

Mark McNALLY

## Who Speaks for Norinaga?

### Kokugaku Leadership in Nineteenth-Century Japan

Hirata Atsutane's prominence within the Kokugaku tradition is well known, as is his status as the successor to the great scholar, Motoori Norinaga. Atsutane's remarkable ascendance did not happen overnight; indeed, it was at times a controversial process that unfolded over many years. Atsutane's Kokugaku leadership was challenged by Norinaga's sons, Haruniwa and Ōhira, as well as Kido Chidate, a bookseller and financial supporter of Norinaga in Kyoto. The work of the late sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is especially helpful in coming to grips with these sociopolitical interactions. His theory of symbolic capital gives us a way of conceptualizing what dominance meant in the context of nineteenth-century Kokugaku. However, symbolic capital has its limitations when analyzing traditional Japanese cultural institutions. Specifically, the master-disciple practices associated with the *iemoto* system represented a significant impediment to Atsutane's claims of Kokugaku leadership based on his succession of Norinaga. In order to overcome this, Atsutane invoked the discourse of the *dōtō*, and used key relics to substantiate his special status.

KEYWORDS: Kokugaku—Hirata Atsutane—Motoori Norinaga—Motoori Haruniwa—Motoori Ōhira—Kido Chidate—Hattori Nakatsune—*Kiyosōhansho*—*iemoto*—*dōtō*

Mark McNALLY is associate professor of history in the Department of History at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

**D**URING the Tokugawa period, there were several intellectuals who, in one way or another, we could consider the leading figures of Kokugaku 国学.<sup>1</sup> Modern scholars have enshrined these figures as such in the vast literature in Japanese on Kokugaku, and to a lesser extent, in the scholarship of Western languages. The names Kamo no Mabuchi 賀茂真淵 (1697–1769), Ueda Akinari 上田秋成 (1734–1809), Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730–1801), and Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤 (1776–1843) are all well known among contemporary scholars of Tokugawa culture and history. However, the prominence of these Tokugawa intellectuals in the secondary literature does not necessarily shed light on the question of their social positions *in illo tempore*. By focusing on the institutional aspects of Kokugaku, analysis of its leadership is rather straightforward.

Specifically, the most prominent Kokugaku academy (*shijuku* 私塾) of the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries was the one established by the most gifted of the Kokugaku scholars, Motoori Norinaga. In accordance with the master-disciple practices of Tokugawa Japan, Norinaga's successors were his sons, Ōhira 本居大平 (1756–1833) and Haruniwa 本居春庭 (1763–1828). Yet these two men, while respected intellectuals in their own time, are virtually unknown among contemporary scholars, with the exception of Kokugaku specialists. Instead, the rather infamous name of Hirata Atsutane is more commonly associated with Kokugaku leadership both in the secondary literature and in his own time. Thus, the issue is how Atsutane managed to overshadow Ōhira and Haruniwa.

In the decades following Norinaga's death, many Kokugaku scholars made important intellectual contributions to the growing corpus of treatises on Japanese antiquity. None of them made any attempt to challenge the leadership credentials of Norinaga's two sons. Without specifically attacking their positions in the Norinaga School, Atsutane claimed a special place for himself among its members. Some scholars felt threatened enough by Atsutane that they denounced him as a fraud. Perhaps the most vocal of Atsutane's enemies was the scholar Kido Chidate 城戸千楯 (1778–1845), who attempted to rally other members of the Norinaga School to refute Atsutane's claims. The fact that Chidate's notoriety among contemporary scholars is even more obscure than that of Ōhira or Haruniwa is a testament to the fruitlessness of his efforts and the growing strength of Atsutane's influence.

1. Earlier versions of this article were presented at Pomona College, the German Institute for Japanese Studies (Tokyo), and the University of Tübingen (Germany).

Ōhira and Haruniwa, as Norinaga's sons, were the natural leaders of the Norinaga School by virtue of who they were, rather than what they did. Atsutane garnered for himself considerable "symbolic capital," enough for him to gain the attention of other members of the Norinaga School. Despite these efforts, his accumulated capital was not enough to outshine the two sons of Norinaga. In addition, it is important to note that Atsutane's proof of orthodoxy assumed physical form as relics of Norinaga. Thus, the reliance on relics was crucial to Atsutane's effort to garner legitimacy. The significance of relics and the unique definition of orthodoxy that operated within the Norinaga School forced Atsutane to delay his claim of sole leadership within it. While Atsutane certainly made statements that alluded to his special place in the history of Kokugaku, he never attempted to prove it until 1834, five years after Haruniwa's death and just one year after Ōhira's.

The invocation of Pierre Bourdieu's concept of symbolic capital is not uncommon among researchers working in fields outside of Bourdieu's own field of sociology. I have argued elsewhere (MCNALLY 2005) that Bourdieu's ideas are generally useful, if not indispensable, when approaching Hirata Atsutane's scholarly career. The accumulation of symbolic capital helps us understand the ways in which individuals are able to achieve their dominant positions within what Bourdieu called their "fields of cultural production." While Atsutane was able to attain formidable forms of symbolic capital, both in quantity and quality, he delayed his declaration of Kokugaku leadership for reasons related to lineage formation. It is the idea of the lineage, therefore, that does not easily conform to the expectations of symbolic capital.

As important as lineage formation and preservation were to the followers of Kokugaku in the eighteenth and especially nineteenth centuries, it is striking how little attention it has been given in the English secondary literature. Of the three major monograph works produced in the last two decades or so, only Susan Burns has dealt with the issue of lineage formation in any direct way. She sees the Kokugaku lineage, specifically the Four Great Men (*shiushi* or *shitaijin* 四大人), as an ideological product of the early Meiji period, the formulators of which had the intention of suppressing views of Japan's nationhood at odds with their own (see BURNS 2003). Burns, therefore, sets out to restore these voices of dissent represented by non-lineage figures such as Ueda Akinari, Tachibana Moribe 橘守部 (1781–1849), and Fujitani Mitsue 富士谷御杖 (1768–1823). In a significant way, Burns's analysis is a response to Peter Nosco's *Remembering Paradise* (1990). In what one could call the orthodox tradition among especially prewar and wartime Japanese scholars, Nosco's work follows quite closely the Four Great Men lineage by analyzing the ideas of Kada no Azumamaro, Kamo no Mabuchi, and Motoori Norinaga. Nosco does not follow the lineage exactly, however, as he also discusses the life and work of Keichū, and has very little to say

about Hirata Atsutane. Finally, Harry HAROOTUNIAN's *Things Seen and Unseen* (1988) confronted, in its own way, the issue of Kokugaku's lineage. Although, like Nosco, Harootunian also discusses the works of Azumamaro, Mabuchi, and Norinaga, he devotes considerable space to Atsutane's ideas as well. It is difficult to argue that he followed the Four Great Men lineage as closely as Nosco, since Harootunian also focuses much of his analysis on the works of Atsutane's Bakumatsu students and disciples. In none of these English works on Kokugaku, however, was the process of lineage formation itself directly analyzed. Since lineages emphasize selection/inclusion, suppression/exclusion cannot be ignored when analyzing the circumstances of their formation. In the case of Atsutane's succession of Norinaga, the stories of Haruniwa, Ōhira, Kido Chidate, and others must be told.

The study of early modern Kokugaku is possible in a significant way because its followers maintained lineage records from one generation to the next. Thus, it is not an exaggeration to say that lineage formation was crucial to their identities as scholars and teachers. These lineages generally followed the rules of the *iemoto* 家元 system, whose origins lay in the Muromachi period (1336–1575). By analyzing Atsutane's succession of Norinaga, we can see that Atsutane de-emphasized the importance of an *iemoto*-type of lineage in favor of an orthodox lineage, or *dōtō* 道統, that was less predicated on the master-disciple relationship. Consequently, the study of Atsutane's succession of Norinaga demonstrates how the followers of Kokugaku were an important part of the general phenomenon of lineage formation during the Edo period. At the same time, it draws our attention to an area of Tokugawa cultural history that adds a Japanese corollary to Bourdieu's theory of symbolic capital.

#### *The Norinaga School Becomes a Field: 1801–1822*

By the time Norinaga died in 1801, he had amassed a substantial following of students and disciples, perhaps exceeding five hundred. Most of these were from his home province of Ise 伊勢 and nearby provinces, such as Owari 尾張 (RUBINGER 1982, 162); there were, however, students who hailed from as far away as Kyushu. For students who were not able to attend meetings of Norinaga's academy, the Suzunoya 鈴屋, they tried to pursue their scholarship by corresponding with Norinaga and by organizing their own local meetings. With Norinaga's death, most of the members of the Suzunoya continued to meet under the leadership of Ōhira. In 1808, the lord of Kii-Wakayama 紀伊和歌山, Tokugawa Harutomi 徳川治寶 (1771–1852), invited Ōhira to serve as his personal tutor, a post that Norinaga had occupied. In Wakayama, Ōhira established a new academy; at the height of its popularity, Ōhira had more than one thousand enrolled students there (HAGA 1975, 274–75). Following his father's death, Haruniwa accepted

students on his father's behalf, granting them the designation of "posthumous student" (*botsugo no monjin* 没後の門人). With Ōhira's departure from Matsusaka 松阪, Haruniwa assumed control of the Suzunoya, changing its name to the Nochi 後 ("later")-Suzunoya to reflect its new leadership. With these two academies serving as the foundation, students in other parts of Japan perpetuated Norinaga's legacy by opening their own academies. The most important of these were in Edo and Kyoto. I call this confederation of affiliated academies the Norinaga School.

#### MOTOORI HARUNIWA

Norinaga had a prosperous medical practice that allowed him to devote his free time to scholarship, and the Suzunoya thrived during the last three decades of the eighteenth century. It was Norinaga's wish that his academy would continue after his death, and he naturally assumed that Haruniwa would fulfill this role.

