Fifty years of Japanese at Cambridge
1948–98

A chronicle with reminiscences

Compiled and edited

by

Richard Bowring

© Faculty of Oriental Studies
University of Cambridge
1998

CONTENTS

Preface
Introduction
‘The early days, 1947–55‘ by William E. Skillend
‘Reminiscences of Cambridge’ by Donald Keene
‘The next thirty years’ by Carmen Blacker
‘On the receiving end in the 1960s by Richard Bowring
‘A memoir’ by Douglas Mills
‘Chronicle of the years 1984–97’by Richard Bowring

* * *

‘Japanese libraries and books in Cambridge’ by Peter Kornicki
‘Japanese students in Cambridge during the Meiji Era
by Koyama Noboru

* * *

Academic staff appointments
Japanese lectors
PhDs awarded
Undergraduates by year of matriculation
Undergraduate numbers by year

Preface

This book has been created as a small celebration of a not-insignificant milestone and it is presented in the hope that it may be of interest not only to former students, present students, and Japanese who know Cambridge, but also to anyone who is curious to see how an initially unfamiliar, ‘new’ academic subject in the humanities can, with time and perseverence, be translated into the ranks of the accepted and the legitimate, even in a fairly conservative institution. It is designed to stand as a record, so the reader will find some rather dry lists that will be of immediate interest only to those who appear in them; but it also contains reminiscences by former lecturers, which should give some flavour of the personalities who contributed to the teaching and research that are the very reason for our continued existence. The picture that emerges is one of rather haphazard beginnings and eventual survival against considerable odds, but the celebration is genuine. The future is relatively secure, even in what is now an increasingly hostile financial environment. Moves are now afoot to create an East Asian Institute, where it is hoped that Japanese studies in Cambridge will find a new home, link itself fruitfully to other disciplines, and continue to grow and prosper.

As a first step this book has been produced in-house. We welcome any additions to the record, either in the form of corrections or further reminiscences, and we intend to produce a second, definitive edition in due course. Comments, please, to the Editor, Faculty of Oriental Studies, Sidgwick Avenue, Cambridge CB3 9DA.

To an outsider, the system that operates in Cambridge is largely a closed book. Much of what is written here is by insiders and so assumes a prior knowledge of ‘colleges’, ‘Tripos’, ‘supervisions’, ‘specified texts’ and the like. Former students will probably be at home with such vocabulary but many others will need help. This very short description constitutes the bare minimum necessary to make sense of what follows.

Cambridge is a collegiate university which works like a federal institution. Each college is an independent legal entity with its own foundation, rules and buildings. Each college is governed by its ‘fellows’, most but not all of whom also hold appointments as ‘teaching officers’ in the University. The student applies to a college rather than the University, and the college provides the student with accommodation, food, a home-from-home, and close academic supervision, often on a one-to-one basis. It is the University, however, that runs the examination system and each college must ‘enter’ its students for these examinations. It is therefore the role of the college to prepare the student for the exams and to monitor progress throughout the year. The examinations are known as the ‘Tripos’ and are usually split into ‘Preliminary to Part I’, ‘Part I’, and ‘Part II’ (the nomenclature may differ in different faculties), taken at the end of each academic year. Japanese used to be a three-year course until 1986. Now, however, Part I is taken after two years of study and Part II after four with a mandatory period in Japan. Because the examinations and the teaching are separately administered, continuous assessment is still rare and a series of three-hour written tests are the norm. Information about which texts are to be examined must therefore be communicated to the student well in advance; hence the reference in what follows to lists of ‘prescribed’ or ‘specified’ texts. There are three terms: Michaelmas, Lent and Easter. A student comes to Cambridge to ‘read’ a subject and the work is fairly specialized from the beginning. Such an approach offers great advantages in terms of depth but it is predicated on the student already being fully educated in a general sense, a luxury that cannot now necessarily be taken for granted.

There are in the system as a whole three kinds of ‘teaching officer’.

(1) Those who have a University appointment but no college fellowship. They give University lectures and classes and devote themselves to research. They have no direct involvement in college affairs but may on occasion teach students from colleges in small groups, for which they receive extra payment from the colleges.

(2) Those who have a University appointment and hold a college fellowship in addition. They sit on the college's governing body and they may have a more substantial job within the college, such as Tutor or Director of Studies. They are usually expected to participate in small-group teaching for their own college (and sometimes for other colleges as well) for which they may receive extra payment.
(3) Those who only hold a college appointment. They may be scholars working in academic fields for which a college may feel a specific need or they may be research fellows. Their stipend comes entirely from college rather than university sources. Titles may differ from college to college. It is to distinguish such appointments from those held in the University that one finds the latter with the prefix 'University'.

The exact role of a college in a student's academic life will vary depending on the subject. Here we shall concentrate on the Humanities. In English literature or History, for example, the university provides lectures and other classes in the Faculty, but the decision as to whether or not to attend these lectures is up to the student and his or her academic adviser, known as a Director of Studies. Academic control is handled by this Director of Studies and the student works largely via small-group teaching ('supervisions'), which is usually organized by the college. The case of Japanese, however, is rather different. Because the student numbers University-wide are too low for the subject to be viable on a single-college base, all teaching, both lectures and supervisions, is organized centrally by the Faculty. The role played by the college is, of necessity, minor. This is rather an unusual situation in the Cambridge context. There is a drawback here. Since a college can 'buy-in' teaching on an hourly basis whenever the occasion arises, it rarely has the need to appoint a fellow in Japanese studies per se. Until recently, it was in fact most unusual for a teaching officer in such a subject to have a college fellowship. This had a knock-on effect on student intake and affected the degree to which the academic concerned felt tied to the wider community. It is clear from Carmen Blacker's memoir that in the early years Japanese, and indeed Oriental Studies in general, was simply accommodated in a large house on what was then almost the outskirts of Cambridge. College affiliation was quite rare. In fact she had to wait almost ten years to be accepted by a college as a fellow, and then it was a college devoted to graduate students only. This may come as a surprise to former students, whose own life would normally have revolved around their college and who are probably still unaware that it is possible to hold a University appointment without automatically being a fellow. Matters have improved recently, but it is still true to say that it remains difficult to obtain a college fellowship for a teacher of Japanese.

The fact that one specializes from the very beginning at Cambridge means

that an undergraduate can progress quickly, but by the same token it is difficult to provide proper training in both a difficult language and an academic discipline such as anthropology, history or literary theory. Cross-faculty cooperation is increasing, but there is still a long way to go in this regard. Most students emerge with good language skills but still need further training in a discipline before going into research. As the figures in this report will show, postgraduate numbers are still very low.

* * *

The preface mentioned 'survival against considerable odds'. Why such odds? One might expect here a tale of pure prejudice against an only-just-defeated enemy who had waged war with a ruthlessness that we had conveniently forgotten, but it is difficult to find any of this in the records. The truth is more prosaic, more a story of academic self-interest, and the subtle influence of names and titles. When the study of Japan and Japanese finally became a legitimate subject in the University it was placed within the Faculty of Oriental Languages. The Faculty subsequently became renamed Oriental Studies in 1955, but it remained in essence devoted to the study of a wide range of non-European languages with heavy emphasis on the Middle East and India. The common thread here was an interest in philology and religion that ultimately went back to colonial and imperialist concerns. The only sensible bedfellow for Japan in such a context was China, but China itself was marginalized in such company. There were, and are, no separate departments within the Faculty.

As a new, unfamiliar subject with very few students indeed, Japanese was bound to find it a struggle if not to survive then to prosper. Power in faculties lies in the Faculty Board and the constitution of the Board is often crucial to a subject's well-being. Suffice it to say that during the 1950s, and as late as the 1970s, this was a world in which when the Board was asked to create a 'wish-list' of new posts, a lectureship in Ossetic, Sogdian, or Ancient Iranian was liable to rank far higher than one in modern Japanese history, a situation that continued until the availability of outside funds allowed Japanese to expand on its own. It is not so much a matter of prejudice as of simple self-interest. To have Arabic, Hebrew and Persian in the same faculty as Chinese and Japanese is rather like putting Law in the same pot with Economics.

Since 'Oriental Languages' was an offshoot of the 'classics' (Greek and Latin) and still tied to the discipline of philology, it is hardly surprising that the design of the earliest courses in Japanese was based on classical lines. This is why one finds first-year students in 1949 beginning with *Taketori*

monogatari and the *Tosa nikki*, and going on in the second year to the *Man'yōshū*, *Makura no sōshi*, and finally having to tackle the *Kojiki*. As Donald Keene notes, the reading of modern Japanese was only introduced in haphazard fashion. We must not assume, of course, that this was simply a case of die-hard classicists ruling the roost. It was well nigh impossible to obtain modern Japanese books at the time and it is clear from Peter Kornicki's account that the University Library itself was of no help in this regard. In a letter dated 10 June 1947 to Captain J. Clifford, who was stationed at the time in Kuala Lumpur and was to become one of the first students at Cambridge, Eric Ceadel had occasion to write as follows:

> I wonder if you have any contacts, official or unofficial, with anyone in Japan now who could help me get some Japanese books – mainly works of reference, dictionaries, and editions of the Classics? I have tried four or five times to get some of these books by writing to people in Japan (mainly officers in the Occupation Forces) but with no success. If you know of any means to help me, I would be very glad.

