tamura was censured for behavior considered unbecoming a Japanese Christian minister. Published immediately following the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution and the Imperial Rescript on Education, and on the eve of Japan's entry into war with China, the book contradicted and countered many Japanese leaders' claims that Japan was a modernized and civilized empire. This curious and often overlooked controversy provides an interesting window into the complex ways in which ideas such as the proper family, and the link between the family and the state, were considered and defined in this period.

KEYWORDS: Tamura Naoomi — *The Japanese Bride* — Japanese women — family — nationalism — Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai

Emily ANDERSON is a PhD candidate in Japanese history at University of California, Los Angeles.

I^N 1893, Christian minister Tamura Naoomi 田村直臣 published a slim volume in English titled *The Japanese Bride*. The seemingly innocuous book was published by Harper & Brothers and received favorable reviews in the United States.¹ In Japan, however, it was met with condemnation. First the secular press, then the Japanese Christian press, denounced Tamura for daring to expose the Japanese people and nation to ridicule by describing traditional Japanese family and marriage practices to an American audience. Later that year, the Tokyo Presbytery (Tōkyō daiichi chūkai 東京第一中会) of the Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai 日本基督教会 (Church of Christ in Japan) took the drastic step of initiating disciplinary proceedings against Tamura. The following year, when Tamura refused to issue a public apology, the General Conference (*taikai* 大会) revoked his ordination for defaming the Japanese people, behavior deemed unbecoming to a Christian minister.

At first glance, the conference's reaction seems extreme and inappropriate, since Tamura's book made no controversial or radical theological arguments, and mentioned Christianity only as a framework that could assist in reforming Japanese family practices and the position of women within the home. Furthermore, since it was published in English, it was largely inaccessible to the Japanese public, as well as to many of the Japanese Christian leaders who criticized him. Also, much of the content was not new, since it was based on a book Tamura published in 1889 titled *Beikoku no fujin* 米国の婦人 [American women], in which he had also advocated reforming Japanese family practices according to an American Christian model, but for which he had not been criticized (TAMURA 1924, 208).²

But Tamura published *The Japanese Bride* at a critical time. In the four years between the publication of his earlier book and *The Japanese Bride*, a number of historic political events occurred: the establishment of the Meiji Constitution (*Meiji kenpō* 明治憲法) in 1889, the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education (*kyōiku chokugo* 教育勅語) in 1890, and Christian leader and educa-

1. The *New York Times* reviewer commented, "The writer of 'The Japanese Bride' has a charming naivete, and he is delightful when he explains some of the methods of American courtship as he sees them. The pretty little volume deserves readers for the insights it gives us into Japan and for that quaint way of expression which Mr. Tamura possesses." *New York Times*, 27 March 1893.

2. I have been unable to confirm that *Beikoku no fujin* actually received favorable reviews. When it was published in 1889, the *Fukuin shinpō*, in which much of the criticism of *The Japanese Bride* appeared, was on hiatus. There is no mention of the book in any of the other Christian periodicals either. This suggests that whether or not the book was received with enthusiasm, it certainly did not provoke the same kind of controversy that surrounded his later book.

tor Uchimura Kanzō's 内村鑑三 forced resignation from his teaching position for failing to show the Rescript proper respect in 1891.³ Additionally, by 1893 it was apparent that Japan was about to enter into war with China over Korea,⁴ and this impending conflict increased the stakes for defining and regulating the nature and form of what constituted the proper imperial subject, the foundation of the nation—defined as a family-state (*kokka* 国家),⁵ under the emperor—and Japan's reputation among Western imperialist powers. In this atmosphere, while Christians were not the only ones scrutinized and considered suspect by nationalist ideologues such as Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎, they were particularly vulnerable because their religion was considered foreign and Western, and they maintained close, if somewhat difficult, relationships with foreign missionaries.

The “Japanese Bride incident,” though occasionally mentioned in passing in scholarship dealing with late-Meiji ideology,⁶ had limited long-term impact, and failed to attain the public notoriety of Uchimura's incident. At the same time, the debate surrounding the publication of *The Japanese Bride* provides an opportu-

3. Uchimura, who considered himself a patriot, was nonetheless conflicted about the degree of reverence he should show the emperor. When the Imperial Rescript was presented at his school, he nodded his head as a gesture of respect, but did not fully bow (DOHI 1980, 112–13). He was accused of lèse majesté (*fukei* 不敬), and his conduct was further publicized and vilified by the Tokyo Imperial University philosophy professor Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎, who mounted an attack against Christians by claiming that their belief in the Christian God rendered them incapable of becoming good imperial subjects (*kokumin* 国民 or *shinmin* 臣民) (GLUCK 1985, 132). Inoue specifically argued that the spirit of the Imperial Rescript and Christianity were fundamentally incompatible, since “in one word, the purpose of the Imperial Rescript is nationalism (*kokkashugi* 国家主義)” (INOUE 1988, 70). And according to Inoue, Christianity was a-nationalistic (*mu-kokkashugi* 無国家主義), even anti-nationalistic (*hi-kokkashugi* 非国家主義) (INOUE 1988, 70). Christians were not the only ones singled out in this way. The following year, historian Kume Kunitake 久米邦武 published an article in *Shikai* 史海 titled “Shintō wa saiten no kozoku” 神道は祭天の古俗 (Shinto is an outdated custom of heaven worship); though he was a prominent national historian, he was similarly attacked and forced to resign from his position at Tokyo Imperial University (MEHL 1993, 338).

4. The “Korea question” had dominated Japanese foreign policy from as early as the 1870s, and by the early 1890s, the Meiji government was in full-scale preparation for the possibility of military conflict with Qing China over which imperial power would dominate the Korean peninsula. The Korean civil unrest that started in 1893—usually characterized as a series of protests or rebellions led by members of Tonghak—brought the Sino-Japanese conflict to a head. At the time of the Tamura controversy, while actual military conflict was still a year off, the possibility of warfare with China was a very real and central concern in Japan (DUUS 1995, 66).

5. Although *kokka* is usually translated as “state” or “nation-state,” I have used the phrase “family-state” to reflect the explicit focus on the family's position in the state as espoused by Inoue Tetsujirō in his Ministry of Education-sponsored commentary on the Imperial Rescript, in which he maintained that the basis of the nation was *ikkoku ikka* 一国一家 (one nation, one family) (INOUE 2003, 16).

6. See for example GLUCK 1985, 132, and MEHL 1993, 338. Several scholars have addressed the incident at some length. See DOHI (1980, 120–26); ENNS (1993); TAKEDA (2001, 24–63); and ŌTA (1977, 77–117). While they differ slightly in analysis, they generally agree that Tamura was scapegoated by the Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai, which was afraid of being further accused of being unpatriotic following Uchimura Kanzō's well-publicized refusal to show the Imperial Rescript of Education proper respect. Enns and Takeda also suggest to a lesser degree that Presbyterian leaders had personal differences with Tamura, and took advantage of a public situation to settle a personal score.

nity to reconsider what was at stake for leaders within the Protestant Christian community as their religion became increasingly compromised by the rise of emperor-centered—and by extension family-centered—nationalism in Japan, as well as the attempt by Christian leaders to develop a specifically Japanese form of Christianity that could accommodate both faith and nationalist ideology. Specifically, the extreme reaction to the publication of this book and ensuing debates can shed light on the symbolic significance of the place of women and family in this context, since Tamura's characterization and criticism of the Japanese family were the focus of the debate.⁷ Tamura himself, other Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai ministers, American missionaries, and Christians involved in women's reform all commented on the nature and intent of the book, in public as well as in private. Members of each group arrived at different conclusions concerning the truth and accuracy of the book, Tamura's ethics, and how the publication of such a book would affect Western opinion of the Japanese, as well as Japanese views of Christianity. Tamura's act further sparked a debate over what constituted the proper behavior and practices of a Japanese Christian minister.