Like his father, Haruniwa was also an intellectual prodigy. Haruniwa assisted his father in his research on the *Kojiki* 古事記, which culminated in Norinaga's magnum opus, the *Kojiki-den* 古事記伝 (YAMADA 1983, 98).<sup>2</sup> As Norinaga's parents had done with him, he sent Haruniwa to Kyoto to receive his training as a pediatrician, deciding that the income of a private academy teacher was insufficient to run the household. Around 1790, Haruniwa began to complain about his eyesight, so Norinaga took his son to Nagoya for an evaluation, and the diagnosis was not good. The attending physician informed Norinaga that Haruniwa would eventually become blind. Norinaga was distraught (YAMADA 1983, 30). By 1793, Haruniwa's eyesight began to noticeably deteriorate, and Norinaga turned his attention to the succession of his household and academy.

Norinaga regretfully informed his son that his condition would preclude him from leading the Suzunoya. However, Norinaga did allow Haruniwa to take over the affairs of the household, as well as Norinaga's medical practice; it was only the Suzunoya that he deemed beyond the capacity of his blind son. The fact that Norinaga divided his succession into the household and the academy indicates that the issue of succession was foremost in his mind. Norinaga shared this interest in legitimate succession with his seventeenth-century predecessor, Yamazaki Ansai 山崎闇齋 (1618–1682). As Maruyama Masao has observed, Ansai was consumed by this issue, and it became an obsession that he bequeathed to his students and disciples (see MARUYAMA 1996). A key difference between the two scholars, however, was that Ansai borrowed a discourse on legitimacy and succession from Neo-Confucianism, specifically, the notion of the *dōtō*. As a critic

2. For the biographical details of Haruniwa's life, I have relied mostly on YAMADA Kanzō's *Motoori Haruniwa* (1983).

of Neo-Confucianism, Norinaga consciously avoided adopting such a discourse, leaving the parameters of his own succession somewhat intentionally vague. Although Norinaga was keenly aware of the importance of succession, his opposition to the ready-made discourse of Neo-Confucian orthodoxy precluded him from formulating his own criteria of legitimate succession.

Norinaga believed that Haruniwa's blindness would prevent him from supervising the activities of the Suzunoya; it would also stymie Haruniwa's desire to be a scholar. His advice to Haruniwa before his death was to abandon scholarship and pursue medicine exclusively. Haruniwa, however, had the same dream to be a scholar and teacher as his father. In defiance of Norinaga, Haruniwa conducted his own research on Japanese antiquity. The results of his efforts were the composition of two treatises on ancient Japanese grammar: *Kotoba no kayoji* 詞通路 (The pathways of words) and *Kotoba no yachimata* 詞八衢 (The eight paths of words). Haruniwa's blindness was a serious impediment to his work, and he enlisted the help of his sister, and later, his wife (YAMADA 1983, 99); it is for this reason that his oeuvre was limited to these two studies. Haruniwa devoted his research to the analysis of classical poetry. He argued that the traditional method of *teniwoha* てにをほ (particles) provided only an incomplete insight into the meaning of a given verse. He demonstrated that an analysis of ancient verbs revealed certain conjugational patterns, which served as the key to deciphering classical poetry. Some modern scholars have acknowledged Haruniwa's pioneering work (YAMADA 1983, 95), giving him the kind of recognition that others reserved only for Norinaga.

#### MOTOORI ŌHIRA

Having decided that Haruniwa's disability made him unable to assume control of the Suzunoya, Norinaga was faced with the task of finding a new successor. The logical alternative was to name one of his students, and Norinaga selected the young Inagake Shigeo 稲懸重穂. Shigeo was the son of a Norinaga student whose father had joined the Suzunoya in 1756 (TAMAMURA 1988, 46).<sup>3</sup> Shigeo took the name of Ōhira in 1782, and with his adoption by Norinaga in 1798, he became Motoori Ōhira (TAMAMURA 1988, 21).

Soon after Ōhira became Norinaga's successor, Tokugawa Harutomi declared his recognition of Ōhira's legitimacy (TAMAMURA 1988, 20). Ōhira had the chance to meet with the domainal lord in 1802, the year after Norinaga's death. In 1808, Harutomi invited Ōhira to relocate to Wakayama and assume the position as his personal tutor, and Ōhira accepted (TAMAMURA 1988, 75). There,

3. For those details related to Ōhira's life, I have mostly used TAMAMURA Sadayoshi's *Motoori Ōhira no shōgai* (1988).

Ōhira established his own academy, which became known by Ōhira's nom-de-plume, Fuji-no-kakitsu 藤垣内, a name he took the year of his adoption. Eventually, Ōhira's academy attracted more than one thousand students; along with Haruniwa's academy in Matsusaka, the two centers of the Norinaga School had nearly fifteen hundred students.

As the heir to the Motoori household, Norinaga asked Ōhira to accompany him on his search for a suitable gravesite. The Motoori family had a plot on the grounds of a Buddhist temple in Matsusaka, and the expectation was that Norinaga would be buried there among his ancestors. Norinaga, however, had other ideas. He left instructions to Ōhira and others that he was to have two funerals and two graves (MATSUMOTO 1970, 170). The first would be a Buddhist service in Matsusaka, and Norinaga would have a gravestone erected for him in the temple. For the second service, however, Norinaga ordered that it be a Shinto ceremony, and his mortal remains were to be interred in a separate location. Norinaga's peculiar insistence on having two funerals and two graves was perhaps the result of his research into Shinto eschatology during the composition of the *Kojiki-den*. Norinaga, of course, had argued that the souls of the dead resided in Yomi 黄泉, rather than in a Buddhist paradise. With Ōhira's help, Norinaga selected the top of a hill overlooking Matsusaka called Yamamuroyama 山室山. In addition to the instructions regarding his two funerals, Norinaga ordered that his remains were to be buried at the Yamamuroyama site, and he bequeathed to Ōhira and others the specifications regarding the design of this grave. Except perhaps for the overgrowth, the Yamamuroyama grave looks today much as Norinaga had intended.

Ōhira understood that his selection came at the expense of Haruniwa, and he harbored no illusions about his own abilities. Still, he accepted his role with a seriousness and determination to preserve Norinaga's legacy (TAMAMURA 1988, 22). Ōhira did conduct his own research, specializing in the area of *kagura* 神楽, a form of ritual music and dance associated with Shinto. Perhaps as a result of the considerable administrative work that came with leading the Norinaga School and his own sizable academy, Ōhira was not a prolific scholar; at the same time, his treatises were not considered especially groundbreaking, then or now. Despite Ōhira's interest in *kagura*, he supported Norinaga's assertion that scholarship on Japanese antiquity should not be overly narrow. Norinaga made this observation against Kamo no Mabuchi, who had argued that classical verse, especially those of the *Man'yōshū* 万葉集, took precedence over all other areas of antiquity. By insisting that classical verse was but one aspect of the ancient Way (*kodō* 古道), Norinaga was able to justify his research on prose works such as *Genji monogatari* 源氏物語 and *Kojiki*. Ōhira adopted this axiom of Norinaga, adding that scholars of Japanese antiquity should not limit themselves only to native texts either:

Current adherents of ancient learning (Kokugaku) divide all matters into separate subjects. More and more of them are considering the evidence and correcting the meanings of words. This is a very good development. These are the fundamentals of learning.... Among the students of the Old Man of the Suzunoya (Norinaga), [no one] focuses solely on [Japanese] verse. They broadly study Chinese texts, as well as Japanese ones, such as national histories, legal codes, and ritual texts. (*Kogakuyō*, 30–32)

#### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HARUNIWA AND ŌHIRA

Although Haruniwa had ample reason to resent Ōhira for displacing him as Norinaga's heir, there is no evidence of any initial hostility between the two. However, beginning in 1815, a dispute erupted between them; perhaps not surprisingly, it concerned the issue of succession. Rather than a squabble over who was Norinaga's legitimate successor, since there was no controversy regarding Ōhira's adoption, it was a disagreement concerning the status of each of their own successors. Since Ōhira was the leader of the Norinaga School, did that mean that his successor was its next leader? What would the status of Haruniwa's successor be? These were questions that needed answers, and the one who seemed the most earnest about finding them was Haruniwa.

Haruniwa believed that his father had adopted Ōhira because the perpetuation of the Suzunoya was more important to him than that of his household. Ōhira's biographer, Tamamura Sadayoshi, observes that there were two lineages at stake, a "scholarly lineage" (*gakutō* 学統) and a "blood lineage" (*kettō* 血統). Of the two, Haruniwa argued that it was the former that he and Ōhira were obliged to perpetuate (TAMAMURA 1988, 75). In an attempt to bring the two lineages together, Haruniwa asked Ōhira for permission to adopt Ōhira's eldest son. Haruniwa had his own son, Arisato 本居有郷 (1804–1852), but Haruniwa wanted to send him away for adoption into another family. Ōhira consented to this arrangement in 1815, and he sent his son to Matsusaka. Ōhira then designated his second son as his successor. This plan seemed to work for the next four years, until Ōhira's eldest son suddenly died at the age of thirty-two (YAMADA 1983, 75). Left without an heir, Haruniwa asked to adopt Ōhira's second son. This time, however, Ōhira refused, since he had already rejected a similar request from Tokugawa Harutomi. Ōhira suggested that Haruniwa either bring Arisato back and designate him as successor, or choose another one of Norinaga's grandsons. Ōhira was angry with Haruniwa for putting him in such an awkward position, and Haruniwa was perhaps equally annoyed with Ōhira. Haruniwa eventually relented and named Arisato as his heir.