Ceadel was the real founder of the subject at Cambridge and it is entirely due to his subsequent efforts that the University Library now contains the kind of Japanese collection that could never be built from scratch today and without which none of us would have been persuaded to come and teach. Ceadel had graduated in 1941 with First Class Honours in Classics and had already published three articles on metrical problems in Greek tragedy in Classical Quarterly while an undergraduate. In January 1942 he was posted to an Army course in Japanese held at Bedford and was made Instructor in November 1942, a position that he held until October 1945. During this period over 200 selected men of University scholarship standard were taught a working knowledge of the written language in six-month courses. He was appointed Lecturer in Japanese at Cambridge in October 1947 and stayed in that position until he became University Librarian twenty years later. He died in 1979 , an early example of what is now known in Japan as karoshi or 'death through overwork'.[1]

We begin the series of reminiscences with those William Skillend, one of the first students of Japanese at Cambridge.

[1] For more details of Ceadel's life and achievements see the forward to Nozomu Hayashi and Peter Kornicki, *Early Japanese books in Cambridge University Library* (Cambridge University Press, 1991).

THE EARLY DAYS, 1947–55

by William E. Skillend

I had been awarded a scholarship in Classics at Christ's in the spring of 1944. By the time I was able to take it up, in October 1947, I knew that one was not bound to read the subject in which one had qualified, and I had lost much of my youthful enthusiasm for Latin and Greek. I had an open mind on what I might best read, and my tutor suggested that, since the army had trained me in Japanese, I might consider the course in that language which had just been instituted. My potential supervisor in the subject, Eric Ceadel, was of my college, which no doubt felt some obligation to push what undergraduates it could in his direction. Why not? Ceadel had been my principal teacher of Japanese in 1944 and I liked and greatly admired him. Reading Japanese would probably be at least as enjoyable and useful as Classics as a way of passing the next three years.

I know that, with the intervening changes in the international alignment, the army had later given me some training in Slovene and Serbo-Croat, but that is, or would have been, another story. So, I took the historic decision to become one of the first two students of Japanese at Cambridge. If I had realised the importance of that moment, I might have kept a detailed diary, from which some useful contribution to this publication might have been made. Fifty years on, and far too deeply into retirement to do any serious research, I can only recollect haphazardly my impressions of that time, trusting that others may correct the more serious of my lapses of memory.

My fellow student in 1947/48 must, I think now, have been the J. Clifford mentioned by Richard Bowring. He had, if it were possible, an even more cavalier attitude towards his studies than I did, and we drifted out of touch with each other soon after graduation. Unless he can be found now, I may be the only living witness to the momentous events of fifty years ago. The thought is almost enough to persuade me not to put down in writing anything about it. So, to save tedious repetition, please allow me to suggest that readers add a qualifying clause to every sentence in this paper: 'My recollection is that.......' or 'If my fading memory is to be trusted.......'.

The specified text for the preliminary year in 1947/48 was a history of the First World War, and the only passage I can recall from it – perhaps it was set for translation in the examination – described a German attempt to bomb Sandringham. One can only wonder now how this came to be selected as the text from which all Japanese studies at Cambridge would evolve. Was it,

perhaps, the only book in Japanese in England at that time of which three or more copies could be obtained?

However, for one whose previous experience in Japanese had been translating telegraph style texts in *romaji*, written in horizontal lines from left to right, this book did make two basic points: first that its title was on the back cover of the book and one proceeded from there to read from the last page to the first in vertical columns arranged from right to left; and secondly that to read the title one needed the sort of deviousness of mind which only a training in Latin and Greek could give one, a mind which would happily tackle the Times crossword before breakfast. This title consisted of four Chinese characters in a square block. In the northwest quadrant was the character *shū* 'end', in the northeast *shi* 'begin', and in the two southern quadrants the character *sen* 'war' twice. To meet the challenge of finding the title and of reading it *Shisen shūsen*, and to experience that thrill of enlightenment that this was the fiendishly Japanese way of expressing 'The War to End War' was to have made a very sound start on Japanese studies. There was now no looking back.

Reading this book with, no doubt, other instructional material, took two hours of class in the morning and two hours of preparation between tea and dinner most days during term time, leaving ample time for healthy recreation between lunch and tea and for social activities after dinner. The long 28 weeks of vacation could also be broken into manageable lengths my joining the Mountaineering Club in North Wales or the Lake District. I simply accepted that this was Cambridge as it was, ever had been and always should be. The important thing was to get in. Once you were in, it really did not matter very much what you actually did.

The contrast could not have been greater than that with my last previous period of academic work: between 1940 and 1944, in the sixth form of my Liverpool grammar school, I had read the complete canons of Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle and of Latin literature from Plautus to Suetonius. If that was Classics, what a wise decision I had made to read Japanese.

Cambridge 1947 was indeed a land fit for heroes to live in. The University was at the forefront of pure and applied science: it had invented and installed in every college room gas fires which drew the heat out of a room and dispersed it out of the chimney without actually raising the temperature of the fenland air outside. The culinary art had been refined to its purest in college halls, as Donald Keene relates, and the British Restaurant offered a choice for lunch every day: one could have either snoek or rock salmon, and either take or not take either or both the reconstituted dehydrated potatoes and the mushy peas. Then, at no extra charge, one could carry one's tray to

share a table with E. M. Forster.

The only worry I had, fleetingly, for a few days early in the summer of 1948, was that perhaps I was not really bright enough to have finished the preliminary examination papers in rather less than half the time allotted for them. I need not have worried. My own subsequent experience of teaching Korean solo from scratch leads me to suspect that I probably knew as much Japanese as my teacher/examiner by the end of my first year.

But I should not put myself on the same plane as Eric Ceadel. His powerful brain was always under iron control, but his formal manner never quite managed to shield his students from his infectious enthusiasm for the subject which he had taken upon himself to champion. In this connection, I can support, perhaps even upstage Richard Bowring with his illustration of Ceadel's character by his *ume no hana* story. Seventeen years earlier, in January 1949, I had presented Ceadel with a sprouting crocus bulb wrapped in a *tanka* about the *yuki no ma ni idekuru wakana* which I was minded to offer to *Kiideru-sama*. I was inordinately proud of this, and bitterly disappointed at Ceadel's complete lack of reaction to it. The scene was exactly as described by Bowring, except that it was I who was non-plussed and unable to smile even ever so wanly. I was sure that Ceadel was chiding me, not explicitly – he would never do that – but implicitly, as if I had broken some unwritten rule of a club.

As is amply testified by other contributors to this publication, the second year of the course was one great leap forward into the *Kokinshū* and other texts of real, as opposed to modern Japanese. Certainly it was the *Kokinshū* in the second year and the *Man'yōshū* in the third year for poetry. For prose I am not sure now of what we read when, but over these two years we certainly read at least parts of *Taketori monogatari*, *Makura no sōshi* and *Genji monogatari* plus, incredibly, some Noh and some *kanbun* texts. Our attitude to this was that there was nothing that we could not do. I did not then, and now cannot know what our teachers felt, but we students had no conception of the massive scholarship there was on all these works in Japan. We were the bold explorers, mapping accurately territory of which there had previously only been sketch maps drawn by the likes of Arthur Waley.

I was not conscious that this attitude was arrogant, and hope that my naïvety and immaturity may earn me some understanding of, if not forgiveness, for my arrogance. We were Cambridge, that is the best: there was simply no world outside Cambridge. (Yes, of course there was Oxford, but Oxford had no Japanese studies at all then.) The Cambridge system always has been idiosyncratic, and usually aloof, and there was one more peculiarly Cantabrigian twist at this time. The BA is generally taken as a mark of some academic achievement, even if nowadays only a qualification for proceeding

to higher academic achievement in an MA or PhD. Not so in Cambridge, at least not in 1949. 'BA' after one's name simply showed that one had reached a minimum level of maturity, that one was no longer in *statu pupillari*. One practical effect of this was that one was no longer restricted, as undergraduates were, presumably for their own moral well-being, to living in college or in licensed lodgings. Cambridge had a problem at this time: with many returning ex-servicemen taking up places offered to them up to five or six years earlier joining those who were currently being offered places directly from school, colleges and licensed lodgings were bursting at the seams. Part of the university's solution to this problem was to award BA degrees not at the conclusion of one's Tripos course, but a given number of years after matriculation, that is after qualifying for entry to the university. I had matriculated in 1944 and so, after taking Part I only, I was awarded by BA in 1949. I suppose that I might have gone out into the world as 'BA in Japanese' and after the lapse of the further statutory number of years, would have been 'MA in Japanese', having read only selected parts of *Shisen shūsen*, *Kokinshū* and *Taketori monogatari.*

That I in fact went further with my studies was in part due to the companionship I had with Geoff Sargent, with whom I shared unlicensed lodgings for a couple of years. He had taken Part I in Classics, but switched to Japanese for Part II in 1948, thus becoming the first real graduate in Japanese in 1949. Geoff had a sincere attitude towards his studies, tempered by a healthy sense of humour. After finishing his PhD he went on to a useful career in Japanese in Australia, and it was a loss to us all that he died so young.