At the same time, Tamura cannot simply be reduced to a generalized symbol against which his critics directed their fears and anxieties about the position of Christianity in the 1890s. His relationship to his critics extended beyond discourse, and was intensely personal, at times even acrimonious. This incident, therefore, provides insight into the complex and often conflicted nature of relationships among Christian leaders which was necessarily linked to, but not solely dictated by, the larger discourse of nationalism and the place of Christianity within it. Further, his personal experiences provide an important window into the complex and often contested way in which Japanese individuals were exposed to and interpreted the suitability of Christianity and Western (and in Tamura's case, specifically American) practices.

Tamura did not write *The Japanese Bride* in a vacuum; it was the result of a series of personal experiences, exposure to a variety of ideologies, and reaction to both localized and national events and trends. As such, any in-depth analysis of the incident must begin with a larger exploration of Tamura's development as a Christian, minister, scholar, and author. This includes the way in which he was exposed to Christianity, his extensive and somewhat idiosyncratic

7. The discourse surrounding the status of women as a marker of civilization is well-documented and studied; in the study of Japan, however, the debate over the relationship between the place of women and the degree of Japan's modernization has often been studied in relation to the earlier period, specifically as part of early Meiji leaders' anxieties about how Japan was viewed by the West and the Freedom and Popular Rights Movement. To my knowledge, the concern with women's reform as part of the overall modernization project has not been considered in the context of the 1890s and Japan's attempt to position itself as a legitimate modern world power immediately preceding the Sino-Japanese War, except as part of studies of women's movements. See for example SIEVERS 1983, 10–25; MACKIE 1997, 22–41.

experiences studying in the United States, and his often troubled relationship with his contemporaries.

Tamura's Early Years

Tamura was an important early Christian leader, though his role in the development of the Meiji Christian community has generally been overlooked in comparison to his contemporaries. He was an integral part of the ecumenical group of Japanese Christians who founded the Japanese YMCA, as well as the journal *Rikugō zasshi* 六合雜誌 (*Cosmos*), which began as the YMCA's journal (SCHEINER 1970, 110–111). SUZUKI Norihisa (1979, 130) counts Tamura as the fourth “mura” along with the three other “muras” who were integral to the founding and early development of the Japanese Protestant church: Uemura Masahisa 植村正久, Uchimura Kanzō, and Matsumura Kaiseki 松村介石.

At the same time, Tamura was unusual among his Christian contemporaries. It has been argued that many of the early Meiji church leaders came from samurai families that suffered incredible losses, both financial and psychological, with the end of Tokugawa rule (BEST 1966, SCHEINER 1970, YAMAJI 1999). This is true of the leaders in the Yokohama and Tokyo area with whom Tamura had the most contact and who led the charge against him during the “Japanese Bride” incident. Uemura Masahisa was the son of a Tokugawa *hatamoto* family and was left destitute by the regime change (TAKEDA 2001, 43); Ibuka Kajinosuke 井深梶之助, who at fifteen went to defend the castle at Aizu Wakamatsu 会津若松 upon orders of his domain, also suffered firsthand from the Restoration (TAKEDA 2001, 40). While Tamura also witnessed the turmoil of the bakumatsu years, he was not left destitute by the Restoration, nor did he see battle. According to his memoir, *Shinkō gojūnenshi* 信仰五十年史 [A history of fifty years of faith], Tamura was born into an Osaka samurai family, then adopted into a relatively well-off samurai family in Kyoto. As a youth, he and his friends were exposed to the horrors of the civil war, but the extent of their involvement was stealing decapitated heads displayed near the Kamo River (TAMURA 1924, 12–13). When his father traveled to Tokyo in order to try his hand at business, the young Tamura stowed aboard ship, and forced his father to allow him to go to Tokyo where most young men of his acquaintance had already gone (TAMURA 1924, 14).

Many of the Christians who rose to prominence were concentrated in Kumamoto, Yokohama, and Sapporo, areas where American missionaries or teachers opened schools and conducted evangelism.⁸ For instance, Uemura and Ibuka

8. The Kumamoto band members studied with Captain Leroy L. Janes at Kumamoto Yōgakkō (School of Western Learning); the Yokohama band members studied with Dr. James Hepburn, James Ballagh, and S. R. Brown in Yokohama; and the Sapporo band members were influenced by William S. Clark at Sapporo Agricultural College.

made their way to Yokohama to study English at the school operated by Presbyterian missionary S. R. Brown. They eventually converted to Christianity and were core members of a group of converts who came to be known as the Yokohama band 横浜バンド (TAKEDA 2001, 41–43). Tamura, however, attended Tsukiji College 築地大学 in the Tsukiji area of Tokyo, a school operated by Christopher Carrothers, a maverick Presbyterian missionary, his wife, and fellow missionaries Hugh Waddell, D. C. Greene, and W. C. Davison, who served as instructors.⁹ It was at Carrothers's school that Tamura became acquainted with, then converted, to Christianity, through Bible studies led by Carrothers.

Tamura's conflicts with the larger Christian community started while he was still at Carrothers's school. In an incident reported by Tamura as well as by Presbyterian missionary Dr. James Hepburn, Carrothers broke with the other missionaries over a disagreement about the proper Japanese word for Jesus.¹⁰ While Tamura recalled the incident with a touch of sheepishness, remarking how silly the debate seemed in retrospect, the incident nonetheless reveals how Tamura was not fully integrated into the larger Christian community and, while still a young man, was in an antagonistic position in relation to most other Japanese converts. This was further exacerbated when the Carrothers's school was forced to close down after a mere three years. Tamura attributed the Carrothers' difficulties to other Presbyterian missionaries such as D. C. Greene, William Imbrie, and George Knox, whose arrival in Japan at this time made it difficult for the Carrothers to operate their school independent of the mission's policies (TAMURA 1924, 34).

Tamura recounted in his memoir that he initially converted because he believed that in order for Japan to compete with the rest of the world, it needed to adopt the religious system of the West (TAMURA 1924, 24). Despite this rather pragmatic start—which was not unusual among his Japanese contemporaries—he became the only member of the Tsukiji group to pursue ministry as a career. At twenty-one he was ordained by Guido Verbeck, and was appointed to the independent Ginza church in 1879. A few years earlier, the members of the Yokohama band, following the lead of the missionaries who influenced them, had advocated ecumenism and established a non-denominational church in Yokohama. But Tamura and others influenced by Carrothers refused to join, and established Presbyterian churches, including the one in Ginza (TAMURA 1924, 25–27).

9. The Carrothers started Tsukiji Daigaku in 1873 (Meiji 6) in the Tokyo area of Tsukiji.

10. Dr. Hepburn mentions this incident in a letter dated January 10, 1876: “[I]mmediately after the Resol. was passed, [Carrothers] would not allow any one to preach in his church who used the name of Iesu, thus excluding all the young men, five in number, from Yokohama who are in his school, now preparing for the ministry and thus shutting out all the rest of the members of this mission.... He is certainly the most purely self-willed and obstinate individual that I have ever known” (TAKAYA 1955, 140).

Soon after he was ordained, Tamura became entangled in a personal scandal: one of his congregants—a former geisha—accused him of sexual impropriety. Other church members and missionaries came to his aid as character witnesses and his accuser soon dropped her accusation and left the church, but Tamura felt that he had inconvenienced the church, and resigned his position (TAMURA 1924, 106–107). He promptly decided to travel to America “to study more deeply Christian truths, witness the fruit of this teaching, out of a deep desire welling up from inside [of him] to become a great preacher in Japan” (TAMURA 1924, 107).