Unfortunately for Ōhira, his second son also died prematurely in 1821 at the age of thirty-three (YAMADA 1983, 76). Without any other sons, Ōhira was

forced to adopt, naming Togashi Hirokage 富樫広蔭 (1792–1873) as his successor in 1822. Hirokage had joined Ōhira's academy only the previous year. Since he was deeply interested in ancient linguistics, Ōhira sent him to Matsusaka to study with Haruniwa (YAMADA 1983, 88–89). During Hirokage's time in Matsusaka, he developed a deep admiration and fondness for Haruniwa. Upon returning to Wakayama, he took ill, and his health became enough of an issue that he quit Ōhira's household, leaving him without an heir once again. Although Hirokage used his illness as a reason for leaving Ōhira, his relationship with Haruniwa was most likely what motivated his decision. Indeed, after Hirokage recovered, he left Wakayama to take up residence in Matsusaka in 1823. There he became one of Haruniwa's most trusted students (YAMADA 1983, 89). After Hirokage quit Ōhira's family, due at least in part to Haruniwa, Ōhira's anger grew even stronger (TAMAMURA 1988, 84). He was forced to adopt yet again, only this time he chose one of his nephews, his sister's son. His nephew took the name of Uchitō 本居内遠 (1792–1855), and Uchitō's health and resolve were stronger than any of Ōhira's three previous designated successors. For Haruniwa, Arisato proved to be a capable scholar. With the succession of both households stabilized by 1823, relations gradually began to improve between Ōhira and Haruniwa once again.

#### KIDO CHIDATE

Although Haruniwa and Ōhira were Norinaga's sons, and their leadership in the Norinaga School was unquestioned, there were other members who had leading roles as well. The most important of these members were those who founded academies affiliated with either Haruniwa or Ōhira. The Kyoto scholar Kido Chidate (1778–1845) was one such member. Chidate was a bookseller and publisher who joined the Suzunoya in 1787. He was mostly interested in classical poetry, a facet of Kokugaku that was not the most prominent in Norinaga's research, so he joined the academy of Arakida Hisaoyu 荒木田久老 (1746–1804), a student of Mabuchi, sometime after Norinaga's death.<sup>4</sup> Chidate founded his private academy in Kyoto, which he called the Nudenoya 鐸屋, in 1816. The Nudenoya became the most important of the academies of the Norinaga School outside of Matsusaka and Wakayama. In 1826, a fire consumed and destroyed the academy. Worried about the future of his students, Chidate met with the Osaka scholar Murata Harukado 村田春門 (1765–1836), another member of the Norinaga School. Under Harukado's leadership, the Nudenoya began meeting once again a few months later (*Shimimuro zakki*, 6).

4. For an analysis of the ideological differences between the Norinaga School and the Mabuchi School, as represented by Hisaoyu, see TEEUWEN 1997.

Like his friend and mentor, Ōhira, Chidate was not renowned for either his brilliance or productivity. He was the author of only a handful of works, and the ideas that they present merely parrot the views of previous Kokugaku scholars, especially Mabuchi and Norinaga. Despite the fact that Chidate and Ōhira were on good terms, Chidate disagreed with the notion that Kokugaku scholarship had to be broad in scope. On this issue, Chidate's views were actually closer to those of Mabuchi and his students, particularly those living in Edo. Kokugaku scholarship began with classical verse, and Chidate believed that any legitimate sub-field was merely an offshoot from it: "On Learning: One should study well the songs of the *Nihongi* 日本紀, the songs of the *Kojiki*, the *Man'yōshū*, the *norito* 祝詞 of the *Engishiki* 延喜式, and the imperial decrees of the *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀. Then, one should undertake [to compose] the verse of antiquity" (*Shimimuro zakki*, 236).

Chidate defined Kokugaku quite simply: "The Way of ancient learning (Kokugaku) [means] to pore over the texts of antiquity in particular, to ponder the essence of the Age of the kami, and to appreciate the sublime and reverent origins of the imperial, august land" (*Manabi no hiromichi*, 280). He supported Norinaga's assertion that the study of antiquity was not a socially irrelevant undertaking. Scholars who examined the classical sources discovered, he argued, that the ancients had a deep respect for their emperors that was the foundation of their obedience. The perfect union of ancient emperors and the Japanese people made antiquity superior to the contemporary world, and it surpassed foreign cultures as well: "Norinaga explained in detail the inherent superiority of the antiquity of the imperial realm to foreign lands in all things, starting with its rice" (*Manabi no hiromichi*, 281). Although Chidate acknowledged Norinaga's research on the *Kojiki* as foundational for Kokugaku, he emphasized the importance of classical verse even more, especially those of the *Man'yōshū*. It was in this eighth-century anthology that one found abundant evidence of the centrality of the emperor in the lives of the ancients: "[The *Man'yōshū* demonstrates] that the emperor is a kami... [The emperor rules] the realm, so that we reverently serve him, as well as the mountains, rivers, plants, and trees" (*Manabi no hiromichi*, 288).

It is clear that there was an ideological tension in Chidate's writings between upholding Norinaga's inclusive view of Kokugaku, and Chidate's insistence on the special role of the *Man'yōshū*:

The texts that we must learn are, first of all, the *Furukotobumi* (*Kojiki*), the *Yamatobumi* (*Nihongi*), and various others. The gist of these texts is that the meanings and words (*kokorokotoba* 心詞) of a time far removed from our own are difficult to explicate directly with the contemporary mind. Thus, we must widely peruse these texts and consider the commentaries of our venerable master (Norinaga) and those of others. *The verse of antiquity was the [vehicle] for the meanings and words of ancient people. Thus, we must devote ourselves to*

*the reading and composition of verse in the ancient style, so that we can unite our minds with antiquity.* (Manabi no hiromichi, 284, emphasis added)

For Chidate, the study of classical verse represented a means to enter the past spiritually. Once properly immersed in antiquity, the scholar would discover the true reverence and awe in which the ancients beheld their emperors. The composition of *Man'yōshū*-style poetry, therefore, was not merely an aesthetic exercise. At the same time, it had a social, political, and religious significance:

It is pointless to view [the verses of the *Man'yōshū*] as only songs (*uta* 歌). These are the recorded proof (*akashi ni no setaru mono zo* あかしに載たる物ぞ) of the honest, upright, and loyal words and meanings of the people of high antiquity.... Beginning with the emperors of the past, we must realize that the emperor is a manifest kami who now rules all under heaven. We must realize that the imperial realm is different from foreign realms and that it should certainly rule [over them], along with heaven and earth.

(*Manabi no hiromichi*, 290–91)

#### HIRATA ATSUTANE

Hirata Atsutane also became a leading figure of the Norinaga School in the years following Norinaga's death. His scholarly career, however, had a more obscure beginning than those of other members. Perhaps his greatest disadvantage was the fact that he never actually met Norinaga. Although he was twenty-five the year of Norinaga's passing, he later confessed to his students that he had not yet even heard of Norinaga's name at that time. Instead, his interest in Kokugaku developed after 1801 in meetings that Atsutane had with Edo scholars already familiar with Norinaga's work. Subsequently, Atsutane's enthusiasm for Kokugaku grew, and he eventually established his own private academy in 1804. It was at this time that he completed his first treatise, the *Kamōsho* 呵妄書, a reply to Dazai Shundai's 太宰春台 (1680–1747) contemptuous dismissal of Shinto in the *Bendōsho* 弁道書. Atsutane's refutation came several decades after Shundai's death, and it earned him very little notice among other scholars. He began work on a new book, the *Kishinshinron* 鬼神新論, in which he argued for the real existence of spirits. As he labored on this treatise, his friend and colleague, Ban Nobutomo 伴信友 (1772–1846), told him of his recent enrollment as a student of Motoori Ōhira. Nobutomo offered to send a letter of introduction to Ōhira, as a prelude to Atsutane's enrollment. When the first draft of *Kishinshinron* was completed, Atsutane sent the manuscript to Ōhira with a request for some remarks that he wanted to use as a preface. He never received a reply from Ōhira; thinking that this was an indication that Ōhira disapproved of his work, Atsutane wrote a letter to Haruniwa, asking for permission to become his student. Haruniwa

noted in his reply that other Edo scholars had vouched for Atsutane, and that he was impressed with Atsutane's enthusiasm, symbolized by Atsutane's claim that he was visited by Norinaga's spirit in a dream the year before in 1805. Haruniwa accepted Atsutane, and he and the students in his academy, the Ibukinoya 気吹舎, officially became part of the Norinaga School.

Although Atsutane managed to join the Norinaga School, he was a rather anonymous figure, a condition that his Edo residency only made worse. If he was to fulfill his ambitions of becoming a leading disciple, which his dream meeting with Norinaga convinced him that he was, then he would have to find a way to get the attention of the other members of the Norinaga School. Luckily for him, he found a way during research on his third major work, the *Tama no mihashira* 霊の真柱 (The true pillar of the soul). This work was an extension of the *Kishinshinron*, only this time Atsutane attempted to ground his theory of spirits in the native classics. He read the commentaries of his Norinaga School colleagues, especially one penned by an Ise student named Hattori Nakatsune 服部中庸 (1756–1824). In his examination of the *Kojiki*, Nakatsune discovered that its creation story was missing any reference to the moon. He believed that scholars should interpret the stories of the *kamiyo* 神代 (Age of the kami) metaphorically rather than literally. Surely, the ancients would not have intentionally omitted something as important as the moon in their myths, he reasoned. He deduced that Yomi, which scholars had traditionally viewed as the realm of the afterlife, was another name for the moon (*Sandaikō*, 263). Norinaga was impressed with Nakatsune's study, called the *Sandaikō*, and he ordered that it be published as part of his *Kojiki-den*. Nakatsune's new interpretation of Yomi gave Atsutane the basis for writing the *Tama no mihashira*. Specifically, Atsutane accepted Nakatsune's interpretation of Yomi as the moon, but he argued that Yomi was not the true "destination of the soul" (*tama no yukue* 魂の往方) (*Tama no mihashira*, 118–19). Instead, the souls of the dead disappeared into an invisible realm over which the kami, Ōkuni-nushi 大国主, presided. It was from this spiritual realm that the ancestors were able to protect their living descendants; thus, it was imperative, Atsutane argued, that the rituals of ancestor worship be undertaken with a true faith, and not simply practiced pro forma. After publishing his work in 1812, Atsutane generated for himself some vigorous denunciations by other members of the Norinaga School. This developed into a condition in which, in the words of Pierre Bourdieu, "adversaries whom one would prefer to destroy by ignoring them cannot be combated without consecrating them" (BOURDIEU 1993, 42). He had succeeded in getting their attention.