More important to me, however, was Ceadel's encouragement. He recommended me for a Scarborough scholarship early in 1950, and I cannot deny that the increase of grant which this gave me, from something like £200 a year as an undergraduate to £300 as a 'postgraduate' was one factor in my growing commitment to academic life. At exactly what stage this commitment became firm and irrevocable I cannot now say, but I think that by the end of my third year I was sure that I wanted to, was convinced that I was able to establish the long envisaged relationship, on the Indo-European model, between the vocabularies of Japanese and other 'Altaic' languages.

My research centred on the *Man'yōshū*, and the eventual aim of it was to compile a vocabulary of the earliest ascertainable state of the Japanese language as it could be firmly attested by hard scrutiny of the texts. This work was delayed in its later stages when Ceadel told Geoff Sargent and me that he had been totally disappointed in his hopes to expand Japanese Studies at Cambridge. He advised me to apply for the lectureship in Korean which was to be established at the School of Oriental and African Studies,

University of London. In 1953 I had been learning Korean there from a visiting professor from Korea for nearly two years, and I did get the post. It was envisaged at the time that I would divide my time equally between Korean and Japanese, and a rather low load of Korean teaching allowed me time to finish my thesis by 1955. That thesis, though entitled 'The Vocabulary of the Manyoosyuu', actually only set out how I had established the methods by which such a vocabulary might be compiled.

Although I continued for some years to compile that vocabulary, I became discouraged from completing and publishing it for a number of reasons. One was certainly that there seemed to be no one I could easily associate with who had a similar interest in the subject and who could stimulate me or evaluate my work. In contrast, the help and guidance in Korean studies which I immediately received from Korean scholars during and after my sabbatical year in Korea in 1955/56, allied to the quickly growing demand for the teaching of Korean at SOAS, encouraged me strongly to give more, eventually all of my time to Korean.

Then my growing awareness of the work done in Japan on the history of its language and comparative philology eventually became more of a handicap than a help in two different ways. Typical of one was my introduction to the work of Ono Susumu. At first I was greatly comforted that he had reached in his published works the same conclusions on the language of the *Man'yōshū* that I had reached in ignorance of his work but later, though I was pleased to establish a good personal relationship with him in Japan in 1956, I could not but be disillusioned by his subsequent conclusions on the relationship between the vocabularies of Japanese and various unlikely languages of Southeast Asia. On the other hand, other Japanese scholars seemed to be sounder in their conclusions but, when I saw that even the best informed, best disciplined and most responsible of these, such as Kōno Rokurō, still could not establish any systematic relationship between the vocabularies of Japanese and Korean, I came to doubt whether even the most brilliant 'MA, PhD (Cantab)' had any hope of doing so.

In the end, however, it was the results of my own efforts at comparative philology which extinguished my enthusiasm for the work. I had occasional achievements of the apparently impossible, such as establishing a roundabout relationship between Japanese *na* and Korean *irum*, 'name', but overall I only succeeded in proving the rightness of the aphorism often attributed to Voltaire, that comparative philology is a branch of language study in which consonants count for very little and vowels for nothing at all. Even stricter application of my logic to the phonemic systems of Japanese at its various stages within the *Man'yōshū* produced a list of words formed, for comparative purposes, of only three types of consonants combined into

syllables with only two types of vowels. With such an abstract system, it was hardly ever difficult to find for a Japanese word a similarly structured word in Korean with a close enough meaning to that of the Japanese word to make a match. Distressingly it proved equally easy to find a matching Chinese word also, even in many cases, a suitably matching Indo-European word. I was probably at this stage when I was at Columbia University for a year, during which I had close contact with Goren Malmquist, who had found his historical study of Chinese stymied by the nature of its script, and with Sir George Sansom, who totally dismissed historical linguistics as of any importance at all for the future of Japanese studies. My card index of my vocabulary of Proto-Japanese was last seen in the loft of my previous house, that is it has not been seen for over a quarter of a century.

I see that this is becoming far too much of my personal story. Perhaps I could return to the subject of early Japanese Studies at Cambridge by going back to the point at which I left Cambridge for London. One of the reasons for that was that I wished to learn Korean, but another was the dearth in Cambridge of authorities in fields which are now commonly related to Japanese Studies. Or perhaps rather that Japanese Studies, being interpreted very much as the study of ancient Japanese texts, were not yet in a state to take advantage of the expertise that there was in other disciplines. Of course there were, famously, economists at Cambridge, but no one thought before 1950 of studying the Japanese economy systematically. Ron Dore, in London, was in the preliminary stages of his study of Japanese society, but the hallowed precincts of Cambridge would not have tolerated at that time the presence of a sociologist. Most importantly for me there was no linguistics or phonetics, such as there was in plenty in London, which would take account of Japanese. The nearest to linguistics there was Professor Jopson's course on Indo-European philology. That was both entertaining and informative. It was said that Professor Jopson was fluent in fourteen languages, thirteen of them dead languages. Cambridge rejoiced in its wealth of such characters verging on the eccentric, and even in Japanese, a very esoteric subject compared with such core subjects as Indo-European philology, all the teachers were people of talent and character.

Donald Keene joined us in 1948 , as he relates, and it seems incredible now that we took so little advantage of his unique ability to convey to westerners the essence of Japanese literature, though we did benefit from the touch of reality which he brought to the language teaching. He also performed, as again he relates, one pivotal role: having actually set foot in Korea during his navy service, he had learned two words of Korean. He offered to teach a small group of us both of these words, and in fact went on to unravel for us the mysteries of Ramstedt's *Korean Grammar*. Those were the very first steps I took in Korean, and it must at least in part be some tribute to Keene's

qualities as a teacher that this led to my holding the first academic post in Korean in Britain, virtually in the whole western world and eventually, in 1977, to my playing a leading role in forming the Association of Korean Studies in Europe.

Kamei Takashi, a scholar of the history of the Japanese language at Hitotsubashi University, I believe, was the first lector in Japanese. He must have come in 1950, and was the first living speaking Japanese I had ever met. That, remember, was after I had finished the Japanese Tripos. Kamei was a model of what a *sensei* should be to his students, at least if the teacher-pupil relationship which I came to value most highly in Korea is applicable to Japan also. I was saddened by his telling me, when I met him again in Japan in 1955, how much he had suffered all the time he was in Cambridge from a total lack of the sort of companionship within which he could exchange jokes. Again, this may be a clue to the nature of Japanese Studies there at the time. Also, local attitudes towards any Japanese at the time were distinctly hostile, fuelled by the experiences of men of the Cambridgeshire Regiment in prisoner of war camps. Kamei's digs were a lonely apartment in St Mary's Chambers. Only as I write these words do I wonder why Kamei and Keene did not have much humour to share with their views of life in England. For myself, at the time I had thought that he and I enjoyed each other's company. Now I suppose that the greatest amusement he had at anything in England was at the curious form of my spoken Japanese. My style and vocabulary were probably essentially eighth century, with occasional modernisms from the tenth to eighteenth centuries.

Joyce Ackroyd joined us for a year or so, about 1948/49, and I should surely have gained more from being with her than the pleasure I found in going round the Gog Magog course with her, which is all that sticks in the mind now. No, there was one other thing: she had packed in the same case as her dictionary a bottle of Australian sherry, which had leaked away completely during the voyage. She could be abrasively argumentative, but at least it was always a pleasure to look up the words on which we disagreed in her dictionary.

John McEwan was, in those days, totally devoted to his subject, and I recall as the chief characteristic of his teaching his kindliness. I wondered at the time, and still do, how he came to decline so sadly. Could the apparent unreceptiveness of his students have been a factor?

Of course Ceadel insisted that our education would not be complete without Classical Chinese, and our teachers of that were also in the best Cambridge tradition. Gustav Haloun's flaunted Sudetan German accent was as intriguing a study as the *Mencius* which he was ostensibly interpreting for us. Under him we completed our study of the first four characters of Book I

in the first term of 1948/49, which equipped us adequately to read the rest of it for ourselves in the Christmas vacation. In 1949/50 it was Bertie Davies on *Chuang Tzu*, or perhaps it was the *Tao-te-ching*. Anyway, Davies' exegesis of whatever it was called for more ingenuity in interpretation than the original Chinese texts.

As if Korean and Chinese were not enough, we also had the benefit, probably in 1950/51, of Denis Sinor's teaching of Mongolian. Sinor was an Hungarian by birth, who had learned, while studying in Paris, to be infinitely more French that the French, but in English too he was the most lucid of teachers. I am sure that his description of Mongolian influenced greatly my own later analysis of Korean.

I would not have missed for anything my four years in Japanese Studies at Cambridge, plus the next four years in which I was a frequent visitor there to see my supervisor. I have nothing but happy memories of those years and, though I may not have shown due formal respect to my teachers in these reminiscences, all of them commanded my respect at the time. My warm personal regard for them will, I hope, excuse anything I have said about them which might be taken as derogatory or offensive. The debt which I owe them, for a very rewarding subsequent career in Korean studies, is enormous. The debt which Japanese Studies at Cambridge owes to them, especially to Eric Ceadel will, I am sure, always be acknowledged.