Tamura's Sojourn in the United States

Tamura had initially converted to Christianity out of curiosity about the West. In the United States, Tamura deepened his admiration for specifically upper-class American Christian practices and beliefs. This phase of Tamura's life figures prominently in the content, themes, and opinions expressed in both *Beikoku no fujin* and *The Japanese Bride*. Tamura left for New York in 1882, and visited two men to whom he had been given letters of introduction by an American missionary friend. His first visit, to the head of the Presbyterian missions agency in New York, ended in failure; the man there told him that missionaries like George Knox and William Imbrie had been sent to Japan specifically to start a seminary for Japanese students, and that Tamura was undermining their efforts by seeking an education in the US. His second visit, to a pastor of a church in Syracuse, was successful. The pastor had already enrolled Tamura at Auburn Seminary, and welcomed him into his home. Tamura's experiences with the pastor's family and other American Christians with whom he became acquainted left a lasting impression on him.

At Auburn, Tamura was most likely exposed to the on-going theological controversy between the Princeton School and more liberal groups over who would direct Reformed theology in America. The Princeton School, so called because its leaders were theologians at Princeton Seminary, maintained a conservative approach to scripture, opposed controversial ideas like Darwinism, and was influenced by Scottish Common Sense philosophy which argued that Biblical infallibility could be demonstrated through empirical evidence (NOLL 1983, 25–40). While Auburn was generally associated with more liberal theological views,¹¹ Tamura's primary influences were apparently more conservative. Wilis Judson Beecher, his closest advisor and the teacher with whom he studied

11. Auburn Seminary was founded in 1821, partly to counter Princeton's orthodoxy (AHLSTROM 2004, 463–64). It later became the site of the writing of the “Auburn Affirmation,” a protest against the Presbyterian Church's “five points of fundamentalism,” which codified certain orthodox theological views, including the inerrancy of Scripture, an orthodox interpretation of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and views on the incarnation, resurrection, and supernatural power of Christ (MARS-DEN 1980, 180).

Hebrew, was described as a conservative: “As earnestly and ably as he has contended with the conservative critics of the day for the unity of the Pentateuch and its Mosaic authorship, he would as willingly accept the very opposite of either of these conclusions if they could be substantiated by evidence” (RIGGS 1890, 11). He also studied theology with Samuel Miles Hopkins and Welch. Welch later contributed money towards Tamura’s ministry activities, and his wife even left Tamura some money in her will (TAMURA 1924, 122). After completing his studies at Auburn, Tamura attended Princeton University, choosing to study the emerging field of psychology, partly because he had become acquainted with president James McCosh’s writings on the subject while still in Japan (TAMURA 1924, 126).¹² McCosh was also known for being one of Princeton’s last Scottish Common Sense philosophers (NOLL 1983, 15). At Princeton, Tamura also studied theology with Francis Patton and Archibald Alexander Hodge, and was invited into the McCoshes’ home (TAMURA 1924, 127–29). He took full advantage of his time in America by traveling across the country and attending sermons given by popular preachers like Henry Ward Beecher, T. DeWitt Talmadge, John Hall, and William Taylor (TAMURA 1924, 127–29).¹³

The *kind* of Christianity to which Tamura was exposed is important, since by the 1880s the American Protestant community was embroiled in a rancorous debate between conservative and liberal theologians and preachers. Whereas the Princeton School attempted to protect and defend orthodox Reformed theology, other preachers like Beecher tried to appeal to a less theologically inclined middle-class audience by stressing the internal experience of Christianity over a strict adherence to doctrine. According to George Marsden, a scholar of American evangelicalism, “Beecher’s message was aimed at relieving the anxieties of his affluent Brooklyn suburbanite audience, who sensed a conflict between their new wealth and the stern Puritan morality in which they had been raised” (MARSDEN 1980, 22–23). By emphasizing a vague morality instead of a morality infused with Puritan anxiety, Beecher offered his audience a form of Christianity through which wealth, social status, and spiritual assurance could be reconciled. Furthermore, such a view also emphasized the role of motherhood and domestic space as the protectors of social morality. For instance, the prolific preacher Dwight L. Moody, who had started out ministering to the poor, came to advocate evangelism as the most effective means of eliminating poverty,

12. James McCosh was one of the first to introduce psychology to academia in the United States. Psychology, which was first included as part of the philosophy department, was made a requirement for undergraduates at Princeton University in 1868, with President McCosh as one of the main instructors. “History of the Psychology Department” (Princeton University: <http://www.princeton.edu/~psychlib/history.htm>, accessed May 2005).

13. Henry Ward Beecher was one of the preeminent public preachers of his day; Talmadge was the pastor of Central Presbyterian Church in New York; John Hall was the pastor of Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church; William Taylor was known as an important Methodist Episcopal missionary to Liberia and India.

crime, and other social problems, since reform was possible only through the establishment of Christian homes (MARS DEN 1980, 37). And the establishment of a Christian home depended on the character of the mother in the home, who was responsible for setting the moral tone for the entire household.

Tamura was not simply a seminary student, but was an eager student of American cultural and social trends, including the customs and practices advocated by preachers like Beecher. Through attending sermons, and visiting the homes of middle- and upper-class American Christians, Tamura was exposed to a theology tailored for the emerging American middle-class that advocated a self-assured morality based on the Christian home. Through his seminary connections, he was also invited into other Christian homes during the summers, when he traveled across the country speaking at churches and in homes about the state of Christianity in Japan. He was admitted into the most elite class of Christian society, and it was his experiences in these homes that influenced his views of the proper model of Christian family life. It was after returning from this trip, with fond memories of these exceptional households, that Tamura penned *Beikoku no fujin* to exhort his compatriots to develop homes like the ones that had welcomed him with open arms.

Beikoku no Fujin: The American Goddess and the Ideal Household

In both the preface to *Beikoku no fujin* and his memoir Tamura wrote that he was deeply impressed and moved by the warmth and hospitality he encountered in American households. In particular, he found the way American men and women related to each other entirely different and vastly superior to male-female relationships in Japan. In the preface to *Beikoku no fujin* Tamura explained that, “My reason for writing this book was to let people know that the male-female relations which seem to have reached the depth of decay [in Japan] might through the morals of Christianity become pure and innocent.... That there is a vast difference between American courtship and marriage customs and Japanese courtship and marriage customs is due to very significant reasons” (TAMURA 1889, 1). Tamura was concerned that most Japanese seemed to be blindly copying Western practices without understanding the reasons and beliefs that served as their foundation, which he understood to be Christianity. He believed that this not only opened Japanese up to foreign ridicule, but that such imitation made those who desired to adopt legitimate Western practices vulnerable to the attack of nationalists who were critical of Western influences on Japan.

Though Tamura later argued that Western ideas had not yet fallen out of favor when he published *Beikoku no fujin*, it is apparent even from the preface to his book that intellectual and popular sentiment was shifting against the wholesale adoption of things Western. For instance, by 1885, the Meiji education system, which had earlier followed the more liberal French model, had been reorga-

nized on the basis of a Prussian model, reflecting the general movement in favor of a more centralized and restrictive form of government (BEST 1966, 106). The nature of the Meiji Constitution had also been rigorously debated in the years leading up to 1889, and in its final form, it codified the relationship between the people and government as that between imperial subjects and the emperor. Furthermore, the 1889 draft of the Civil Code was rejected out of fear that it did not sufficiently reflect “traditional” Japanese family values. The final version, promulgated in 1898, legalized the traditional samurai family and lineage system as the framework for the modern Japanese family (JANSEN 2000, 472). So while Tamura argued in his memoir that *Beikoku no Fujin* conformed to popular sentiment in 1889, he actually published it in the midst of the heated debate over what ideological framework would shape all aspects of Japanese life.

The book is divided into five chapters: “Physical appearance and style,” “How women are treated,” “Men and women’s courtship,” “Process of marriage,” and “The inside of a family.” In each chapter, Tamura offered his Japanese readers firsthand observations of American life which he compared to familiar Japanese practices and conventions. Tamura’s main purpose might have been to inspire his compatriots to reform their family practices, but he chose to present his argument in the form of travel literature. In fact, he repeatedly described different American customs of courtship, engagement, and marriage through the often failed efforts of “a certain Japanese” to compete with American men in courting American women. Further, it is clear that the experiences of this “certain Japanese” were based on his own personal experiences,¹⁴ and Tamura used self-deprecating humor to describe the intricate details of American courtship for a Japanese audience. It is curious that he claimed to write a book that demonstrated how Christianity could provide a firm basis on which to build a family, for the greater part of the book focused not on American families, but on American *women*.