Many students in the Norinaga School wrote refutations of either Nakatsune, or Atsutane, and in some cases, both. One of the first of these was written by Motoori Ōhira, who wrote his *Sandaikō-ben* 三大考辨 (A discussion of the cosmic triad) several years before the publication of the *Tama no mihashira*.

Atsutane assumed the responsibility for defending not only his own work, but Nakatsune's as well. One of the assertions made by Nakatsune in support of his contention that Yomi was the moon was that Tsukiyomi (or Tsukuyomi 月読), a kami of the moon, was actually Susano-o 須佐之男. Since Susano-o had a connection with Yomi, Nakatsune believed that he had successfully linked Yomi to the moon. In a refutation of Ōhira in defense of Nakatsune, Atsutane made the following argument:

In the *Sandaikō*, [Nakatsune] proved the fact that [the two] are one kami. Thus, the august name, whether Susano-o or Tsukiyomi, originally [signified] the same kami. There used to be no problem with this [fact]. However, how could the author [of the *Sandaikō-ben*] think that he has kept track of [all of] the august names? (For example, in one historical record it says Ashikaga-dono 足利殿, and in another, Minamoto Takauji 源尊氏, and in another, Jibu Taifu 治部大輔. It is as if they were all different people [yet they were not].

(*Sandaikō-benben*, 257)

The above are historical analogies. Atsutane came back to this issue a little later in his argument by citing a scientific example, perhaps inspired by Dutch Learning: “Trying to [interpret two names as] two kami in a text is the same as saying that water is [only] water. So, without hesitation, [one will say] that something else is not water, even though it [really] is. In fact, it [could be] ice. Thus, to claim that water and ice are one and the same is to understand this concept well” (*Sandaikō-benben*, 262).

The criticisms leveled against Nakatsune and Atsutane fell into either of two categories. In the first place, Ōhira and others dismissed the notion that metaphorical interpretations were appropriate for the native classics. These scholars viewed Japan's classical literature as scriptural in nature, and scriptural exegesis should never become a subjective endeavor. Atsutane's critics noted that those scholars who considered themselves to be followers of Norinaga should explicate the classics as they were, and they invoked Norinaga's axiom that “one should interpret and understand the transmissions of antiquity without adding one's subjective views to even one ideograph or word” (MSHNN, 458).

The second criticism of Atsutane and Nakatsune was that their methodology was inspired by Dutch Learning. The refutation of metaphorical interpretations was partially related to this accusation of surreptitious borrowing from Dutch Learning, but it was also connected to Norinaga's denunciation of the subjective interpretations produced by the Neo-Confucians. As was the case with Confucianism and Buddhism, the fundamental problem with Dutch Learning was that it was a foreign form of knowledge. The critics of Atsutane and Nakatsune explained that only native exegetical principles were appropriate for the analysis of Japanese antiquity. One of these scholars was Kido Chidate who joined the

chorus of anti-Atsutane scholars a few years after the publication of the *Tama no mihashira*. Although he admitted, if only grudgingly, that Dutch Learning was useful for some things, the wisdom of Japanese antiquity defied elucidation by Dutch Learning:

The application of principle to the various mysteries of the kami is something that scholars of ancient learning generally consider doing, and that is fine. However, since [they] forcibly seek to investigate and understand, in the end, only “false theories” (*higakoto* 僻説) emerge, which confuse people. Do they not unknowingly turn their backs on the meaning of the correct Way of the imperial realm?... All discussions of heaven and earth, even those of foreign lands are... all conjectures. Not only do [the scholars who produce them] not grasp the correct transmissions, but also they cannot truly comprehend them. Among these are [the scholars of] the recently developed Dutch Learning... With the details that they observe, they ponder everything by guessing, so that [they reach] only a superficial level [of understanding]. Thus, [Dutch Learning] has its limitations... [I]n Dutch medicine, they peel back the skin of a corpse and look inside; through careful examination using various principles they conclude that this is a muscle, this a bone, and this is some sort of flesh. They have determined that the voice touches a certain place, resulting in the emergence of sound; and [they have explored] how food is digested. However, when [the subject is] the soul (*tama* 魂), they speak voluminously using the principles in their minds. What are these principles?... [We] should realize that this [form of] learning cannot fathom the fantastic mysteries in heaven and earth. (*Manabi no hiromichi*, 311–12)

### *Atsutane's Journey to Kyoto*

Atsutane had never traveled to the western provinces. As a resident of Edo, he lived on the geographic periphery of the Norinaga School. After he had established the Ibukinoya, he longed to see the Kansai region and to meet his colleagues there, especially Ōhira and Haruniwa. With an invitation from one of his students from Kansai, he made travel plans around 1816, but had to scuttle them for family reasons. Then, in 1823, representatives from Kan'ei-ji 寛永寺 transmitted a message to him from some Kyoto aristocrats asking Atsutane to come to Kyoto and offer copies of his books for presentation to the imperial court (WATANABE 1943, 67). After making arrangements with the Itakura 板倉 family, whom Atsutane served as a physician, he departed on the twenty-second day of the seventh month.

By 1823, Atsutane was an established member of the Norinaga School, occupying a distinct position in its “field of cultural production.” His trajectory toward leadership meant that, at some point, he would have to accumulate sub-

stantial forms of symbolic capital. His sojourn to Kansai presented him with the chance to obtain this capital, chiefly in the form of relics, or as potential relics. His experiences traveling in the western provinces positioned Atsutane to eventually make his claims of leadership over the Norinaga School.

#### THE IMPERIAL COURT

Atsutane arrived in Kyoto on the sixth day of the eighth month. After spending a few weeks sightseeing and visiting with other scholars (more on this later), he was ready to turn over his books to the imperial court. To serve as go-betweens, court poets of the Tominokōji 富小路 family volunteered their services. It is most likely that they were the ones who contacted him via Kan'ei-ji (WATANABE 1943, 78). Atsutane brought with him copies of his most important works, including the *Koshi seibun* 古史成文 (A codification of ancient history), the *Koshichō* 古史徴 (The proofs of ancient history), the *Tama no mihashira*, and the *Koshiden* 古史伝 (The transmissions of ancient history). He bundled together two sets of his books for the imperial court, giving one set to the Tominokōji on the first day of the ninth month. A member of the Tominokōji gave the books to a female attendant for presentation to the recently abdicated Emperor Kōkaku 光格天皇 (1771–1840). They reported Kōkaku's reaction as "the effect of the books was such that his feelings were not shallow," and they transmitted this to the Tominokōji, who then passed the message on to Atsutane (WATANABE 1943, 79).

For the presentation of the second set to Ninkō 仁孝天皇 (1800–1846), the reigning emperor, Mutobe Tokika 六人部節香 (?–1845) and his son, Yoshika 是香 (1798–1863), served as intermediaries. They handed Atsutane's works to a member of the Reizei 冷泉 house who presented them to the emperor. Imperial chamberlains reported the emperor's reaction: "His discriminating mind and effort are fine" (WATANABE 1943, 79). A third set of Atsutane's works was then sent to the Reizei, who sent a letter and two hundred leaves of gold and silver paper to Tokika for presentation to Atsutane. From the Tominokōji, Atsutane received an account of the imperial presentation of his works that Atsutane then used as a preface for the published edition of his *Koshi seibun*.

Atsutane was thrilled with the reception of his works at the imperial court. He decided to spread the good news by writing letters to friends and disciples. In a letter to one of his students, he described his excitement:

[A]t the palace, the aristocrat, Tominokōji, met me. There we talked and he complimented me... I presented all of my works to both the reigning emperor and the abdicated emperor. I received an imperial document with their laudatory remarks... I do not recall [ever receiving] kindness of this sort from such noble people.

(Quoted in WATANABE 1943, 79)

Atsutane's contact with the imperial court certainly conferred upon him symbolic capital, at least for those who were aware of it. A few Yoshida Shinto priests, including Mutoke Yoshika, enrolled as Atsutane's students before his departure from Kyoto on the nineteenth day of the tenth month. Thereafter, Atsutane corresponded with them over matters regarding ritual and theology.

#### ATSUTANE AND THE NUDENOYA

Although the primary reason for Atsutane's Kansai visit was the presentation of his works to the imperial court, he was also intent on meeting his Norinaga School colleagues in Kyoto, Wakayama 和歌山, and Matsusaka. Shortly after arriving in Kyoto, he paid a visit to Kido Chidate's private academy, the Nudenoya. He was aware of Chidate's doubts about him, but the Nudenoya was the only academy in Kyoto affiliated with the old Suzunoya. On the day of Atsutane's visit to the Nudenoya, Fujii Takanao 藤井高尚 (1764–1840) was lodging there, recovering from an illness. Takanao was a Shinto priest from Bitchū 備中 who had been touring the various academies of the Norinaga School. Prior to his arrival in Kyoto, which was shortly before Atsutane's arrival from Edo, Takanao had been in Osaka where he had lectured on classical literature at the academy of Murata Harukado (WATANABE 1943, 69). Two years earlier, Takanao was in Edo where he met Atsutane for the first time. Atsutane was so enthusiastic about having a Kansai member of the Norinaga School in Edo that he invited Takanao to lodge with him and his family. Takanao accepted Atsutane's offer, and he remained in Edo for more than three months. Before Takanao departed for the western provinces, Atsutane promised to meet Takanao again in Kansai someday. It is unclear if Atsutane was aware of Takanao's presence at the Nudenoya at the time of his visit, but as soon as Atsutane realized that his friend was there, he arranged to see him, Chidate's hostility notwithstanding.