REMINISCENCES OF CAMBRIDGE

by Donald Keene

[The following series of extracts come from Donald Keene's book *On Familiar Terms: A Journey Across Cultures* (Kodansha International, 1994), with the author's kind permission. They begin at the point when Keene was studying at Harvard soon after the end of the Pacific War and decided to apply for a grant to study in England. Like the majority of his generation, his knowledge of the Japanese language was a direct result of having to learn it during the Pacific War.]

About halfway through my year at Harvard I made the unpleasant discovery that I would soon exhaust my benefits under the G.I. Bill of Rights. I decided to look for a job teaching somewhere, but the only opening I heard of, at a college in Maine, was to teach "the history of all civilizations" and I did not feel up to this task. When I went to see a professor at Columbia who had always seemed interested in my career and asked his opinion, he examined my undergraduate record carefully and then, on the basis of my marks, suggested that I look for a job teaching Greek. This was hardly a welcome suggestion. I had not looked at a Greek text for seven years and I had no intention of abandoning Japanese. But, obviously, there were absolutely no jobs in Japanese studies. What to do?

At this point someone at Harvard told me about the Henry Fellowships that were awarded to Americans for study in England and to Englishmen for study in America. Preference was given 6o applicants who wished to study subjects that were not so well taught in their own country as in the host country. I knew nothing about the state of teaching Japanese in England, but I thought it would probably be a mistake to ask to study Japanese there. So I boldly opted for Arabic and Persian, without knowing much about this either, but assuming (because of the long-standing British relations with the Middle East) that the teaching of these languages in England was superior to that in America. I wrote the usual kind of proposal, pointing out the rarity of persons whose knowledge of Asia extended from one end to the other, and implying that learning two more difficult languages was well within my capacities.

Did I really mean what I wrote? There is no way for me now to recall whether I was sincere or merely opportunistic, but I believe that if, when I eventually arrived in England, I had been encouraged to study Arabic and

Persian, that is exactly what I should have done. Fortunately, I was discouraged, but neither I nor the board of examiners before whom I appeared foresaw this. I eventually had word that I had been awarded a fellowship. My financial crisis had been solved for at least a year, and I was excited by the prospect of studying in Cambridge, even though I could not help feeling a little uncertain about the desirability of shifting my interests to Arabic and Persian.

[Keene left for England in September 1948 and eventually arrived via France and Holland in time for the beginning of the academic year.]

I took the boat at the Hook of Holland for England. I felt not only anticipation, as I had before arriving in France, but also a certain tension at the thought that I would not simply be visiting but living in England for a whole year. (As a matter of fact, I was to spend five years there.) I did not know a single person in the whole country, and I had absolutely no idea of what it would be like to study (as I planned) Arabic and Persian. Reports I had read about 'austerity', the discipline the British had imposed on themselves to surmount the economic crisis of the post-war years, made me wonder if I might even have to go hungry. And almost every account of postwar Britain suggested that, contrary to prewar days when the sun never set on the British empire, it now rained constantly.

My arrival in Cambridge initially confirmed my worst fears. I had been accepted by Corpus Christi College, and when I presented myself, a 'gyp' (a college servant) led me to my rooms, remarking, 'Coldest rooms in Cambridge, sir.' My rooms consisted of a large sitting room and an almost-as-large bedroom with a window that it was impossible to shut. That afternoon the gyp brought me my daily ration of milk, about one inch of milk in a jug. And that night dinner consisted of whitefish with a white sauce and white potatoes and white cabbage on a white plate. I had never realized before how important color is to food. The thought of a year of austerity filled me with foreboding. I had feared that the traditional reserve of the English might keep me from making friends, but within a day or two I had developed at least a nodding acquaintance with several members of my college, and some of these eventually became friends. Although I already had an M.A. and was now twenty-six, the college, reluctant to give credit for degrees obtained elsewhere, considered me still to be an undergraduate. This did not upset me, but I found myself, for the first time in my life, the oldest in any group.

Shortly after my arrival, I was sent to a member of the Faculty of Oriental Languages to discuss my plans for studying Arabic and Persian. He asked,

'How many years will you be here?' When I told him that my fellowship was for just one year, he smiled. 'Do you think you can learn Arabic in one year?' he asked. 'And Persian too,' was my cheerful response. This, I think, was too much for him – as it would be for anyone who knew anything about those languages. He made it clear that there was no point in bothering the professor of Arabic with so presumptuous a plan.

What to do? As had become usual with me in times of crisis, I fell back on the Japanese. What this meant now was that I went to see the Lecturer in Japanese, Eric Ceadel. He advised me to study classical Chinese with Professor Gustav Haloun, and suggested that I might also help in the teaching of Japanese. Both suggestions were immediately accepted and I was grateful for them. Although I had found the pace of studying the Chinese classics at Columbia much too slow for me immediately after my wartime experiences, I seemed to have matured somewhat, and I came to enjoy the late-afternoon sessions of reading *Chuang Tzu* with Professor Haloun and four or five other students. We gathered not in a classroom but in the professor's living room where we were diverted by a cat named Pluto and an asthmatic grandfather clock that struck the hours only after a long protracted wheeze.

I did the first teaching of my life at Cambridge that autumn. Once a week I held a session of Japanese conversation with three undergraduates. I had not spoken Japanese for almost three years, and no doubt my Japanese had become rather rusty, but there was not a single real Japanese in Cambridge. Only one of the three students had ever actually spoken Japanese at whatever level; the other two had begun their Japanese, as was then the practice in Cambridge (though this practice has long since been discontinued), with the Preface to the tenth-century collection of poetry *Kokinshū*. In terms of the traditional British education in the classics, it was normal to study a language like Latin or Greek that one would not attempt to speak. Beginning instruction in Japanese with the Preface to the *Kokinshū* was entirely in keeping with that tradition. The vocabulary of the Preface is restricted, very few *kanji* are used, and the grammar is absolutely regular. Only after the student had obtained a firm grasp of classical Japanese was he introduced (in his second year) to the modern language.

This system was logical in terms of pedagogy, but it made for the most peculiar conversation hours. The students mingled Heian period phrases with colloquialisms picked up from me or elsewhere, rather as if a Japanese had learned his English conversation from a combination of Beowulf and Ernest Hemingway. I was not a great success as a teacher, but in spite of me two of my three students went on to have distinguished academic careers, and

toward the end of the year Professor Haloun asked me if I would not consider remaining in Cambridge as a member of the faculty.

I remember the day very well. It was a sunny day of a kind one rarely encounters in February. Aconites and snowdrops were in bloom here and there, proclaiming the coming of spring. I went for a walk to clear my thoughts. I had already accepted a position as an assistant professor at an American university, a job far more elevated that the assistant lectureship that was the most I could expect at Cambridge. The salary offered by the American institution was also about five times as much as assistant lecturers were paid. In material terms there was no comparison between the two positions. But I felt extremely reluctant to leave Cambridge.

Cambridge had brought my first acquaintance with living traditions. At first it seemed strange, for example, to wear an academic gown in the manner of students of long ago, and I remember my irritation when I was denied entry to the university library because I was not wearing a gown. But gradually this costume, worn in America only at graduation ceremonies, became a part of my life. I enjoyed seeing undergraduates in gowns (sometimes tattered) on their way to chapel or dinner and hearing the crunch of their footsteps on the gravel path outside my window. It gave me a sense of tradition, too, when I saw at night two officers of the university patrolling the streets on the lookout for undergraduates who were not wearing gowns. These men carried with them, as the source of their authority, a copy of university regulations framed a century earlier. Nothing dreadful would happen to an undergraduate caught not wearing a gown. Wearing a gown was in fact a privilege rather than a duty, and not wearing one a pleasantly dangerous activity. A body of legends had grown up about 'night climbers' – undergraduates who had boldly defied regulations and returned to their rooms in college late at night without gowns or permission by scaling walls and spiked fences.

I enjoyed also eating in "hall", as the college dining room is called. The food was terrible. Whale meat was, I think, the worst thing served, but there were other, nearly as unpalatable dishes, all of which were listed on the menu with elegant French names. There was extremely little variety. One week, as I noted a the time, of twenty-one meals eaten in hall during the course of a week, fourteen had herring as their chief ingredient. (Years later, when in Kyoto for the first time, I blanched when invited to eat *nishin soba*, *soba* noodles with herring.) But hall itself was a splendid building, ornamented by the portraits of long ago masters of the college. I enjoyed, too, hearing grace said before meals each night in Latin by members of the high table, the dons of the college.

In short, I had developed such a strong attachment to Cambridge, even during this period of drab austerity, that I was not much tempted by California sunshine. As I walked along that day in February the college buildings had never seemed more splendid. I went into the library of Trinity College and examined the mementos of what seemed to be half the great men of England. I thought, I can't leave this place. The thought became a firm conviction as I walked back to my rooms in college, and that night I wrote a letter to the American university asking to be released from my promise to teach there. I had made a decision that would directly affect the next five years of my life, the years spent in Cambridge.