Tamura offered detailed observations about American women, and the first several chapters were devoted to descriptions of their physical appearance, from body shape to clothing and fashion style to attitude. He then compared these observations to the behavior and appearance of Japanese women, and typically Japanese women came up short. He was so impressed (or startled) by the way American women were treated that he declared that in America, women were *onna daimyōjin* 女大明神, or female deities (TAMURA 1889, 31). But he did not merely describe American women, but repeatedly included accounts of interactions between “a certain Japanese” and American women, where the man was presented as a heterosexual masculine figure and they the legitimate objects of

14. For example, Tamura described a visit to Mammoth Caves in Kentucky and observations he made about American married couples in *The Japanese Bride* (59–62) from a first-person perspective, whereas the same incident is recorded in *Beikoku no Fujin* (131–42) as the experience of “a certain Japanese.”

his desire. As Tamura described the American family, social interactions, and courtship rituals, he also showed how a Japanese man might be able to fully participate in this system and ultimately, succeed in obtaining an American bride with whom he could establish a proper warm and loving American Christian home. In addition to advocating the American family system where marriage was supposedly based on mutual love and respect, he also comically depicted Americans as the other, both objects of desire and the inquisitive gaze. This was essentially a safe project, a travelogue, and ultimately, a light-hearted piece.

At the same time, *Beikoku no fujin* was not without its faults, albeit ones that probably would not have raised objections from Tamura's Japanese audience. Though it appears, based on his memoir, that the work is a fair representation of Tamura's experiences in America, much of it is at best a caricature of actual American experiences and customs. By characterizing American women as "gods" and American men as obsessed with gaining the favor of certain women, Tamura elided the realities of women's position and experiences in 1880s America. Furthermore, his description of American courtship rituals is certainly entertaining and dramatic, but would have applied only to a limited segment of society. By conflating all American customs to that which he observed in the few upper-class Christian and missionary homes that he visited, Tamura presented a skewed and generous view of American gender relations. It is unclear whether the exaggerations were intentional, or if Tamura really believed that American homes were like this; nonetheless, by exaggerating the position of women and their importance in society, Tamura perpetuated certain assumptions about Western life while simultaneously enabling his audience to participate in a rather farcical rendition of life in America. But it was this farcical element in English-language writing on Japan that partly motivated Tamura to write *The Japanese Bride*.

The Japanese Bride

The publication of *The Japanese Bride* was also contingent on a trip to the United States, this time in 1892. According to his memoir, Tamura faced opposition to its publication even before he left for his trip. Presbyterian missionary David Thompson paid him a visit and urged him not to publish the book because it would only lead to trouble for Christians in Japan (TAMURA 1924, 211). However, Tamura responded that "as part of my character I encourage fighting with the world, so that even if I face opposition because the world opposed this work, if telling the truth means demonstrating the shortcomings of Japanese, it is still my responsibility [to do this] as one who loves truth" (TAMURA 1924, 212). Tamura later told his critics that he decided to publish *The Japanese Bride* out of his discontent with existing English-language publications on Japanese women. The British poet and journalist Sir Edwin Arnold had just published *Japonica*

(1891) and *Adzuma, or, The Japanese Wife* (1893), and American Christian educator Alice Mabel Bacon had published *Japanese Girls and Women* in 1891 based on her experiences living in Japan among upper-class Japanese Christian women like Tsuda Umeko. Dissatisfied with the often exoticized or romanticized depictions of women in these books, Tamura explained that he decided to write a book that accurately described the experiences and conditions of middle-class Japanese women (*Kirisutokyō shinbun* 22 September 1893).¹⁵ This was not his only motivation. He completed the manuscript for the book just as he was about to leave for a second visit to the United States, this time in order to raise funds for his primary ministry, the Jieikan 自営館, or Industrial Home for Boys. By publishing a book targeted at a general audience, he hoped to earn money to support this ministry. However, it is doubtful that he would have been able to earn much from the publication alone. According to the terms of his contract, he would have had to sell more than five hundred copies to receive any royalties, and would have had to sell three thousand copies to receive one hundred and twenty-five yen (*Kirisutokyō shinbun* 22 September 1893).

The Japanese Bride was loosely based on the material he published in his earlier book, and consisted of eight chapters: “Why Do We Marry?,” “Courting,” “The Go-Between,” “Preparing for the Wedding,” “The Wedding Ceremony,” “The Honeymoon,” “Bride and Bridegroom at Home,” and “Mother and Grandmother.” However, Tamura did not place himself within the narrative, but presented himself as a detached reporter describing truth about Japan that had thus far remained concealed from foreign eyes. Tamura’s tone in the English version for an American audience was descriptive, not dramatic, and the examples lacked the narrative comical quality of *Beikoku no fujin*. Furthermore, the descriptions were passive, and did not include the active Japanese participant so characteristic of the earlier version. There were, no doubt, several reasons for this. In *Beikoku no fujin*, Tamura was writing for a Japanese audience eager to see one of their compatriots fully participate in intricate American rituals and practices. In *The Japanese Bride*, Tamura addressed an American audience, and had to speak not as a fellow citizen who had infiltrated another society, but as a native informant simultaneously divulging information about his own society and demonstrating sufficient knowledge of American customs to prove his own credibility.

Tamura continuously stressed with each example he offered in *The Japanese Bride* that Japanese practices left most people unhappy and unfulfilled. Throughout the book, he directly addressed his Western audience, with statements such as this: “Your young men have many friends among women. They have perfect freedom to meet and associate with them in the parlor, on the streets, in public assemblies, or in private; by sunlight or gaslight or moonlight. Parents permit

15. Tamura was visited by Tagawa Daikichirō 田川大吉郎 and Kageyama Nabekichi (?) 景山鍋吉, representatives of *Fukuin shinpō* and *Kirisutokyō shinbun*, who published their interview with him in their respective papers. *Fukuin shinpō* 1893b, 14–16; *Kirisutokyō shinbun*, 22 September 1893, 6–7.

them to form the most intimate friendships with out any suspicion of wrong. Free country, indeed!" (TAMURA 1893, 10). After establishing a friendly rapport with his audience, he proceeded to reveal to them the Japanese equivalent of these practices: "Our young folks, on the contrary, have no such privileges and freedom. There is a Japanese wall as well as a Chinese wall, and the former separates the young men and women of the land" (TAMURA 1893, 11).

In contrast to the earlier work, Tamura employed a more confessional tone in *The Japanese Bride*. In the preface, he explained to his American readers that "I have frankly painted our home life which foreigners never penetrate, and which most Japanese hesitate to reveal, feeling it to be a shame to open the dark side of our home life in public, and especially before the gaze of foreigners. I have tried to write with sincerity, in the spirit of loving truth, and without any fear" (TAMURA 1893, iv–v). Here Tamura not only suggested that his act of writing would be subject to criticism in Japan, but characterized Japanese home life as something hidden and shameful. While in each work he focused on the position of women in society to discuss society as a whole, both his tone and attitude varied greatly. Whereas in the earlier work he attempted to persuade his Japanese audience of the merits of the American Christian home through a light-hearted and playful narrative, in the latter, he declared to an American audience the dangers and inequalities of the traditional Japanese home. Furthermore, in order to emphasize the differences between Japanese and American practices, Tamura imposed a rigid binary framework, thereby reducing all American practices to generally positive and Christian ones, and making all Japanese practices unpleasant, "backwards," and Buddhist.