Takanao had been a prominent student of Norinaga, who recognized him as perhaps his most skilled disciple in the analysis of narrative tales. Another prominent disciple awaited Atsutane at the Nudenoya as well, Hattori Nakatsune. Nakatsune had known of Atsutane for several years, chiefly as the lone member of the Norinaga School who had defended his *Sandaikō* against attacks mounted by Motoori Ōhira, Kido Chidate, and others. He was grateful to Atsutane for this, but was somewhat apprehensive about meeting him in person. He discovered that his anxieties were unfounded, and Atsutane's attitude and demeanor impressed him (WATANABE 1943, 70). Nakatsune and Takanao encouraged Chidate to welcome Atsutane by allowing him to give some lectures at the Nudenoya. Takanao tried to impress Chidate with the account of Atsutane's generosity only two years earlier. Chidate responded to their pleas by saying, "Aside from the venerable

Ōhira of Kii 紀伊, the venerable Haruniwa of Ise 伊勢, and you, others are never permitted to enter the Nudenoya” (Quoted in WATANABE 1943, 71). Takanao and Nakatsune attempted to arrange for Atsutane to deliver some lectures at an alternate site with the help of two other members of the Norinaga School, but this plan failed, largely due to Chidate’s interference. Eventually, Atsutane was able to deliver some lectures at the home of Mutobe Tokika, a figure who did not belong to the Norinaga School (WATANABE 1943, 71).

Atsutane had planned to visit Osaka after Kyoto. It is most likely that he intended to meet with members of the Norinaga School there, in much the same way as Takanao had done some months earlier. The main Osaka academy of the Norinaga School at that time was that of Murata Harukado. Atsutane’s relationship with Murata Harukado had been an icy one; Harukado had earlier accused Atsutane of insolence for his lack of deference to Harukado’s position within the Norinaga School (WATANABE 1943, 77). Atsutane went to Osaka after his stay in Kyoto; afterwards, he never mentioned meeting with any members of the Norinaga School there, including Harukado (WATANABE 1943, 83). It is possible that Atsutane changed his plans after Chidate’s hostile reception in Kyoto. Kanetane later explained his father’s doubts concerning Harukado, implying that Atsutane was troubled by Harukado’s criminal past:

[I]chiyanagi 一柳 Harukado came to the household of the Edo *hatamoto* 旗本, Ogasawara 小笠原. However, [Harukado] embezzled from his lord and was unable to flee. He was charged with a crime and sent to prison. He had many old colleagues in Edo who felt sorry for him, and they supported him while he was in prison. Finally, it became difficult for him to remain in Edo and he went in exile to the Kamigata 上方 region. He found no refuge there, so he changed his name [to Murata] and shaved his head. (Quoted in WATANABE 1943, 78)

After his brief stay in Osaka, Atsutane and his companions continued on their way to Wakayama, where Atsutane had arranged a visit with Motoori Ōhira.

#### ATSUTANE MEETS NORINAGA’S SONS

Atsutane reached Wakayama by the evening of the twenty-second day of the tenth month. During the evening of the following day, he went to Ōhira’s academy. This meeting between the two scholars was the first, and the two men talked late into the night. Atsutane and Ōhira later admitted that each was impressed with the other (WATANABE 1943, 84). The next day, Atsutane and his party toured the nearby sights; Ōhira insisted that Atsutane return to his home before departing for Matsusaka. That night, Ōhira showed Atsutane two of Norinaga’s possessions: a *shaku* 笏 (ceremonial scepter) and a portrait. As parting gifts, Ōhira presented both of these to Atsutane. In a letter, Atsutane recounted the events of that night:

Then he showed me a desk bequeathed to him by the former Great Man (Norinaga). We talked about his various merits. [He then showed me] a relic (*oreidai* 御霊代), a *shaku* that Ōhira had venerated. During our conversation, [he told me that] while the former Great Man was alive, he had two *shaku*. The one that he had used most often became a relic for Kentei 健亭 (Haruniwa). The other became Ōhira's relic. As per [Norinaga's] dying wish, Ōhira inscribed his spirit name [on it]. With the same wood of the aforementioned cherry tree, there was one that Ōhira had made in imitation of those of the former Great Man. He said that he should bestow this on someone... and he gave me it to me. With extreme gratitude, [I accepted it with] flowing tears. Then, I humbly received a [Kanō 狩野] Yoshinobu 義信 [1747–1797] portrait of the former Great Man.... He said that he should bestow this on someone [as well], and I accepted it.

(Quoted in WATANABE 1943, 85)

Atsutane published the details of his meeting with Ōhira in the *Tamadasuki*. The story is essentially the same, except that Atsutane asserts that all three of the *shaku* were fashioned by Norinaga:

The Great Man was given the posthumous name of Akitsuhi komizusakurane 秋津彦美豆櫻根. This was inscribed on a *shaku*-shaped object made of cherry wood that [Norinaga] had used.... There were three such objects that he himself had created from this cherry tree. He instructed Ōhira to write his [posthumous] name on them after his death. Thus, after he passed away, as per his instructions, [Ōhira] inscribed [Norinaga's] name on two of them. One was placed in the [Motoori] household, and the other two in [Ōhira's] and worshiped [as relics]. At that time, Ōhira used [Norinaga's] brushes and ink to write the [posthumous] name on a separate sheet of fine paper and this was added to the aforementioned *shaku*-shaped object and maintained [by Ōhira]. In the tenth month of the sixth year of Bunsei 文政 (1823), I went to Wakayama and met Ōhira. At that time, he took these out and explained their details to me. I humbly accepted [one of them]. Originally, [Norinaga] had made three [*shaku*]. Is it not the case that it was for some profound reason?

(*Tamadasuki*, 527–28)

Atsutane makes it clear that his possession of the *shaku* gave him the same status as Haruniwa and Ōhira, namely, as Norinaga's successor.

Ōhira's presentation of the portrait and the *shaku* had a symbolic significance of which Ōhira was well aware. In the years following Norinaga's death, enthusiastic followers of Norinaga's teachings approached Ōhira with requests for some personal possessions of Norinaga, including *shaku*. Others asked Ōhira to authenticate objects given to them as genuine relics of Norinaga. In a letter to a student fully six years before meeting Atsutane, Ōhira described an incident involving two *shaku*, both of them allegedly owned by Norinaga:

[I] seem to remember that Kishie Sadayuki 岸江定行 had obtained a discarded cherry-wood *shaku* of the former master (Norinaga). He also had a poem composed by the former master. The reason [that I tell you this] is that Tarao 多良尾 [of] Shigaraki 信楽 showed me last winter another *shaku* with a receipt from the Bunkaidō 文海堂. He asked me at length if [the *shaku*] was authentic.... At that time, I looked it over carefully and pronounced that it was. Please confirm this for me. If it is a fake, it is troubling... Kashima 賀島 [of] Awa 阿波 asked me various things about the issue of authenticity. Fakes are always a problem. I know that there are many of them. As for that long poem, I regard that as a fake as well. (Letter dated 1817/4/30, *Nihon geirin sōsho* 9: 7)

For Ōhira, the problem with fake relics was that scholars attempted to use them in order to claim themselves as disciples of Norinaga:

Scholars who are not disciples, yet claim that they are, try to argue that a thing is genuine [when it is not] and this is not good. I have received requests from others [regarding the authenticity of relics], and I must pronounce them as fakes, which bothers me.... That is the current situation which will likely continue into the future. (Letter dated 1819/6/15, *Nihon geirin sōsho* 9: 30).

The situation between Ōhira and Atsutane regarding Norinaga's relics is different from those described by Ōhira in these two letters. Apparently, Ōhira presented the portrait and the *shaku* without any request from Atsutane. The *shaku*, especially, seems to have had a special symbolic meaning to scholars of the time. Of more importance is the provenance of the particular *shaku* given to Atsutane, namely, that it was one of three such objects, with the others in the possession of Haruniwa and Ōhira. Ōhira, therefore, significantly contributed to the symbolic basis of Atsutane's later claims as Norinaga's sole orthodox successor.

Atsutane lodged in Wakayama for several days. At the end of the tenth month, he set off for Matsusaka, arriving on the first day of the eleventh month. He visited briefly with Haruniwa for what was their very first meeting. Atsutane promised to return to Haruniwa's home after seeing the local sites. He toured the Inner Shrine of Ise on the second day of the eleventh month, and the Outer Shrine on the third day (WATANABE 1943, 88). On the fourth day, he went back to Haruniwa, who gave Atsutane directions to Yamamuroyama. Other than meeting Haruniwa, the pilgrimages to Yamamuroyama was the main reason for Atsutane's stay in Matsusaka. Atsutane later told his students about how deeply moved he was to be at the gravesite, and he composed several poems to commemorate his experiences there.

After paying his respects at Norinaga's grave, Atsutane returned to Haruniwa's home. That evening, he and Haruniwa talked about Norinaga's life and scholarship. Atsutane asked Haruniwa if he could see some of Norinaga's personal pos-

sessions, and Haruniwa had some of Norinaga's brushes brought out. Perhaps out of a sense of entitlement, following Ōhira's presentation of the *shaku* and the portrait, Atsutane boldly asked Haruniwa if he could take some of these brushes. Haruniwa hesitated somewhat, as many admiring scholars of his father had made similar requests in the past, and he was running out of things to give people, but he granted Atsutane's request. Haruniwa gave him three of Norinaga's brushes. Atsutane asked for some commemorative verse as well, and Haruniwa obliged:

Master Hirata asked me for brushes used by  
the former master, which I gave to him.  
Practice writing and vaguely think of the past,  
the traces of a flowing brush. (Quoted in WATANABE 1943, 90)

Atsutane later used these brushes during his ongoing work on the *Koshiden*.