****

My remembrances of my first year in Cambridge are mainly of my pleasure in the architecture and atmosphere. I enjoyed even the nights in November when yellow fog stung my eyes because they recalled the descriptions I had read of the London fog. England gave me a feeling of homecoming, not in terms of ancestors but of English literature. To hear a cuckoo for the first time or to go to a place known for its nightingales was not simply enjoyable but created a link between myself and the poetry that spoke of these birds.

I enjoyed also the sounds of English as pronounced by my new friends. In recent years, I understand, regional accents have come to be accepted, but at that time any undergraduate who did not speak the language appropriate to his privileged station would be urged to attend a school where he might improve his speech. I myself tried to speak as much like an Englishman as possible. This was not very difficult, and it enabled me to feel that I belonged in Cambridge. But sometimes it only earned me such sarcasm as, 'How is it that you, an American, can speak English?' Unpleasant comments about Americans formed part of the normal conversation of some of the people I met. It was annoying at first to be asked such questions as, 'Is it true that American universities grant doctorates in dishwashing?' I gradually realized that there was generally nothing more than a pleasantry involved in these queries. The contrast between the austerity of life in Britain and the opulence of American life, as depicted in the films, must have been irritating to people brought up to the strains of 'Rule Britannia'; and the 'brain drain' of scholars to America was no doubt a reminder of the changes that had occurred in the comparative economic strength of the two countries. It would have been strange if there had been no resentment. But the courtesy of the British, far more than such momentary irritations, lingers in my memory.

During the winter vacation in 1948 my rooms in college were to be used by students taking examinations, and I decided to go to Rome, where I knew some people from the ship that had taken me to Europe. I had completed writing my doctoral dissertation, *The Battles of Coxinga*, while in Cambridge, and I decided to type it in Rome. I went first to Paris, then took an overnight train to Milan. The compartment was stuffy, and I thought I would take advantage of the wait in Milan to get some fresh air. I asked another passenger in the compartment if he would look after my suitcase and typewriter, and I then walked up and down the platform briskly for perhaps five minutes. When I returned to the compartment there was no man and no suitcase. At first I couldn't believe it. I thought that it must be a nightmare from which I would presently awake. I went to the police, and in my poor Italian explained what had happened. I urged them to look for the man, who must still be in the station, but they laughed at my guilelessness and insisted that I complete a form. Name of father. Name of mother. Names of grandparents. Profession of father. And so on. By this time I was almost hysterical, but there was absolutely nothing I could do.

I never saw the manuscript of my dissertation again. I returned to Cambridge with nothing but the few clothes I had bought in Italy. I was shaken by the disaster, but it led to the formation of my most important friendship in England.

It was still the Christmas vacation when I got back to Cambridge, and there were very few people in the college. I told everyone I met of the disaster that had overtaken me in Milan; this seemed to be the only way of dissipating even slightly my frustration. The response was heartwarming. One person arranged for me to stay in a warm and comfortable room that was empty during the vacation, another found me a typewriter on which to write a new version of the stolen dissertation. One of the few friends who was actually in Cambridge at the time, William Dickins, was the son of one of the dons at Corpus Christi College. His mother, by way of expressing her sympathy, invited me for lunch, and the invitation was extended day after day until the college kitchen started to function again.

It was no small favor to invite a guest to meals during those days of rationing, and I was profoundly grateful. More than that, Mrs Mary Dickins became a close friend, a relationship that lasted until her death. She was the eldest of the five daughters of Sir Herbert Grierson, the great scholar of English literature. Her sisters, all of whom were exceptionally interesting women, lived in Oxford, The Hague, New York, and Paris. They had grown up in a household where scraps of poetry were used as a kind of shorthand communication, it being assumed that the relevance of the quotations to the situation at hand would immediately be understood. I confess that I did not

always recognize the quotations, but that hardly mattered. It was exciting to talk with anyone from whom ideas tumbled so rapidly that ordinary prose could not keep up the pace.

Among Mrs Dickins's achievements was that of being a great cook. She was able to find ways of preparing delicious meals from items (such as sheep's heads) that were not rationed because almost no one knew how to cook them. Years later, when she decided to live independently, her skill as a cook was recognized by higher and higher levels of employers until she was finally cooking for the royal family at Balmoral.

One of the many subjects we talked about, painting seemed closest to her heart. Sometimes we went to galleries together. It was her practice to look at only one or two pictures during a visit, but to stay before each until she felt she really understood it. She had no interest in what was merely decorative; unless a painting spoke to her directly, she soon moved on. I recall that when I went with her to the Frick Collection in New York, she seemed to absorb into herself the great El Greco portrait of St Jerome. Only then did she give me the benefit of her perceptions of what El Greco wished to reveal in the portrait. Or at the Metropolitan museum she stopped before a Goya showing two women who sit on a balcony, smiling down on the scene before them, while a third person, somberly dressed, looks away. Mrs Dickins instinctively felt that the women were watching an execution. I have no idea whether or not Goya in fact intended to suggest this, but it made perfect sense to me.

I suppose that one definition of a friend is someone with whom one always has something to talk about. That was certainly true of Mrs Dickins. After my first year in college I lived in her house for two years, and although we met at mealtimes every day, there never seemed to be enough time for all we both had to say.

I managed , thanks to my friends in Cambridge, to rewrite the dissertation that spring. One friend who had read both the old and new versions told me that the new one was a great improvement. Perhaps he was only trying to comfort me. Even more important than his praise was the friendship with Mrs Dickins that had stemmed from my loss. Perhaps I should really have thanked the thief in Milan.

****

The one person I wanted most to meet in England, even before I left America, was Arthur Waley. His translations of Japanese and Chinese literature had been my inspiration during the long years of learning to read

these languages. I still have somewhere a copy of his *More Translations from the Chinese* with the Chinese texts laboriously (and clumsily) copied in my hand at a time when I was groping ahead in the dark toward the light that was Waley. For some years I had thought (before I realized my own limitations) that I would imitate Waley in being a scholar of both China and Japan. However, though I admired his translations of Chinese poetry so much I had memorized some, I had never been able to read through his translation of the Chinese novel *Monkey*, though some people enjoy it most of all his works. This made me think again that perhaps I was cut out to be only half of Waley.

I preferred his translations from the Japanese, and sometimes I tried to persuade myself that he really liked Japanese literature better than Chinese. He once told me that his partial translation of *The Pillow-Book of Sei Shōnagon* was his own favorite among his works. I had been moved especially by the beauty of his translation of *The Tale of Genji*, a marvellous re-creation in English of a text a thousand years old. During the war I had tried to read the original in a class at the University of Hawaii, and this painful experience had aroused renewed admiration, even awe, for Waley's accomplishment.

I had been told before leaving America that Waley worked at the British Museum, but this had not been true for many years. As I was wondering how to meet him, I learned in January 1949 that he was to lecture in Cambridge and wrote inviting him to tea. I had no introduction, and only an ironclad desire to meet him can explain what gave me the courage to offer this invitation. Waley replied with a postcard, the message written in minuscule handwriting at the top, saying that I should introduce myself after his lecture.

That afternoon I was listening to a broadcast from Germany of a Wagnerian opera, when there was a knock on my door. 'Come in!' I shouted unceremoniously, and an unknown man entered. 'I am Dr Waley,' the man said. In great confusion, I switched off the radio, and stammered something about having been studying. I heard later from a friend with whom Waley subsequently spoke that he had been astonished that anyone could study to the beat of American jazz. I was miserable at the thought that Waley had formed a bad impression of me, and was sure he would never be able to take seriously anyone with such uncouth habits. Only later did I realize that my best qualification for being accepted as an acquaintance by this great collector of eccentrics was as the American who could study only to the raucous accompaniment of jazz.

His lecture that night was on the Ainu epic *Kutune Shirka*. All I knew about

the Ainu was the stereotype of 'the hairy Ainu', but Waley's rendering of the epic made me realize they had composed delicate and beautiful poetry. He read aloud in a rather high-pitched voice, interrupting himself occasionally to make some comment on the poetry, which he obviously loved. The possibility of discovering another variety of poetry had induced him to study the Ainu language, though he was of an age when learning a new language is by no means easy.

In the years that followed I visited Waley from time to time in London. I have met people who complained that they could never get a word out of Waley, but we always found topics of mutual interest, and sometimes we sat in his room talking until it became too dark even to see each other.

****

Not long after I had firmly committed myself to teaching in Cambridge, the pound was devalued by about a third. My modest salary in terms of dollars became insufficient even to sustain life, to the consternation of family and friends in America; but as a matter of fact, I have no recollection of having suffered because of lack of money. Almost every item of food was rationed at a price that was calculated to the farthing, a quarter of a penny. Meals in restaurants never cost more than five shillings, though fancy establishments might add charges for such items as flowers on the table. Tickets to plays and concerts were still cheap enough for me to go regularly. In all the time I was in Cambridge I never heard of the existence of a black market, though perhaps this academic community was not typical of the entire country. The only time I felt the strain of austerity was when, during vacations, I went abroad. The allowance for foreign currency was twenty-five pounds a year, hardly enough for travel to France, Spain, and Italy, the countries I wanted most to visit. All the same, I managed to go abroad almost every vacation without breaking any laws.