Some months after *The Japanese Bride* was published in the United States, articles began to appear in mainstream newspapers such as *Nihon* 日本 and *Yorozu chōhō* 萬朝報 criticizing Tamura. Ōta Yūzō has argued that the authors of the articles in these two papers based their opinion on a review of *The Japanese Bride* that appeared in the English-language paper, *The Japan Mail*, and had not seen or read the actual book (ŌTA 1977, 86).¹⁶ Tamura attempted to publish a Japanese translation of the work under the title *Nihon no hanayome* 日本の花嫁, but this was stopped mid-production by the Ministry of Home Affairs (Naimushō 内務省) when it was found to be in violation of Article 20 of the Shuppan Jōrei 出版条例 (Publication Ordinance), which applied to works published abroad that "disturbed public peace and order and corrupted public morals" (TAMURA 1924, 212; FUJISAWA and UMEMOTO 2003, 371–72). This same law had been used a few years earlier to ban "anti-government" newspapers printed by journalists who had fled to the United States, and later to arrest the journalists when they returned to Japan (MITCHELL 1983, 94). While Tamura was never

16. The first Japanese-language article criticizing Tamura appeared in the *Yorozu chōhō*, 29 July 1893.

arrested or faced criminal charges for attempting to publish a Japanese translation of *The Japanese Bride*, it is evident from the specific charge used against him that the government found the contents of his work subversive and potentially detrimental to “public morals.” It is most likely that what the Ministry of Home Affairs objected to was Tamura’s depiction of the “traditional Japanese family”—which in actuality applied only to former samurai households and not the vast majority of Japanese—the very same family system that the government was attempting to formally codify through the Civil Code as the basis for Japanese families, and by extension, the basis for the relationship between imperial subjects and the emperor. Therefore, the government was no doubt more concerned with preventing the Japanese public from reading Tamura’s critical account of this “traditional” system than with the fact that Tamura had published a book describing this system in English for an American audience.

However, it would be inaccurate to say that Tamura never published ideas that directly criticized the state from a Christian perspective. In 1890, the same year that the Imperial Rescript on Education was issued, Tamura published a short book entitled *Kirisutokyō to seiji* 基督教と政治 [Christianity and politics]. Unlike *Beikoku no fujin* and *The Japanese Bride*, in which Tamura argued for a generalized (and somewhat vague) Christian foundation for the reform of Japanese homes, in this earlier work, Tamura argued that Christianity should be the foundation of both the Japanese state and society. In making this argument, he was also indirectly attacking the political framework of the newly formed Meiji state, including the supreme sovereignty of the emperor that had been formally codified by the Meiji Constitution promulgated only a year earlier. Beginning with a summary of how the emergence of nations had been explained in the past, he argued that nations are in fact endowed by God, and therefore must abide by God’s law (TAMURA 1890, 7). At the same time, he insisted that since Christians believe that nations are established by God, they love their nation, thereby countering anti-Christian arguments by nationalist ideologues by establishing himself as a good patriot concerned with the future of Japan (TAMURA 1890, 10).

While his main argument throughout this work was to establish that Christians were best equipped to reform and purify the nation’s morals, and therefore should fully participate in politics, he also made one crucial controversial argument. He argued that while Christians were as a rule loyal to the ruler of the land—since they believed that the ruler had been ordained by God—it was occasionally necessary for Christians to violate the law if the law of the land contradicted God’s law. In other words, earthly rulers were limited in their jurisdiction and could not violate the freedom that God had given to his people. He invoked the example of Peter and John in Acts when they defended their continuing evangelism before the Sanhedrin—paraphrasing their charge, “Judge for yourselves whether it is right in God’s sight to obey you rather than God”

(Acts 4: 19 NIV)—and then declared that “This is the first instance that Christians demonstrated that there were limits to a government’s authority, and that there are areas where the government’s authority does not extend” (TAMURA 1890, 19). According to Tamura, Christians owed their loyalty to God first, and man (including the Japanese emperor) second.

It is possible that he was not attacked for publishing this work because its publication preceded the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript by six months. As Carol Gluck has demonstrated, the way in which the Rescript was eventually understood was due to a series of detailed and extensive interpretations provided by a number of scholars, but primarily Inoue Tetsujirō, in his official commentary, *Chokugo engi* 勅語衍義, commissioned by the Ministry of Education (GLUCK 1985, 127–29). Perhaps Tamura’s assertion that the role of government was limited failed to spark the same kind of controversy as Uchimura’s *lèse majesté* incident because Christian allegiance to God was not yet perceived as a threat. It is possible that nationalist ideologues such as Inoue simply did not read his book, and therefore did not attack him. Regardless of why Tamura was not attacked by nationalist ideologues for articulating a Christian framework for politics that undermined the authority and sovereignty of the emperor, what is clear is that before publishing *The Japanese Bride*, Tamura had provided his critics with ample opportunity to charge him with unpatriotic and subversive ideas, and to give his Christian colleagues cause for concern that his writings could jeopardize their position amid rising Japanese nationalism. What this suggests is that in 1893, criticizing and attacking the putative traditional Japanese family was possibly more subversive and threatening than explicitly asserting that Christians were bound to their God more than they were bound to their nation.

The Christian Reaction to The Japanese Bride

More significant, however, is that Tamura’s Christian colleagues objected, not to this earlier work or his attempt to publish a Japanese translation of *The Japanese Bride*, but to the English-language original. In fact, Tamura received his harshest criticism from fellow Japanese Christian men deeply involved in and committed to women’s reform, especially Uemura Masahisa and Iwamoto Yoshiharu 巖本善治. Their varied responses to his work demonstrate how issues such as the position of women in Japan, the relationship between Japan and the West (and more particularly between Japanese Christians and Western missionaries), and the relationship between family and nation were far from settled, and increasingly placed Christians in a vulnerable position.

In an editorial in the *Fukuin shinpō* 福音新報 prompted by the first series of critical articles that appeared in the mainstream press, Uemura presented his own concerns with Tamura’s book. Uemura agreed with Tamura’s basic observations about Japanese domestic practices, but made an interesting qualification:

“There is more than a little truth to what he says; however, [these observations] only apply to those lower rungs of society who are beneath us. And so his claim that he represents the entirety of our customs cannot help but cause trouble for the people” (*Fukuin shinpō* 1893a, 1). This statement suggests that Uemura held views similar to Tamura’s concerning traditional Japanese domestic practices. By both acknowledging and qualifying the appropriate target of Tamura’s critique, Uemura attempted to both distance himself from this “lower group” as well as to assert his own enlightened position on domestic practices. As Takeda Kiyoko 武田清子 notes, Uemura held radical views on Christian marriage and the position of women, even among his contemporaries. For instance, when he married his wife, Yamanouchi Sueno 山内季野, a graduate of and later instructor at Ferris Academy, he wrote to her expressing his desire for a marriage based on love (AOYOSHI 1935, 67–69). He even advocated the ordination of women, and was instrumental in the ordination of the first two women ministers in Japan, one of whom was one of his daughters (TAKEDA 2001, 55–56).

Uemura’s primary criticism, therefore, was directed not at the truthfulness of Tamura’s work, but at Tamura’s decision to reveal these observations to a Western audience:

Now, Tamura has maliciously spread these outrageous words, and has ridiculed our compatriots to foreign countries. As for myself, I feel great shame on his behalf, as well as sorrow, for even if something is true, there is no need to inform foreign countries of every little thing about one’s own country. In fact, there is an obligation to conceal.

(*Fukuin shinpō* 1893a)

What Uemura meant by ridicule and the obligation to conceal was clarified when the Tokyo Presbytery of the Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai organized an investigative group consisting of Ibuka Kajinosuke, Kumano Yūshichi 熊野雄七, and Yamamoto Hideteru 山本秀煌, all men close to Uemura, to determine what to do with Tamura (TAMURA 1924, 216). These three men compiled a list of charges against Tamura which they presented to the Tokyo Presbytery on 10 October 1893:

The accused, Reverend Tamura Naoomi, authored an English-language book titled *The Japanese Bride* (*Nihon no hanayome*) which he published in 1893 through the publishers, Harper & Brothers, in New York. This book may be described as flippant and trivial, resorting to both fact and fiction, all jumbled together without any authority, reporting things harmful and humiliating to the Japanese people. He has defamed his compatriots and sullied the position of a Japanese Christian Church minister.