#### 1824–1834: *The Aftermath of the Kyoto Journey*

Atsutane triumphantly returned to Edo in the late autumn of 1823. He had succeeded in amassing some formidable forms of symbolic capital, including imperial recognition for his scholarship, for which he had material proof in the form of letters from the court and his gift from the Reizei house. In the years that followed, Atsutane rarely mentioned these souvenirs. Instead, the relics of Norinaga that he had received were more important to him. In an undated letter to a student, Atsutane discussed the significance of his journey to the western provinces. He specifically linked these relics to his status as the “very last disciple,” namely, as Norinaga's new successor:

My teacher, Motoori Norinaga, lived in a domain of the province of Kii and in Matsusaka in the province of Ise. He had hundreds of disciples (*deshi* 弟子) and thousands of students (*monjin* 門人). I was his very last disciple (*saimatsu no deshi* 最末の弟子)... After my former teacher passed away, there were the [biological] son, Haruniwa, and the adopted son, Motoori Ōhira. Under the gracious auspices of the lord of Kii, they perpetuated the scholarship of the household, and wrote various treatises. There was also Hattori Nakatsune, who was an especially revered disciple... On the occasion of my visit to Kyoto, these three men were already in their twilight years. They were [all] able to appreciate my scholarship. Haruniwa said that, although [some of my] conclusions were not reached by our former teacher, I continued to probe [ancient matters]. Thus, he gave to me, as his inheritance (*ibutsu* 遺物), the brushes, ink, and such that the former teacher had used. From Ōhira, I received a relic made by the former teacher himself. (Letter no. 32, in WATANABE 1943, 628)

After his return to Edo, Atsutane and his adopted son, Kanetane 鉄胤 (1799–1880), continued to supervise the recruitment of new students into the Ibukinoaya

and the publication of Atsutane's books. It is not difficult to imagine that his experiences in Kyoto during 1823 had a role in these efforts. In the years that followed, Atsutane told his students about the significance of his journey to Kyoto; in turn, he heard stories from his students about the views of other Kokugaku scholars, especially those from Kansai. One of his students showed Atsutane copies of letters from Kokugaku scholars that detailed their opinions of Atsutane, and most of these letters had very critical comments about him. Atsutane was both stunned and angered, wondering how anyone could attack him after his Kansai tour. He then made his own copies of these letters, but he and Kanetane had not yet decided what to do with them.

#### THE NARRATIVE OF SUCCESSION: THE *KIYOSŌHANSHO*

Motoori Ōhira died in 1833; Haruniwa had died four years earlier. With Ōhira's death, Atsutane and Kanetane decided that the time was right to make these critical letters public by publishing them in 1834 as the *Kiyosōhansho* 毀譽相半書. Kanetane wrote commentaries on each of these letters, providing important contextual information. Kanetane and Atsutane also decided to include another important document, not a letter, but a *norito* 祝詞. According to Kanetane, Hattori Nakatsune composed the *norito* after Atsutane left Kyoto; he then sent it to Edo where Atsutane received it after his return home. This document was crucial for the *Kiyosōhansho*. Together with Kanetane's commentaries, it demonstrates the fact that Atsutane was Norinaga's true heir.

The most hostile of the letters were written by Kido Chidate. The reasons for Chidate's less than enthusiastic reaction to Atsutane's arrival in Kyoto become clear in his letters. As Nakatsune observed of Chidate's behavior:

[C]hidate had deceived others with the Great Man's name and imitated the Suzunoya, calling his academy the Nudenoya. He deceived and duped all of those who came to his academy. He presented only the amusement of elegant language as the Way of the teachings of the Great Man. He did not learn even a little of the intention of the Way of ancient learning as established by the Great Man. Fortuitously, a brilliant person like Atsutane appeared. Thus, Chidate grew envious of Atsutane's brilliance. While claiming to learn the Way of the Great Man, he denied and prevented Atsutane from entering his academy, and spread lies about him. (MSHNN, 468–69)

He had already concluded by that time that Atsutane's scholarship was too tainted with Western influences and conflicted with the main focus of Norinaga's work, classical literature. In a letter to Ōhira, with whom Chidate had sided during the years of the debate over Nakatsune's *Sandaikō*, he asked how any member of the Norinaga School could recognize Atsutane as a fellow member. Chidate specifically referred to Atsutane's claim in his letter of admission into Haruniwa's

academy that he had met Norinaga's spirit in a dream: "[C]laims that he became a student of the old man (Norinaga) in a dream and such have all become a great heap of baseless claims to which I lend no credence. In addition, his scholarship departs from the Great Man's axioms. [Atsutane] is full of mountain air" ("Dōjin yori naisho," dated 1823/10/4, in *Kiyosōhansho*, 385). Since Atsutane conducted research in areas other than classical literature, Chidate concluded that his membership in the Norinaga School was based primarily on this alleged dream. The proof of such a dream, of course, was impossible to produce, so Chidate implied that members of the Norinaga School should simply refuse to acknowledge his legitimacy:

The first time that I heard [of Atsutane's claim] that he had become a student [of Norinaga] in a dream, I did not understand [how he could say this]... I did not know if what came out of his mouth was a lie or the truth. If the Great Man had truly granted such permission in a dream, then I am sure that he could have told me in one of my dreams that Hirata was his disciple (*deshi*). I definitely do not consider him to be part of the same [Norinaga] School.... Since no one in [our] academy (the Nudenoya) believes him, no one has approached him [in Kyoto]. As for meeting him, he is a person without elegance (*bunga* 文雅), so we need not listen to him.

("Kido Chidate yori raijō," dated 1823/9/18, in *Kiyosōhansho*, 383–84)

Chidate's letters, although central to the portrayal of the hostility faced by Atsutane, were not the only ones that were critical of Atsutane. Other scholars who made critical observations of Atsutane in their letters include Arakida Suehōgi 荒木田末寿 (d. 1828), Murata Harukado, and Motoori Ōhira: "Although Atsutane and [I] made various statements [about the *Sandaikō*], the truth is that Atsutane was mistaken and [I] was right" (Motoori Ōhira, *Fujino-kakitsu-ō chinjō no bun*, in *Kiyosōhansho*, 503). Chidate's letters, however, were perhaps the most hostile, and it is clear from the inclusion of his letters in the *Kiyosōhansho* that Kanetane and Atsutane considered him to be their most vociferous opponent.

In order to show that Atsutane did have supporters as well, Kanetane included laudatory documents, too. The most important of these was Nakatsune's *norito*, in which Nakatsune describes how the members of the Suzunoya had abandoned the true foundations of Norinaga's scholarship in favor of an obsession with classical literature, despite Norinaga's warnings to maintain their focus on the ancient Way:

Of the five hundred or so disciples of the Great Man, even if one tried to count every last one of them, they all esteem only elegance. Of those who compose poetry and prose, they are numerous, beginning with Haruniwa and all others in various other provinces who have established academies. However, none

of them focus their studies on ancient learning and concentrate on the august history of the Age of the kami, in accordance with the august will of the Great Man. (MSHNN, 457–58)

His research on the creation stories of the *Kojiki*, which resulted in the publication of the *Sandaikō*, represented Nakatsune's attempt to stay true to Norinaga's intentions. Nakatsune claimed that Norinaga recognized this fact just months before his death in 1801, admitting that Nakatsune was his only true disciple:

[O]n the evening of the thirteenth day of the ninth month of the first year of Kyōwa (1801), there was a moon-viewing party held at [the home of] Fuji-no-kakitsu 藤垣内 (Motoori Ōhira). On the return home, [I] accompanied [Norinaga] and we talked. [I] thought that [I] should have some time this autumn to devote to the Way, and that [I] had learned only a little about the composition of poetry and prose. The Great Man replied, “No, concerning the composition of poetry and prose, this is something that you should not do! [And yet] there are those who esteem that kind of learning. Thus, there is absolutely no one who pursues ancient learning in the main... it seems that this will continue into the future. You have ceased to engage in the composition of poetry and prose, and have concentrated on the Way of the kami.” (MSHNN, 456–57)

During the years that followed, Nakatsune saw how the focus on classical literature continued among the members of the Norinaga School, and how some of them attacked Atsutane for using Nakatsune's *Sandaikō* in the composition of the *Tama no mihashira*. With Atsutane's visit to the Nudenoya, Nakatsune related how he had kept the details of his private conversation with Norinaga a secret for more than twenty years, until he was able to finally make this revelation to Atsutane in person. Atsutane, he proclaims, was also a true disciple of Norinaga:

[I]n the tenth year of Bunka 文化 (1813), in Great Edo, a person named Taira no Atsutane wrote a text called *Tama no mihashira*. He sent copies to Fuji-no-kakitsu and to [me]. He had completely received the teachings of the Great Man and perpetuated his august mind in complete agreement with the *Sandaikō*. His devotion is truly profound. (MSHNN, 461–62)

With the knowledge that Atsutane would continue to perpetuate Norinaga's true scholarship, Nakatsune expresses his relief, saying that he was now ready to die. As Kanetane describes in the *Kiyosōhansho*: “From the year of the Great Man's death, the first year of Kyōwa 享和, to the sixth year of Bunsei (1823), for more than twenty years, [Nakatsune] kept this [secret revelation] to himself. When he was about seventy, he met my father for the first time.... He joyfully proclaimed, ‘My mind is at ease, and I am no longer anxious. After you return to Edo, I will

surely pass on” (*Kiyosōhansho*, 476–77). In fact, just months after Atsutane returned to Edo, Nakatsune did die in early 1824.

#### DISCOURSES OF SUCCESSION: *IEMOTO* VERSUS *DŌTŌ*

The inclusion of Nakatsune’s *norito* in the *Kiyosōhansho* was important to Kane-tane and Atsutane not only as a demonstration of support from an established member of the Norinaga School, but also as an articulation of a discourse of legitimacy and succession that made Atsutane’s claims of inheriting the leadership of the Norinaga School ideologically possible. This was a discourse that was related to Atsutane’s account in the *Tamadasuki*, completed just two years before the *Kiyosōhansho*, in which he stated his case as the next great scholar of Koku-gaku, following Kada no Azumamaro 荷田春満 (1669–1736), Kamo no Mabuchi, and Motoori Norinaga (*Tamadasuki*, 479). This was the Neo-Confucian discourse of the *dōtō* (“orthodox transmission of the Way”).