My teaching consisted mainly of reading classical texts with two or three students. I can remember only two – *Hōjōki* (which I would read with students at Columbia for about thirty years) and *Kojiki* (which I never read again). My one crisis as a teacher occurred during my second year of teaching. I was informed that if I wished to be promoted from assistant lecturer to lecturer I would have to teach a second Asian language. I had studied Chinese for almost as much time as Japanese, and suggested I might be able to teach that language, but I was told that the teaching of Chinese traditionally (on the model of Hebrew) could not be combined with the teaching of any other language. Was there not some other Oriental language I might teach? After some thought, I answered that during the war I had

learned a little Korean, mainly from prisoners of war. 'Excellent!' was the response. 'Nobody will ever want to study Korean, and Korean goes well with Japanese, like Arabic with Persian'. In this manner I became the lecturer in Japanese and Korean. The next summer the Korean War broke out, and in the autumn, when the university year began, I had seven students in my Korean class, most of them persons senior to myself.

I could not very well admit my virtual ignorance of the Korean language. Instead, I pored over the one book that was of help, a textbook of Korean grammar by a Finnish scholar. I also had a Korean-Japanese dictionary that I had picked up during the war. The text we read had been prepared at an American university, but was not accompanied by any teaching materials. The questions asked by my students were penetrating, each one seemingly designed to destroy the weak fabric of my self-confidence. Sometimes, when asked the meaning of a verb ending or particle that I did not know, I resorted to the desperate expedient of saying that it was only a meaningless sound. I really don't know how I got through that year, but one of the students went on to become a scholar of Korean, and I now think of myself (once in a while) as the father of Korean studies in Great Britain.

I was otherwise occupied with preparing for publication *The Battles of Coxinga*, and in the following year I published *The Japanese Discovery of Europe*. I decided then and there to publish a book every year, a resolution I found increasingly difficult to implement.

My first book, *The Battles of Coxinga*, was published in 1951. I was in Istanbul, attending the Congress of Orientalists, at the time of publication, and looked forward to my return to England, imagining I would see copies of my book in the windows of the bookshops in Cambridge. Alas, the book never made a window anywhere, and I can hardly recall ever having seen a copy on sale. It was reviewed in a few specialist periodicals and then left to disappear into the great void of unread books. Many young scholars have had the same experience, but nothing can prepare one or console one for the shock of having (with immense effort and expenditure of time) produced a book that no one wants to read. I marvel now that this experience did not make me decide never to publish another book, but perhaps (I have forgotten now) a spirit of never-say-die impelled me to write a book that would really be read and respected.

****

My life in Cambridge was in most ways ideal for a scholar. My teaching load was light, and the vacations totalled more than six months each year. The collection of Japanese books in the University Library, at first restricted

to the rare editions of the Tokugawa period given to the library by Aston and other pioneers in the domain of Japanese studies, had now been much augmented by purchases of modern books, and it was certainly adequate for my needs. I had friends like Mrs Dickins in Cambridge and a few others elsewhere in England. In France and Spain I also had friends who made it possible for me to spend much longer periods in those countries than my annual allotment of foreign currency would otherwise have permitted. I knew how fortunate I was, and yet I sometimes felt discontented and depressed.

Probably the main cause of my discontent was my lack of satisfaction with my work as a teacher. After the initial excitement of the Korean War, which brought me the largest class I was ever to have at Cambridge, had died down, I went back to teaching classes of one or two students. If these students had been absolutely first-rate, they might have inspired me and persuaded me that I was fulfilling the traditional function of a teacher, passing on the torch of learning. The students were certainly pleasant and intelligent, but not extraordinary, and giving formal lectures to two people was frustrating. Like many others who have devoted themselves to the study of Japan, I had something of the propagandist in me. I wanted to communicate my enthusiasm for Japanese literature to others, the more the better, and two students failed to satisfy me.

The general lack of interest in my books was equally depressing. I had a statement from the publishers of my first book, *The Battles of Coxinga*, to the effect that at the present rate of sales it would take seventy-two years to exhaust the edition of a thousand copies. *The Japanese Discovery of Europe* had been somewhat more favorably received, but I never met anyone in the university who had actually read it. (I did not realize at the time that this was normal in academic communities.) And although I was still very much in love with Cambridge and its traditions, I was rather afraid of becoming like some of the scholars I knew, men who had published a brilliant book before they were thirty and nothing since. I learned not to ask (as one habitually did in America) what a scholar was working on, for fear of receiving an answer such as, 'I've written my book'.

Again, I enjoyed dining with the dons at the High Table in Corpus, where a valiant attempt was made, despite the rationing, to maintain some of the elegance of prewar days. After the meal, when we went to the Combination Room to drink port or Madeira I would sometimes try the snuff that was passed around in a silver box, gingerly imitating the others. I never derived the least pleasure from snuff, not even a good sneeze, but I was eager to participate in all the traditional rites. The avoidance of 'shop talk' on such occasions always depressed me. What, I wondered, could be more

interesting than 'shop talk' with the scholars around the table? And what was less interesting than chit-chat on projected repairs to the college buildings or the current state of the benefice made by some eighteenth-century donor? I can hardly remember one topic of conversation worthy of the learned men around me. Obviously, I was becoming restive but, having made up my mind to spend the rest of my life in Cambridge, it did not occur to me that I might be happier elsewhere.

In the spring of 1952 I offered a series of lectures on Japanese literature at Cambridge University. The frustration I had begun to feel over the fewness of my students and the general lack of interest in my work had made me try to think of some way of arousing interest in my subject and satisfying my vaguely sensed desire to be a real teacher. It occurred to me that a series of lectures, open not only to everyone in the university but to the town as well, might be the best solution to my problem.

I prepared five lectures, trying to make them as interesting and intelligible as possible. Apart from the introductory lecture, in which I presented my impressions of the characteristics of Japanese literature as a whole, I gave one lecture each on poetry, theater, fiction, and, finally, what I called 'Japanese literature under Western influence'. When I think back on these lectures now, I marvel at my daring in having ventured to present my views on a literature that I had first begun to read less than ten years earlier. But, reading the book that resulted now, I see that what I lacked in knowledge, I made up for in enthusiasm.

I feel most dissatisfied now with the last lecture. I would not call it 'Japanese literature under Western influence' if I wrote it today because I am aware of how much in modern literature cannot be explained in terms of influence from the West. At the time, however, it was almost impossible to obtain books from Japan, and the Japanese collection of the University Library, though well provided with works of classical literature, had extremely few modern novels. Arthur Waley gave me the copy of *Sasameyuki* (The Makioka Sisters) that the author, Tanizaki Junichirō, had sent him and this, together with *Ukigumo* by Hayashi Fumiko, were the only postwar works of fiction that I knew and discussed in my lecture.

On the day of the first lecture I waited nervously outside the hall for the time when the lecture was scheduled to begin. A young woman came up to me and asked if this was where the lecture on Japanese literature was to be given. I told her that it was. 'Do you think it will be good?' she asked. I was too embarrassed to say anything, and to my disappointment she went away. When the hour finally arrived, I went inside. I saw that I had been given a very large lecture room, but that there were no more than ten people, all seated in a row. Of course, Mrs Dickins was there, as was Professor Dickins.

Most of the other people present were acquaintances, probably there out of a sense of duty or else (more knowledgeable in such matters than I) aware how few listeners were likely to assemble and anxious to spare me wounded feelings.

The audience for each of the five lectures ranged from six to ten people, huddled together in a room that could easily have accommodated two hundred. I was thoroughly discouraged. I had put into the lectures not only all of my imperfect knowledge of Japanese literature but my youthful love of my subject, and I felt rejected. I decided at this point to abandon Japanese, and I began in the autumn of 1952 to attend classes in Russian with the intention of shifting at some future date from Japanese to Russian literature.

Fortunately or unfortunately, I made absolutely no progress with Russian; I had no trouble with the grammar, but the vocabulary refused to enter my brain. I concluded sadly that I was bound to Japanese for life.

[Donald Keene resigned his post at Cambridge in the autumn of 1954 to return to Columbia University as a professor. Columbia was prepared to give him a longer spell of leave in Japan than Cambridge could bring itself to contemplate. Did anyone realize at the time the loss that this would represent?]

THE NEXT THIRTY YEARS

by Carmen Blacker

The Faculty of Oriental Studies, when I joined it in 1955 as an Assistant Lecturer in Japanese, was said to comprise more professors and lecturers than undergraduates. There were Chairs in Hebrew, Arabic, Sanskrit, Egyptology, Persian and Chinese, and the holders were men of learning and integrity. Professor Harold Bailey, the Professor of Sanskrit, was reputed to know forty languages, including Old High Javanese, and to have resuscitated the lost language of Khotanese. Professor Arberry, the Professor of Arabic, was the leading authority in the land on Islam, and had translated the Koran into English in a manner of which even Muslims approved.

Japanese had no Chair, but it boasted two lecturers and one Japanese lector. Eric Ceadel, owing to whose initiative and drive Japanese had been added to the Faculty in 1947, was a man of indefatigable energy, persuasive administrative skill and a sense of duty which drove him later in life to the obsessive overwork which led to his early death. It was largely owing to his initiative, judgement and knowledge of bibliography, that the University Library acquired the nucleus of its excellent collection of Japanese books. Even when he was in bed with chicken pox, he spent his time not in reading Agatha Christie but in reorganising the class-mark system of the Faculty Library. He would put in long hours cataloguing the Japanese books in the University Library, most of them originally bought by him from bookshops in Tokyo.