(IBUKA KAJINOSUKE TO SONO JIDAI KANKŌ IINKAI, 1969–1971, 366)

Tamura accused the investigators of being practically illiterate in English,

and incapable of sufficiently understanding the contents of his book, let alone of making informed accusations against him (TAMURA 1924, 220–21).¹⁷ However, their charges were quite detailed. For instance, they provided page numbers and quoted directly from the book to prove their charges against him: his statement in the preface that “Japanese virtue is very pharisaical—in form, not in heart”; page 3—“They [Japanese] have never tasted the sweetness of pure, conjugal love”; page 9—“And it is true that fathers give their children in marriage without a care for their future happiness or prosperity”; page 66—“Though many Japanese feel unwilling to support the father, they cannot help it, because our custom, or rather our morality, urge us to support the father as a solemn duty of sonship; so we will support our parents as a duty, though we have no heart or joy in it”; and page 74—“Therefore she [the daughter] is given to him when she is married just like a bed or a table” (IBUKA 1969–1971, 347).¹⁸ The committee recommended that Tamura be ordered to issue a retraction of his defamatory statements and publish it in at least five major English- and Japanese-language newspapers. However, the group was far from being in agreement on the issue, for when the committee voted, it resulted in a five-five tie. The chair, Ishihara Yasutarō 石原保太郎, cast the tiebreaking vote, deciding against Tamura.

Unlike Uemura, who seems to have generally agreed with Tamura’s observations, Iwamoto Yoshiharu attacked Tamura’s content, motives, and refusal to apologize for his actions. While Uemura’s position within gender and family discourse was incidental to his primary role as a leader of the Yokohama band and the Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai, Iwamoto was primarily known for his role as a Christian educator and reformer of women. As the co-founder and editor of *Jogaku zasshi* 女学雑誌 [Women’s Education Journal] and administrator of Meiji Jogakkō 明治女学校 (Meiji Women’s School), Iwamoto devoted his career to establishing and advocating his view of the proper Christian woman and wife. His particular vision for women’s reform can be found in the founding statement of *Jogaku zasshi*, which declared that “we have established *Jogaku zasshi* with the purpose of improving women’s condition by providing them with a model of ideal womanhood that combines both the Western concept of women’s rights and the traditional virtues of our own country.”¹⁹ His wife, Kashi 甲子, best known by her pen name Wakamatsu Shizuko 若松賤子, was not only the first graduate of Ferris Academy—the first school established by missionaries to educate Japanese girls—and an accomplished translator of Victorian literature, but was the only Japanese member of the editorial staff of the missionary serial, *The Japan Evangelist* (COPELAND 2000, 99–158). Given Iwamoto’s position as a widely

17. The legitimacy of Tamura’s accusation is questionable since Uemura and Ibuka had both studied English under Brown during their youth, and Ibuka had only recently returned from studying at Princeton University, where he received an MA (TAKEDA 2001, 42).

18. I have quoted directly from *The Japanese Bride* rather than directly re-translating the Japanese translation of these passages provided by the committee.

19. *Jogaku zasshi*, 20 July 1885, 3, quoted in COPELAND 2000, 10.

recognized theorist of the position of modern Christian women and their role in marriage, his response to Tamura's publication is particularly significant.

Iwamoto was not simply a passive observer of *The Japanese Bride* controversy; he attended both the Tokyo Presbytery proceedings in 1893 and the General Conference in 1894 when Tamura's ordination was formally revoked, and was singled out in newspaper coverage as one of the principle participants.²⁰ He also visited Tamura at his home and urged him to issue a formal apology, as had been recommended by the Tokyo Presbytery.²¹ Following the General Conference's decision, Iwamoto published a five-page opinion piece in the editorial section (*shasetsu* 社説) of *Jogaku zasshi*, in which he issued his final analysis of the incident.²² This piece is not only a full-fledged attack of Tamura, but uses Tamura's transgressions as examples of behavior, ideas, and opinions that should be avoided by the rest of the Christian community. Iwamoto criticized Tamura on several levels. He began by accusing Tamura of not only making errors of fact, but of doing so in a frivolous manner. He then denounced Tamura for presenting a false picture of Japanese families for consumption by a Western audience. He argued that had Tamura directed his criticisms to his fellow compatriots, he could have been forgiven. However, "[that he] directed his writing to foreigners overseas, and made false claims, and presented these false claims in a flippant and frivolous manner, even laughing as he wrote these things without any thought (nonchalantly, indifferently), is something that the authorities and public morality cannot in any way forgive" (*Jogaku zasshi* 4 July 1894, 701; reprinted FUJISAWA and UMEMOTO 2003, 359). He shared Uemura's concern that Tamura published the book in English. However, Iwamoto also dismissed the book's contents, which Uemura did not. He questioned Tamura's character and patriotism by accusing him of frivolous indifference, which he argued was behavior unsuitable to a minister whose responsibility was to elevate, inspire, and edify his compatriots rather than profit at their expense (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 701).

What is most surprising about Iwamoto's attack is his argument that one of the General Conference's motives in disciplining Tamura was to correct both domestic and foreign opinions about the Japanese family. He praised Oshikawa Masayoshi 押川方義, one of the speakers at the conference, and described Oshikawa's decision to denounce Tamura "a prophetic act." According to Iwamoto, Oshikawa, indignantly defended "the ancient national customs and beautiful traditions that had been passed down through blood by parents to their descen-

20. Iwamoto is mentioned and quoted in *Nihon*, 18 September 1893, coverage of Christian responses to the book, and he is mentioned in *Yubin hōchi shinbun* coverage of the incident (22 September 1893).

21. Tamura mentioned Iwamoto's visit (along with Honda Yōitsu 本多庸一) in his memoir. He only mentioned that Honda, who knew him well, did not reproach him but was very friendly, listened to his determination to stick to the book, and left (TAMURA 1924, 215).

22. The author's name is not listed, but I am assuming that it was written by Iwamoto, both because he was the editor of *Jogaku zasshi*, and because he was intimately involved in the debate.

dents.” Oshikawa then “praised traditional parent-child relationships as something not shameful among the nations...as well as the fact that the relationship between husbands and wives had a beautiful history” (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 701). It is remarkable that Iwamoto, who had devoted himself to reforming traditional attitudes towards women, defended and praised Oshikawa’s statements about the “traditional” Japanese family. Certainly Iwamoto’s vision of reform for women was conservative, since he advocated women’s education so that they could become effective mothers and educators of their children. However, his defense of the traditional Japanese family seems to indicate a shift in his own thinking, most likely influenced by his growing dislike of foreign missionary interference in Japanese Christian affairs.

Iwamoto next criticized Tamura’s motives, and characterized the book as an attempt to curry the favor of American Christians and gain their financial support for evangelism by presenting in an easily readable and affordable form an account of how Buddhist influences had corrupted and marred Japanese society, which would demonstrate the need for Christian evangelism. Iwamoto was not simply anxious about Western opinions of Japan, but objected to American missionaries’ continued interference in the Japanese church. He specifically attacked Tamura for perpetuating the American Christian view of Japan as a country that required foreign missionaries and economic aide to support and nurture an active Christian community. Iwamoto wrote that Tamura not only ignored the successes of evangelism in Japan, but that he “contradicts this, and goes abroad on a campaign requesting their [financial] support, and exposes the shortcomings of the people in order to move foreigners’ sympathies, and gain their support for Japanese evangelism, something endlessly shameful” (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 702; reprinted FUJISAWA and UMEMOTO 2003, 360). His ambivalence towards continued dependence on American support reflected the increasingly conflicted relationship between Japanese Christians and American missionaries. According to Iwamoto, there was nothing wrong with accepting financial support from Americans, since after all, money and willing bodies were the two main requirements for evangelism (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 703). However, he distinguished between accepting donations that were offered out of genuine goodwill and sympathy for evangelistic work, and intentionally seeking out donations and creating works that revealed Japanese shortcomings in order to elicit sympathies and interest in evangelism. He characterized the publication of *The Japanese Bride* as the latter, and accused Tamura of compromising the ability of Japanese Christians to gain independence from American missionaries as a result (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 703; reprinted FUJISAWA and UMEMOTO 2003, 361).