Beginning with Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200), Neo-Confucians had composed lineages that illustrated the transmission of the wisdom of the sages from teachers to their disciples down through the centuries.<sup>5</sup> In the *Tamadasuki*, Atsutane emphasized the teacher-disciple relationships between Azumamaro and Mabuchi, and Mabuchi and Norinaga. Any potential attempt to successfully invoke the *dōtō*, however, would collapse, since Norinaga and Atsutane had no such relationship. Nakatsune’s *norito* in the *Kiyosōhansho*, however, overcomes this problem. Nakatsune, then, becomes the link between the two scholars, and he clearly states that he was the one who transmitted Norinaga’s teachings to Atsutane:

The august teachings of the ancient learning of the Great Man have thrived and flourished under Atsutane. Thus, as for the august last words of the Great Man, its august traces cannot be discerned because Nakatsune is [I am] unlearned and without talent. But, he had yielded them to the knowledgeable and talented Atsutane.  
(MSHNN, 470)

As we have seen, legitimate succession was an issue foremost in the minds of both Haruniwa and Ōhira. Rather than the teacher-disciple relationship that Atsutane emphasized with the *dōtō*, they operated under the rules of a discourse that stressed the father-son relationship reminiscent of the *iemoto* 家元 system developed during the medieval period.<sup>6</sup> In schools of cultural production, then as now, succession was determined within the framework of the household. The head of any given school of cultural production, the *iemoto*, had the sole responsibility of preserving the secret knowledge of the school and transmitting that

5. For diagrams of the *dōtō* (Ch. *daotong*), see WILSON 1995, 260–65.

6. For the definitive study of the *iemoto* system, see NISHIYAMA 1959.

to his son. In the event that there was no suitable son, the *iemoto* could adopt one, usually a student within the school. The situation with Haruniwa and Ōhira is perhaps best viewed in this context. While the transmission of secret knowledge (*hiden* 秘伝) may not be connected to their situation, clearly Norinaga was concerned with the future of the Suzunoya when he adopted Ōhira at the end of the eighteenth century. The need to perpetuate this tradition is what motivated Haruniwa and Ōhira to deal with the selection of their own successors, which led to a brief feud between them. By adopting the discourse of the *dōtō*, Atsutane emphasized the intellectual merits of his Kokugaku forebears, implying that his own achievements deserved recognition with theirs. For the *iemoto* system, brilliance was not necessarily a criterion for selection as successor. Ōhira himself admitted this in a letter to a student:

[I] succeeded the former master. [I] inherited the name of Motoori not for reasons of a superior intellect or knowledge.... At the age of twelve or thirteen, [I] became a student (*monjin*) of the Suzunoya, and there was no one who was more devoted to [our] teacher. I was but a child learning how to compose poetry and write prose.

("Fuji-no-kakitsu-ō chinjō no bun," in *Kiyosōhansho*, 503–504)

The adoption of the discourse of the *dōtō* was itself a kind of brilliance on the part of Atsutane. It allowed him to ignore the special status which Haruniwa and Ōhira had as the sons of Norinaga. The dream to which Chidate referred in his letters published in the *Kiyosōhansho* served a special purpose in the context of the *dōtō*: it provided Atsutane with the means to claim a direct link between himself and Norinaga.<sup>7</sup> When Atsutane had first mentioned the dream in his letter requesting admission into Haruniwa's academy, it was merely an illustration of Atsutane's commitment to Norinaga's teachings. In the context of the 1820s and 1830s, it became the crucial teacher-disciple link in the creation of a Kokugaku *dōtō*. This was serendipitous for Atsutane and something that he could not have foreseen. The direct link between Norinaga and Atsutane, of course, minimized Nakatsune's role in the transmission of the orthodox teachings. It is for this reason that later depictions of the Kokugaku *dōtō*, especially that of the Four Great Men, left Nakatsune out.

7. The dream meeting itself became a relic when Atsutane commissioned a painting of it shortly after becoming a member of the Norinaga School. It is reproduced in *Hirata Atsutane ushi toshū* (IYATAKA 1993). The painting is currently housed in the Hirata Shrine in Tokyo. In a personal correspondence with the head of the shrine, Maita Harue, she characterized the painting as one of the "shrine's treasures" (*shahō* 社宝). Letter dated 27 November 2003.

CLASSICAL POETRY, ORTHODOXY, AND SYMBOLIC CAPITAL:  
CHIDATE VERSUS ATSUTANE

Kido Chidate, whom Atsutane perceived as his most ardent critic, had no position in either the Kokugaku *dōtō* or the Suzunoya *iemoto*. He was not related to Norinaga, and was unable to claim the status of either Haruniwa or Ōhira. His position was that of a disciple who defended a kind of orthodoxy, namely, classical poetry, which did not have universal support among the members of the Norinaga School, including Ōhira. Unlike Atsutane, Chidate never claimed to be anything other than one of Norinaga's disciples. Gaining significant forms of symbolic capital, in the form of relics and such, fed Atsutane's audacity, and so too did the swelling ranks of students in his Ibukinoya. The latter phenomenon was largely alien to Chidate's experience as well. Chidate's comment about Atsutane's lack of "elegance" was a slight against the fact that Atsutane was not from Kyoto. With an attitude like that, Chidate did not care to recruit new students to his Nudenoya academy, treating it more like an exclusive club.

For Chidate, perhaps the most humiliating aspect of Atsutane's presence in Kyoto was his contact with the imperial court. The court never invited Chidate to come and present copies of his scholarly works. The fact that Chidate labored in virtual obscurity, as far as the imperial court was concerned, speaks more to the focus of his scholarship, and less to its inherent quality. Since Chidate adhered to the study of classical poetry, as well as its replication, his work had no special appeal for the resident poets at the imperial court, namely, members of the Reizei house. Court scholars and poets of the Reizei and Tominokōji served as mediators in Atsutane's dealings with the court. Contrary to Chidate, Atsutane was more concerned with Shinto theology and ritual, subjects that were less threatening to these court poets. Atsutane's connection to the imperial court, and its concomitant symbolic capital, was the result of the fact that he did not concentrate on classical poetry. Ironically, Chidate's defense of what he believed was the true orthodoxy of the Norinaga School was the reason why the poets of the imperial court ignored his academy and scholarship, despite its geographic proximity.

By the 1820s, Chidate adhered to the study of classical verse as orthodoxy, despite the fact that it did not confer on him the symbolic capital needed for him to maintain his position in the Norinaga School following Norinaga's death. Thus, his trajectory in the field of the Norinaga School was downward. At the same time, the popularity of the Ibukinoya gave Atsutane the economic capital that he needed to maintain his scholarship, while the relics and so forth from his Kansai tour gave him the symbolic capital to lay claim to the leadership of the Norinaga School. Atsutane's trajectory within the field was in ascendance after 1823. Perhaps the sense that the trend of the field was away from poetry in the years following Norinaga's death was the reason why Chidate joined the academy

of the Mabuchi disciple, Arakida Hisaoyu. Three years before Atsutane's visit to Kyoto, Chidate invited another Mabuchi student, Shimizu Hamaomi 清水浜臣 (1776–1824), to the Nudenoya in order to discuss Mabuchi's life and scholarship (*Shimimuro zakki*, 231–32). Classical verse was central to the members of the Mabuchi School in Edo, otherwise known as the Edo-ha 江戸派. They perpetuated Mabuchi's teachings regarding the importance of the *Man'yōshū*, especially the composition of verse in the ancient style. Chidate, therefore, had a position in each of two separate Kokugaku fields. His adherence to classical verse marginalized him in the Norinaga School after 1823, while it bolstered his position in the Mabuchi School. Not much is known about Chidate's activities after 1823, but it is possible that he continued to cultivate his position in the Mabuchi School as his position in the Norinaga School declined.

### Conclusion

During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, Motoori Haruniwa and Ōhira led the Norinaga School. Haruniwa, Norinaga's biological son, was the leader of an academy in Matsusaka, the Nochi-Suzunoya. Ōhira controlled another academy in Wakayama, the Fuji-no-kakitsu. Other members of the Norinaga School founded private academies in other parts of Japan, including Kido Chidate in Kyoto and Hirata Atsutane in Edo. Over the course of the 1820s and 1830s, Atsutane began to make claims, at first implicit and then later explicit, that he was Norinaga's true successor. The fact that the scholarship of figures of the first half of the nineteenth century, other than Atsutane, is virtually unknown among even specialists in Japanese intellectual history indicates that Atsutane convinced people both inside and outside of the Norinaga School that his claim had validity. The theories of Pierre Bourdieu regarding the field of cultural production and symbolic capital are useful for understanding Atsutane's ascendancy. At the same time, Atsutane's example demonstrates important limitations in Bourdieu's theories for Tokugawa Japan, which forces the contemporary scholar to acknowledge cultural particularities even in the application of a universal theory.

Atsutane became a student of Haruniwa in 1806, thereby entering the field of the Norinaga School as well. Prior to 1823, he endeavored to establish a position in the field. Atsutane developed an interest in eschatology, which was a subject that he could research in the context of Ōhira's tolerance of a broad approach to Japanese antiquity. Atsutane's scholarship was not a threat to the other members of the Norinaga School until he attempted to forcefully assert its centrality by joining the debate over Hattori Nakatsune's *Sandaikō*. Atsutane supported Nakatsune's metaphorical interpretation of *kamiyo*, even though Atsutane's conclusions were not identical to Nakatsune's. Scholars such as Motoori Ōhira, Kido Chidate, and others, directed their attention to Atsutane in order to reassert their view that only

literal interpretations of antiquity were legitimate. Atsutane's participation in this debate resulted in the creation of an opposing ideological pole in the Norinaga School, a condition that Bourdieu argues energizes a group of intellectuals and transforms them into a field of cultural production (BOURDIEU 1996, 193).