John McEwan, or Mac as his friends called him, was in 1955 a remarkable scholar of Tokugawa history. He was deeply read in the Neo-Confucian schools of Shūshigaku and Yōmeigaku, and proved one of the few people in the country with whom I could discuss the philosophy and cosmology of Chu Hsi needed for my thesis on Fukuzawa Yukichi. He was equally conversant with the Kokugakusha of the 18th and 19th centuries, and when sufficiently stimulated by wine and congenial company could talk in the language and manner of Motoori Norinaga. He had recently published, in the Cambridge Oriental Series, a major study of the writings of Ogyū Sorai and was engaged in writing another on Tokugawa agriculture. He could also compose poems in Chinese which were said to be very creditable.The lector in Japanese in 1955 was Honda Minoru, a scholar of Central Asian history, who took time off from his studies of Rashi-to-tid to teach elementary colloquial Japanese for six hours a week. There was, however, only one

undergraduate reading Japanese. Patrick James was a Virginian, 6′4″ tall, whose chief delight was to read the battle chapters in the *Heike monogatari*. The classical grammar needed to master these famous passages bored him, as did most of the rest of the required reading for the Tripos. The chapter in Book 4 about the battle of the Uji Bridge, however, he found absorbing. So also the famous account in Book 12 of the battle of Dan-no-ura in 1185. Though he never learned to chant it in the traditional manner to *biwa* accompaniment, he nevertheless had much of it by heart. When, years later, I visited him in his house in Nara near the Sarusawa Pond, I saw that on the desk in his study a copy of the *Heike monogatari* lay open at this very chapter.

In 1955 the Faculty was quartered in No. 16 Brooklands Avenue, a large Victorian house where each language was assigned a room to itself. Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese, all had their separate rooms, where the relevant dictionaries and textbooks were ranged on shelves and where teaching took place round tables. The top floor of the house, which must have comprised the servant's quarters when the house was built, was made into a separate flat then occupied by John McEwan.

The house was not a satisfactory base for the Faculty, for there was no common room, no studies, and no place where anyone could talk to his colleagues over a cup of coffee. Hence people only stayed in the building for the duration of their lectures, and thereafter departed for their colleges or homes or the University Library. Nor was the house built to take the weight of so many books. A new Persian lector, teaching for the first time on the ground floor just underneath the rooms allotted to Chinese and Japanese, suffered a descent of plaster from the ceiling on his head so large that he had to be carried straight to Addenbrooke's Hospital in an ambulance.

The syllabus for the Tripos in Japanese in the 1950s and 60s was by modern standards old fashioned. Undergraduates, duly warned that they were embarking on a study of the most difficult language in the world, were expected to start from scratch, but by the end of their first year to be able to read simple modern texts and to have an adequate overview of Japanese history from early times until 1868. In their second year they began the classical language alongside modern, and by the end of that year when they took Part I of the Tripos, they were expected to have read a good many poems from the *Kokinshū*, the *Hōjōki* and perhaps the *Kokinshū* Preface. In their third and last year they read more difficult texts, both classical and modern. They read a Noh play, extracts from the *Heike monogatari*, and Maruyama Masao's famous essay on the 'Structure and Psychology of

Ultra-nationalism'. This latter work, though difficult, provoked lively discussion as to the meaning and content of virtually every sentence. They could take options too in a specialised period of Japanese history or literature, or in Japanese intellectual history from 1600 to 1868 .

Their numbers were necessarily few, since their only motive in those days was a disinterested love of Japanese culture and language. There were no lucrative jobs, as there are now, awaiting the Cambridge graduate in Japanese in a merchant bank or an import- export firm. There were no bright prospects, as there are now, for becoming a millionaire by the age of thirty. Japan was still remote, enigmatic, holding little to attract the average English schoolboy or girl whose horizon stopped at the boundaries of Europe. Nor were there many academic posts, anywhere in the world, which might await the graduate with First Class Honours.

Despite the lack of modern incentives, however, our undergraduates in those days included one future professor in London University, two future Indian ambassadors, and the identical twins David and James McMullen who are now respectively Professor of Chinese in Cambridge and Reader in Japanese at Oxford. I well remember that David used to join the first year class at 9 a.m. and would struggle with what to a Chinese scholar are horrendously agglutinative passive-causative verbs, the better ultimately to read the essential Japanese commentaries on the Chinese classics. At 10 o'clock he would leave, and the indistinguishably similar James would come in and effortlessly read the *Heike monogatari* or the Noh play.

Others disappeared into Malaysian tea plantations or into firms in Tokyo. More than one has surfaced to tell me that his training in classical Japanese at Cambridge has proved of great practical use, so impressive has been the kudos he thereby acquired over his Japanese colleagues in the firm.

But there was no teacher in Japanese economics or industrial sociology or even contemporary history. Nor was there any teacher of modern post-war literature. Eric Ceadel, John McEwan and I all shared in the teaching of the language and the prescribed texts, and between us offered courses in Japanese history, literature and the history of ideas. No one seemed to think that any more money was necessary for what we were doing, and the phrase 'fund-raising' was scarcely heard. There were no graduate students. It was left to the undergraduates' own initiative to find the ways and means of spending the Long Vacations in Japan. Most of them succeeded, to return with exciting tales of unlikely jobs and memorable personal encounters.

At the end of their course they could boast of having read some Mishima, some Akutagawa, some Natsume Sōseki, and even some *Mencius* in

kanbun, not to speak of the classical works already mentioned. Though everyone had to work extremely hard, there was yet an indefinable sense of *yoyū*, or margin left over for the enjoyment of 'things in themselves' and even of scholarship for its sake.

For two or three years after I arrived Mac continued to talk brilliantly of Shūshigaku, and of the wisdom of Ogyū Sorai's policies of taking samurai off the land and herding them into castle towns. His article on Motoori's views on language was a tour de force when it was first published and has remained essential reading for anyone interested in 'linguistic superiority'. It was very sad, therefore, when his behaviour began to show signs of unaccountability beyond the merely eccentric. He refused to pay the rent of his flat at the top of the house for so long that the Secretary was forced to write that if another month elapsed they would be compelled to change the locks on the door and ban him from entry. This, after another month, was duly done. The Mayor came wearing his chain and supervised the changing of the locks. It was discovered that Mac had not bothered to open any letters, including those from the Secretary, for a good many months.

He would come down during the night from his flat at the top of the house, and write Chinese poems about death on all the blackboards. These were elegant quatrains, *shichigon zekku*, of his own composition, but they made strange reading to those coming in at 9 o'clock the following morning to lecture on Arabic verbs.

He then took to spending most of his time in the University Library copying out the Confucian classics in red ink into large notebooks. Eventually the two current undergraduates complained that though he would appear for his lectures, he would sit with his back to them in silence reading a book. If they asked for some guidance in the text they were supposed to be reading with him he would say briefly 'It means what it says' and return to his reading.

Eventually Dr Taylor, the Secretary General, persuaded him to resign. He left Cambridge, and we afterwards heard that he had died in Hong Kong. It was a tragic end for so brilliant and unusual a scholar.

He was succeeded by Charles Sheldon, a scholar of the Tokugawa merchant class, whose personal experience as an interpreter at the War Crimes Trials in Tokyo gave him a special appreciation of the problems of testimony and of Japanese history in general.

In 1967 Eric Ceadel was appointed University Librarian, with responsibility for running the entire University Library. This tremendous task he took on with such vigour and versatile energy that he even felt obliged to

choose the type of matting to be laid down in the corridors. His light was to be seen every night shining from the Library tower until well past 11 o'clock. He naturally therefore had to abandon his lectureship in Japanese, thoug afterwards, right up to his tragically early death from overwork in 1979, he kept a friendly eye on the Japanese collection and was always ready to advise over a crisis with a lector.

He was succeeded by Douglas Mills, who had already published his translation of the *Uji shūi monogatari*, and who abandoned a comfortable Chair in Berkeley to return to Cambridge. He brought to the strength a remarkable mastery of classical Japanese, administrative initiative and valuable experience of teaching in America.

In 1968 the Faculty moved from 16 Brooklands Avenue to the new building on the Sidgwick Site which it occupies to this day. The effect of the move was transforming. All University teachers had their own studies, suitably enlarged to enable them to accommodate small classes. There was a Common Room and a Library where all the books could be housed together rather than kept in separate rooms. In the Common Room people could meet for coffee and discussion of common topics. Before the advent of computers and word processors, wonderful exchanges would take place about the words for iron or the gender of the Sun Deity, in Hebrew, Arabic, Chinese or Akkadian.

Computers however had a sad effect on such gatherings. The day came when I realised that a long time had gone by without any subject being discussed other than the breakdowns and diseases to which these machines are subject.