To prove his point, Iwamoto cited the American missionaries’ dismay at Tamura’s dismissal. Following the General Conference meeting, a group of missionaries had submitted a petition in which they expressed their disapproval of the Conference’s decision. In particular, the petition argued that the charges

against Tamura had nothing to do with church doctrine: "...that while it must be admitted there are statements and opinions in *The Japanese Bride* open to criticism because of their lack of good taste and their unfairness, these statements and opinions have no reference to any point of doctrine or government in the standards of the Church, nor, in the opinion of the members of the Council, can the writing of them be properly construed as a moral offence" (*The Japan Evangelist*, August 1894, 346). Iwamoto reserved his most scathing language for these missionaries, and accused them of insolence: "[These missionaries] have come to our empire, knowing nothing of the empire's history, interacting with the people without knowing anything of their character, and from start to finish recklessly [promote] their own people's opinions according to their own country's customs" (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 704; reprinted in FUJISAWA and UMEMOTO 2003, 362). Rather than criticize or denounce the decisions of Japanese Christian authorities, as far as Iwamoto was concerned, the missionaries should just "keep their mouths shut," particularly when the issue at hand related to traditions, emotions, Japanese dispositions, or history (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 703). As his final admonition to them, Iwamoto chided, "If they do choose to open their mouths, they should first fairly and humbly inquire what the majority of influential Japanese think about this issue, and if surprisingly there is a discrepancy with their own opinion, they should repent and conclude that this arises from a difference in national custom, and reflect on this..." (*Jogaku zasshi*, 4 July 1894, 703). As is clear from Iwamoto's admonition, what was at stake with the Tamura controversy was not only how other Japanese perceived Christian patriotism, but how American Christians perceived the progress of Christianity in Japan, and Japanese progress in general. According to Iwamoto, by presenting Japanese families as backward, ignorant, lacking in love—all shortcomings that could be remedied by Christianity—Tamura minimized Japanese Christian authority and made it seem as though Japan was still dependent on foreign evangelism.

The Strange Silence of Women

The voices of Japanese women were conspicuously absent in this debate. Iwamoto's wife, Wakamatsu Shizuko, who had been a frequent contributor to *Jogaku zasshi*, was by this time devoting all of her time to writing and editing the Women's Department column in *The Japan Evangelist*, a missionary journal published for the missions-supporting community abroad. Writing under her married name, Iwamoto Kashi, she commented on Japanese women's place in society, made (often critical) observations about the activities of American women missionaries, and explained Japanese traditions and customs to her American audience.²³ Given the material usually covered in her column, it seems natural to assume

23. Iwamoto Kashi edited both the Women's Department and Children's Department columns in *The Japan Evangelist* from June 1894 until her death from illness in February 1896.

that she would mention this controversy. However, she was strangely silent on the matter. In fact, the only woman who seems to have been involved in the debate was Yajima Kajiko 矢島楯子, founder of the Nihon Kirisutokyō Kyōfūkai 日本基督教矯風会, or the Japanese Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The Kyōfūkai wrote Tamura urging him to issue a public retraction of *The Japanese Bride*. Tamura himself claimed later that they had been pressured by some unknown powerful figure (he uses the term *kuromaku* 黒幕, which can be loosely translated as godfather or power broker) to do this. He wrote in his memoir that he later received a letter from Yajima saying that she had nothing to do with the Kyōfūkai's letter (TAMURA 1924, 215). What is curious about this incident is that it demonstrates a lack of consideration for women's opinions on how Japanese women were depicted in *The Japanese Bride*. In addition to Iwamoto Kashi and Yajima Kajiko, there were numerous other women involved in women's reform and education, who like Iwamoto were educated by Americans or in the United States, and who were more than equipped to participate in the debate.

There are several factors that may have contributed to the conspicuous lack of women's public participation in this debate. In the 1880s, at the height of the Freedom and Popular Rights Movement (*Jiyū minken undō* 自由民権運動), several women, especially Kishida Toshiko 岸田俊子, had attained a degree of public prominence and notoriety, and spoke publicly against the inferior position of women in Japanese families and society (SIEVERS 1983, 33). With the demise of the Liberal Party (*Jiyūtō* 自由党), these women lost their public platform, and they were further silenced by the passage of Article 5 of the Police Security Regulations in 1890, which prohibited women from participating in politics or attending public forums (SIEVERS 1983, 52). Kishida Toshiko did write for *Jogaku zasshi* under her married (and pen) name Nakajima Shōen 中島湘烟, but apparently did not contribute anything in response to the "Japanese Bride" debate (SIEVERS 1983, 47). Fukuda Hideko 福田英子, who had gained notoriety for her role in the Osaka incident (*Osaka jiken* 大阪事件), and who later worked closely with Uchimura Kanzō and leading socialists Sakai Toshihiko 堺利彦 and Kōtoku Shūsui 幸徳秋水 at the *Heimin shinbun* 平民新聞, was not connected with any newspapers or journals that would publish her work in 1893 (MURATA and ŌTA 1998, 669). Women who continued to work or publish following the passage of Article 5 were primarily social reformers, such as Yajima, not political activists. This may suggest that "activist" women were not interested in the public debate surrounding Tamura, but given their prolific writings and speeches concerning the nature of women's position in the home, this is highly unlikely. Rather, their silence, in addition to the silence of Uemura Sueno and Iwamoto Kashi, who were in a position to contribute their opinions in forums like *Jogaku zasshi*, suggests that the debate, though centered around a book that took as its main theme Japanese women, in fact had little to do with Japanese women. Rather,

it was what the position of women symbolized—the degree of Japan’s modern progress—that was at stake.

Conclusion

While American missionaries asserted that writing a book about the Japanese family had nothing to do with Christian doctrine, the Tokyo Presbytery—and the General Conference a year later—convincingly demonstrated that theological and cultural opinions could not be separated. Tamura’s dismissal was not simply the result of anxieties about how Japanese Christians were viewed, but represented a widening division among Japanese Christians concerning the appropriate future of Japanese Christianity in its relationship with the West. Tamura, who had initially converted out of admiration for the West, enjoyed intimate relationships with American Christians, and remained committed to an American Christian model of the family, increasingly found himself in the minority, even among fellow Japanese Christians. Within the context of growing anti-Western sentiment, Japanese Christians were also rethinking their relationship with and dependence on American missionaries and missions agencies. This was no doubt in part brought on by the national trend, but it is also clear that this was largely the result of Japanese converts trying to construct and develop Christian theology and practices that were consistent with their own experiences and communities. The unfolding debate surrounding *The Japanese Bride* must be understood within this context. Unlike the American missionaries, who were convinced that there had to be other reasons besides the book to explain the Nihon Kirisuto Kyōkai’s actions, Uemura and Iwamoto made it clear that a good Japanese minister was not just someone who held to proper doctrine, but was accountable to the nation and a good imperial subject.

But it would be simplistic to reduce the General Conference’s decision to patriotic reactionism; more was at stake than simply proving that Christians could be good patriots. For it appears that the central issue at stake in this incident was competing attitudes towards the legitimacy of the emerging definition of the proper Japanese family, which was intended as the foundation of the new modern Japanese nation-state.²⁴ At the same time, since the family was central to the Japanese nation-state—more specifically, a successfully modernizing nation-state about to compete with the West on the international stage—how other countries perceived the Japanese family, and the position of women within it, directly reflected on how they viewed Japan within the West-determined hierarchy of nations. In this context, Tamura’s book was doubly problematic.