Atsutane's emerging influence in the Norinaga School was enhanced by crucial events in 1823. Scholars at the imperial court were drawn to Atsutane's eschatological scholarship, and they invited Atsutane to present his works to both the reigning and retired emperors. While in Kyoto Atsutane visited the Nudenoya, and Chidate's reaction to his presence confirmed that the adversarial relationship between the two, developed during the years of the *Sandaikō* debate, had not changed. On his return journey to Edo, Atsutane met both Haruniwa and Ōhira, receiving from each of them some of Norinaga's personal possessions. Atsutane treated these items as precious relics and he venerated them in his academy as material proof of his special status in the Norinaga School. In early 1824, he received a *norito* from Hattori Nakatsune, in which Nakatsune confirmed that Atsutane had received Norinaga's orthodox teachings. As Kanetane later observed, this was also preserved as a relic in the Ibukinoya: "Perhaps the most reverential of the old man's (Nakatsune) bequeathed teachings and his strongest achievement was the *norito* that he had personally written.... It has been carefully preserved as an august treasure in our household" (*Kiyosōhansho*, 478–79).

In 1834 Atsutane and Kanetane published an account of these experiences, which they entitled the *Kiyosōhansho*. In this text, Kanetane describes Atsutane's encounter with the imperial court and the presentation of Norinaga's relics by Haruniwa and Ōhira. In addition, Kanetane included the entire text of Nakatsune's *norito*. The *Kiyosōhansho* conveys the message that Atsutane was Norinaga's true disciple and successor. It demonstrates that Atsutane's status as the sole orthodox heir was not the result of the default rules of succession that were supplied by the discourse of the *iemoto* system. Instead, Atsutane invoked the Neo-Confucian discourse of the *dōtō*, and Nakatsune's *norito* and Norinaga's relics functioned as confirmation of Atsutane's *dōtō* succession: "Thereafter, I (Atsutane) increasingly observed his (Norinaga's) bequeathed teachings and perpetuated the *dōtō*" (Letter no. 32, in WATANABE 1943, 628).

The fact that Atsutane amassed symbolic capital is not surprising when his trajectory is analyzed with Bourdieu's theory of the field of cultural production. Bourdieu focused on issues of dominance and orthodoxy in his research on the field of cultural production, and both of these are important in the analysis of the Norinaga School during the first half of the nineteenth century. However, during the Tokugawa period, orthodoxy had specific meanings, especially in the contexts of the *iemoto* and the *dōtō*. Although Atsutane had built up his reserves of symbolic capital during the 1820s, he was not able to stake his claim to orthodox succession until 1834. By then, both Haruniwa and Ōhira were dead and

there were no other immediate heirs to Norinaga. Atsutane was then able to use his symbolic capital to transform the discourse of succession within the Norinaga School from an emphasis on the perpetuation of the Motoori household to that of the Kokugaku tradition. Haruniwa and Ōhira, of course, had designated their own heirs before their deaths, but Atsutane's dominance of the Norinaga School nullified their significance.

The example of Atsutane and his leadership of the Norinaga School indicate cultural specificities for which Bourdieu's theory cannot account. Atsutane's respect for Haruniwa and Ōhira demonstrates that their status as Norinaga's sons conferred on them a symbolic capital that no other member of the Norinaga School could assail, not even Atsutane. His relationship with Norinaga's sons illustrates the influence of the discourse of the *iemoto*. At the same time, Atsutane was only able to invoke the orthodoxy of the *dōtō* after he had secured proof of his succession in the form of relics. Thus, symbolic capital during Tokugawa Japan could have either an intangible (family pedigree) or a tangible (relics) existence. Only a chosen few had access to the former, but there were no restrictions on the latter. It was for this reason that material symbols were so important to cultural producers during the Tokugawa period.

Atsutane's succession of Norinaga is relevant to the broader issue of Kokugaku lineage formation. The analysis of this formation is revealing in three important ways. First, it adds some nuance to the application of Bourdieu's notion of symbolic capital to the analysis of Tokugawa cultural institutions. Rather than argue that Bourdieu's theories do not apply to Japan, or apply only poorly, one could argue that his theories help draw our attention to practices such as lineage formation that might otherwise receive little notice. Second, it is clear from the analysis of Atsutane's succession of Norinaga that Kokugaku was part of the early modern Japanese tradition of lineage formation. Not surprisingly, the practices associated with the *iemoto* system were foremost in the minds of Kokugaku scholars, especially those of the eighteenth century. Finally, the role played by Kokugaku in the story of Tokugawa lineage formation was, at the same time, unique in comparison with other institutions. By invoking the discourse of the *dōtō*, Atsutane sought to overcome the limitations of the *iemoto* system, reliant as it was on a close master-disciple relationship. Ironically, Atsutane's effort to divert Kokugaku's lineage away from the Japanese discourse of the *iemoto* and toward that of the *dōtō* brought Kokugaku closer to the roots of Chinese Neo-Confucianism.

## REFERENCES

## ABBREVIATIONS

- MSHNN *Minoda Suigetsu Hattori Nakatsune-ō norito* 箕田水月服部中庸翁祝詞 (1824), HATTORI Nakatsune 服部中庸. In *Kiyosōhansho* 毀譽相半書, SHAZ, supp. Vol. 5, 1981.
- NZT *Nihon zuihitsu taisei* 日本隨筆大成. Series 1. Ed. Nihon Zuihitsu Taisei Henshūbu 日本隨筆大成編集部, 23 vols. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1975–1976.
- SHAZ *Shinshū Hirata Atsutane zenshū* 新修平田篤胤全集. Ed. Hirata Atsutane Zenshū Kankōkai 平田篤胤全集刊行会, 21 vols. Tokyo: Meicho Shuppan, 1976–.

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- Kinsei bungei sōsho* 近世文芸叢書. Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行会, ed. Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1912.
- Kiyosōhansho* (1834), Hirata Kanetane 平田鉄胤. In SHAZ, supp. vol. 5, 1981.
- Kokumin dōtoku sōsho* 国民道德叢書. Arima Sukemasa 有馬祐政 and Kurokawa Masamichi 黒川真道, eds., 3 volumes. Tokyo: Hakubunkan, 1911–1912.
- Kogakuyō* 古学要 (1809), Motoori Ōhira 本居大平. In *Nihon kokusui zensho* 日本国粹全書, vol. 13. Tokyo: Nihon Kokusui Kankōkai, 1915–1918.
- Manabi no hiromichi* 萬那備能廣道 (1817), by Kido Chidate 城戸千楯. In *Kokumin dōtoku sōsho* 国民道德叢書, vol. 3, 1911–1912.
- Nihon geirin sōsho* 日本芸林叢書, Ikeda Roshū 池田蘆洲 et al., eds. 12 vols. Tokyo: Rikugōkan, 1927–1929.
- Nihon kokusui zensho* 日本国粹全書, Ed. Nihon Kokusui Zensho Kankōkai 日本国粹全書刊行会, 24 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Kokusui Kankōkai, 1915–1918.
- Sandaikō* 三大考 (1791), Hattori Nakatsune. In *Nihon Shisō Taikei* 日本思想大系, vol. 50. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1973.
- Sandaikō-benben* 三大考辯々 (1814), by Hirata Atsutane 平田篤胤. In SHAZ, vol. 7, 1976.
- Shimimuro zakki* 紙魚室雜記, Kido Chidate 城戸千楯. In NZT series 1, vol. 2, 1975–1976.
- Tamadasuki* 玉禪 (1832), Hirata Atsutane. In SHAZ, vol. 6, 1976.
- Tama no mihashira* 靈の真柱 (1813), Hirata Atsutane. In *Nihon Shisō Taikei*, vol. 50. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1973.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

## BOURDIEU, Pierre

- 1996 *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1993 *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- BURNS, Susan  
2003 *Before the Nation: Kokugaku and the Imagining of Community in Early Modern Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- HAGA Noboru 芳賀 登  
1975 *Kokugaku no hitobito: Sono kōdō to shisō* 国学の人々—その行動と思想. *Nihonjin no Kōdō to Shisō* 日本人の行動と思想, no. 42. Tokyo: Hyōronsha.
- HAROOTUNIAN, Harry D.  
1988 *Things Seen and Unseen: Discourse and Ideology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- IYATAKA Jinja 彌高神社  
1993 *Hirata Atsutane taijin zushū* 平田篤胤大人図集. Akita: Iyataka Jinja.
- MARUYAMA Masao  
1996 Orthodoxy and legitimacy in the Kimon School, part one. Translated by Barry Steben. *Sino-Japanese Studies* 8: 6–49.
- MATSUMOTO Shigeru  
1970 *Motoori Norinaga, 1730–1801*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MCNALLY, Mark  
2005 *Proving the Way: Conflict and Practice in the History of Japanese Nativism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- NISHIYAMA Matsunosuke 西山松之助  
1959 *Iemoto no kenkyū* 家元の研究. Tokyo: Azekura Shobō.
- NOSCO, Peter  
1990 *Remembering Paradise: Nativism and Nostalgia in Eighteenth-Century Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- RUBINGER, Richard  
1982 *Private Academies of Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- TAMAMURA Sadayoshi 玉村禎祥  
1988 *Motoori Ōhira no shōgai* 本居大平の生涯. Kinki Bunkashi Sōsho 近畿文化誌叢書 vol. 2. Osaka: Kinki Bunkashi Kankōkai.
- TEEUWEN, Mark  
1997 Poetry, sake, and acrimony: Arakida Hisaoyu and the Kokugaku movement. *Monumenta Nipponica* 52: 295–325.
- WATANABE Kinzō 渡辺金造  
1943 *Hirata Atsutane kenkyū* 平田篤胤研究. Tokyo: Rokko Shobō.
- WILSON, Thomas  
1995 *Genealogy of the Way: The Construction of the Confucian Tradition in Late Imperial China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- YAMADA Kanzō 山田勘藏  
1983 *Motoori Haruniwa* 本居春庭. Matsusaka: Motoori Norinaga Kinenkan.