First, “the family,” as an important focus of discourse during this period, was

24. According to Carol Gluck, “the family figured in ideology in the form of Confucian renderings of family and society, the emphasis on the imperial line, moral precepts of loyalty and filiality, and the familial relationship expressed in the Rescript on Education” (GLUCK 1985, 187).

one issue upon which Christians could claim authority, and about which they had been attempting to offer an alternative vision for some time. In other words, much of visible Christian activity, from schools to women's education and moral reform, was focused on the development of a proper, moral, Christian family that would serve as the basis of a strong (eventually Christian) nation. As such, the fact that Tamura attacked the family created a crisis for Christian leaders that went far beyond a fear of nationalist attacks. It jeopardized the effectiveness of their central ministry efforts, and contradicted the shifting focus of their reforms, as demonstrated by Iwamoto's criticism of Tamura, which was to carefully balance a renewed sense of pride in a putative traditional Japanese family system with Christian-based moral reform.

Second, Tamura's book made a critique of this family system available to a Western audience. This had greater significance beyond a vague Japanese anxiety about how they were viewed by the West. Japanese Christians in the 1890s were caught in a complex and often contradictory debate over the benefits and dangers of Westernization. On one hand, they, along with many other Japanese, asserted their independence from Western influences, including missionary support. They proposed alternative forms of religious practice and family structures, and began to glorify the same Japanese traditions that had seemed so distasteful only a few years earlier. At the same time, their claims on independence were based on the argument that Japan had achieved sufficient parity with Western nations. This notion of parity was based on a Western model of modernization, industrialization, and civilization. In other words, though they wanted to separate themselves from direct Western influence and control, their very claims of legitimacy rested on Western definitions of success and progress.

Of greater political consequence, however, was the ideological conflict between Tamura's book and the rhetoric used by intellectuals and politicians to justify Japan's entry into war with China in 1894. The rhetoric used to justify Japan's entry into the war depended specifically on the claim that Japan had achieved social and political parity with the West, and as the most fully modernized Asian country, was in the best position to assist its inferior brother Korea towards civilization. China, on the other hand, represented all that held Asia back, and if Korea were left in the hands of the Chinese, it would be mired down in ignorance and backward tradition. The Sino-Japanese War was Japan's first demonstration of its modern military, so an image of its success and apparent modern-ness was absolutely crucial to the Japanese effort to assert its degree of civilization. As such, the rhetoric emerging from Japan and directed towards both Japanese and Western audiences depended on the acceptance of Japan as a modern and civilized nation. It was this claim that Tamura's book threatened to subvert. By characterizing Japanese families—the very core of the nation—as shameful, backwards, and unhappy, Tamura was in fact defying the central argument of Japanese claims to modern legitimacy.

REFERENCES

- AHLSTROM, Sydney E.
 2004 *A Religious History of the American People*. Second edition. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- AOYOSHI Katsuhisa 青芳勝久
 1935 *Uemura Masahisa den* 植村正久傳. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan.
- BEST, Ernest
 1966 *Christian Faith and Cultural Crisis: The Japanese Case*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- COPELAND, Rebecca
 2000 *Lost Leaves: Women Writers of Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- DOHI Akio 土肥昭夫
 1980 *Nihon Purotesutanto Kirisutokyō shi* 日本プロテスタント・キリスト教史. Tokyo: Shinkyō Shuppansha.
- DUUS, Peter
 1995 *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895–1910*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- ENNS, Robert
 1993 “Slander against our people”: Tamura Naomi [*sic.*] and The Japanese Bride incident. *Japanese Religions* 18/1: 15–46.
- FUJISAWA Matoshi 藤澤全 and UMEMOTO Junko 梅本順子, eds.
 2003 *Tamura Naoomi Nihon no hanayome Beikoku no fujin shiryōshu* 田村直臣日本の花嫁米国の婦人資料集. Tokyo: Ōzorasha.
- Fukuin shinpō* 福音新報
 1893a Uemura Masahisa, “Nihon no hanayome” 日本の花嫁, 18 August.
 1893b Tagawa Daikichirō and Kageyama Nabekichi, “Nihon no hanayome no chosha Tamura Naoomi shi o tou” 日本の花嫁の著者田村直臣氏を訪ふ, 21 September.
- GLUCK, Carol
 1985 *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- IBUKA KAJINOSUKE TO SONO JIDAI KANKŌ IINKAI 井深梶之助とその時代刊行委員会, ed.
 1969–1971 *Ibuka Kajinosuke to sono jidai* 井深梶之助とその時代, vol. 2. Tokyo: Meiji Gakuin.
- INOUE Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎
 1988 *Kyōiku to shūkyō no shōtotsu* 教育と宗教の衝突. Reprinted in *Inoue hakushi to Kirisutokyōto* 井上博士と基督教徒. Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō.

- 2003 *Chokugo engi* 勅語衍義. Reprinted in *Inoue Tetsujirō shū* 井上哲次郎集 vol. 1. Tokyo: Kuresu shuppan.
- JANSEN, Marius B.
2000 *The Making of Modern Japan*. Cambridge, Mass: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- The Japan Evangelist*
1894 Rev. Henry K. Miller, “Daikwai’ and the General Council of Missions,” August.
- Jogaku zasshi* 女学雑誌
1894 “Nihon no hanayome chosha” 日本の花嫁著者, 4 July.
- MACKIE, Vera
1997 *Creating Socialist Women in Japan: Gender, Labor and Activism, 1900–1937*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARSDEN, George M.
1980 *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870–1925*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- MEHL, Margaret
1993 Scholarship and ideology in conflict: The Kume affair, 1892. *Monumenta Nipponica* 48: 337–57.
- MITCHELL, Richard H.
1983 *Censorship in Imperial Japan*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- MURATA Shizuko 村田静子 and ŌTA Motoko 太田素子
1998 *Fukuda Hideko shū* 福田英子集. Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan.
- NOLL, Mark A., ed.
1983 *The Princeton Theology, 1812–1921: Scripture, Science, and Theological Method from Archibald Alexander to Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- ŌTA Yūzō 太田雄三
1977 *Uchimura Kanzō: Sono sekaishugi to Nihonshugi o megutte* 内村鑑三—その世界主義と日本主義をめぐって. Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.
- RIGGS, J. S.
1890 American Old Testament scholars: Willis Judson Beecher. *The Old and New Testament* 11: 7–11.
- SCHEINER, Irwin
1970 *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

SIEVERS, Sharon L.

- 1983 *Flowers in the Salt: The Beginning of Feminist Consciousness in Modern Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

SUZUKI Norihisa 鈴木範久

- 1979 *Meiji shūkyō shichō no kenkyū: Shūkyōgaku koto hajime* 明治宗教思潮の研究—宗教学事始. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai.

TAKAYA, M., ed.

- 1955 *The Letters of Dr. J. C. Hepburn*. Tokyo: Toshin Shobō.

TAKEDA Kiyoko 武田清子

- 2001 *Uemura Masahisa: Sono shisōshiteki kōsatsu* 植村正久—その思想史的考察. Tokyo: Kyōbunkan.

TAMURA Naoomi 田村直臣

- 1889 *Beikoku no fujin* 米国の婦人. Tokyo: Tamura Naoomi.
1890 *Kirisutokyō to seiji* 基督教と政治. Tokyo: Keiseisha.
1893 *The Japanese Bride*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
1924 *Shinkō gojūnenshi* 信仰五十年史. Tokyo: Keiseisha.

YAMAJI Aizan 山路愛山

- 1999 *Essays on the Modern Japanese Church: Christianity in Meiji Japan*. translated by Graham Squires. Ann Arbor, Mich: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan Press.