Some notable lectors came and went. There was Torigoe Bunzō, who is now head and moving spirit of the Tsubouchi Shōyō Museum of Theatre at Waseda. There was Yamanouchi Hisaaki, who was the first Japanese to present a thesis to the English Faculty and to receive a PhD as a result. This thesis, a study of melancholy in Wordsworth and Coleridge, was remarkable for the elegance and lucidity of its English prose. In 1983 we were stimulated by a visit of a Japan Foundation Visiting Professor. Katō Shūichi galvanised everyone by his wit, his conversational powers, his seminars in which he drew on his own experience of modern Japanese history, and the course of public lectures he delivered on intellectual history. These took place in the Common Room of the Faculty, and were crowded to capacity with people from other faculties and walks of life. Professor Katō proved a tower of moral and intellectual strength, which braced us for the crisis which was seen to be blowing nearer.

This crisis eventually broke upon us in the early 1980s. Government cuts to

education meant that the Faculty of Oriental Studies was threatened with retrenchments. The University, hoping for further economies, offered tempting silver handshakes to all University teachers between 57 and 65, together with varying inducements to early retirement. My two colleagues took advantage of this offer, and for a time it seemed that Japanese studies might have to close down, any undergraduates anxious to read the subject being diverted to Oxford.

The situation was saved by the energy and determination of our then Ambassador in Tokyo, Sir Hugh Cortazzi, who devoted himself to the cause of Japanese studies in Cambridge, often sending away, angry and envious, other petitioners for his help. Thanks to his persuasive energy, a munificent benefaction of over £500,000 was voted to fund a Chair in Modern Japanese Studies by the Keidanren, of which the sympathetic Chairman was Mr Hiraiwa Gaishi. In June 1984 the General Board published a Report on the Establishment of this Chair, which the following month was discussed in the Senate House. Few people attended this discussion, at which I made the only speech I have ever made in the Senate House.

[For the record, we include here the text of Carmen Blacker's speech, made on 17 July, 1984.]

> Vice-Chancellor, may I first thank the General Board for this Report and say how we in the Oriental Studies Faculty welcome this truly magnificent benefaction from the Keidanren, the Japanese C.B.I.?
>
> Two years ago, owing to the government cuts to universities and to the early retirement of my two colleagues, it seemed likely that Japanese studies in Cambridge might soon go to the wall. Our degree course, which since its beginning in 1948 has sent a number of distinguished men and women into museums, business firms, the civil service, and academic life, was threatened with immanent demise, and suggestions were even made that for the long term future the sensible and realistic policy would be to send undergraduates wishing to read Japanese to Oxford. And this despite the fact that the Japanese collection in the University Library is the finest in the country, and despite the fact that our course in Cambridge offered a nicer balance between modern and classical studies than any of those devised at the other three centres in the country where Japanese can be studied to honours degree level.
>
> Two years ago the prospect for the subject seemed bleak, and it

would have been scarcely credible that the General Board should now be presenting the University with the Report under discussion. But there is a saying in Japanese, Kafuku wa azanaeru nawa no gotoshi, good and bad luck are entwined like a rope. Or even more explicitly, *Wazawai wo tenjite fuku to nasu*, disasters can be turned into blessings. That this has happened with our subject is due overwhelmingly to the efforts made on our behalf by Japanese friends of Cambridge, and by our Embassy in Tokyo, particularly by our then Ambassador Sir Hugh Cortazzi. It was Sir Hugh who, on hearing of our plight, at once took up the cudgels and wrote an article which was given wide coverage in the Japanese press. He explained that Japanese studies in Cambridge were under threat, and called for advice and suggestions as to how our course might be saved.

The response was immediate and heart-warming. More articles appeared in the Japanese press, recalling that the first western scholars of Japanese literature and language had been Englishmen, that the British had built the first railway in Japan, that England and Japan had concluded an alliance in 1902 , that it was vital for future relations between the two countries that more English people should be educated in the Japanese language and culture, and hence that it simply would not do to allow the Cambridge course in Japanese to become extinct for want of money.

During the succeeding year enquiries and monetary contributions continued to arrive, both at our faculty and at the Embassy in Tokyo. Sir Hugh Cortazzi himself started the fund with a generous donation. Complete strangers sent us sums of money from their personal savings. Sir Hugh continued to press the Cambridge case to potential large- scale benefactors with tact and determination. Last September Professor Hiro Ishibashi, O.B.E., who some twenty years ago was our Lector in Japanese and is now President of the Ueno Gakuen University, organized a meeting to raise funds which was attended by the press, by representatives of the business world, and by Japanese friends in many walks of life. Eloquent and helpful speeches were made in Japanese by many persons, including one by Sir Hugh himself which called for funds to found a Chair which would give Cambridge Japanese studies the security and standing so badly needed.

The present Report is the result of all these efforts, and I am glad to take the opportunity of this Discussion to say how profoundly grateful we feel to our Embassy in Tokyo, and to the various firms

> in the Keidanren, notably the Tokyo Electric Power Company, who have contributed so munificently towards the extremely generous bequest under consideration. Our thanks here go particularly to Mr Hiraiwa, the President of the Tokyo Electric Power Company, and to Mr Hanamura, the Vice-President of the Keidanren.
>
> Thanks to this generosity we can look forward to an even stronger centre for Japanese studies than we could boast before the alarms of two years ago. The University has filled one of the vacant posts, and has already appointed Dr Richard Bowring, who has given up a full Professorship in Princeton to come back to Cambridge. St John's College and the Japan Foundation have equally generously founded a Senior Studentship, with teaching duties in Japanese, to which Dr Peter Kornicki has been appointed.
>
> And now we are to have something that Cambridge has never had before: a Chair in Modern Japanese Studies. Thanks to this splendid benefaction we can hope to expand on the modern side with more confidence than ever before, and to supply the teaching and inspiration needed for this important subject which, though as yet our numbers have been small, can confidently be predicted to expand in the near future.
>
> May I say once more how much we welcome this Report, and how deeply grateful we are to Mr Hiraiwa and the Keidanren for their splendid generosity, and to our Embassy in Tokyo for its energy, determination, and kindness in guiding the campaign for the funds to save and promote Japanese studies in Cambridge. (*Cambridge University Reporter*, 1984, p. 851)

This Chair, and its first incumbent Richard Bowring, and his indefatigable and imaginative energy in raising money, were to inaugurate a new era in Japanese studies in Cambridge. The University allowed the lectureship so vacated to be filled soon afterwards, so that Peter Kornicki, with his wide ranging knowledge and skills, was permanently added to the strength. When Stephen Large joined the team as Lecturer in Modern Japanese History and Hugh Whittaker came to lecture on Society, it was clear that an entirely new chapter had begun.

At the same time the booming economic scene in Japan had its repercussions on undergraduate numbers. New dazzling opportunities now offered themselves to those with a good degree in Japanese, not only in firms and banks in Tokyo and London, but also in universities. Academic posts, which for years had offered a barren and hopeless prospect, now appeared in such profusion that supply almost exceeded competent demand. 'Centres of

Japanese' proliferated in England, Scotland and Wales, not to speak of the United States, Australia and New Zealand. As a result the numbers of undergraduates wishing to read Japanese were pushed to the utmost limits that the Colleges could be persuaded to allot places to. Indeed their numbers were at one time greater than the sum total of all the undergraduates reading other Oriental languages in the Faculty.

This new scene, with its prospects for the future expanding like an open fan, will be described elsewhere in this book. I record here something of the older scene, from which there emerged the company of people who have brought about this notable change.

[Carmen Blacker retired in 1991. She lives in Grantchester and is still an active scholar, pursuing her interests in Japanese religion and folklore. A Festschrift was complied in her honour and presented to her in 1996.[2]

[2] P. R. Kornicki and I. J. McMullen, eds, *Religion in Japan: arrows to heaven and earth* (Cambridge University Press, 1996)

On the receiving end in the 1960s

by Richard Bowring

In 1965 when I arrived at Cambridge from the wilds of Somerset, lo and behold, there were five other misguided souls interested in studying Japanese. This must have come as a bit of a shock to our lecturers, for whom one or two had been the rule, although we did not realize this at the time. We were to discover that not only were there no students in either of the years ahead of us, but that no one else was to join until well after we had graduated. It certainly made us feel exclusive and an esprit de corps was not long in emerging. Only three of us, Bill Laws, Jonathan Rice and myself, went on to complete Part II. The other three had already done Part I in another Faculty. Mary-Grace Feacham (as was), who had studied Natural Sciences, left after completing Prelims., although she kept at it and is now the leading light in the UK for the teaching of Japanese at secondary-school level. Mike Linacre, a mathematician, left after Part I, and when I last met him was working in a university in Chicago, but not directly involved in things Japanese. Jim Backhouse, who had studied French and Latin, now teaches Japanese at ANU.

Carmen Blacker was away in the States on leave, so our mentors were Eric Ceadel, Charles Sheldon, and Kaneko Ryōtai. Kaneko sensei was a scholar of Tibetan from the Tōyō bunko studying Khotanese with Professor Bailey and I strongly suspect he was roped in at the last minute when it was discovered that the Japanese section was about to be overrun with students. He did his best with us, but we were occasionally unruly and he must have despaired at times. Apart from regular classes, we also had supervisions with him once a week. I have a vivid memory of sitting in an attic room at the top of one of the tall houses on Station Road. The room was entirely bare except for a small table and two chairs. This was '*kaiwa no jikan*'. Kaneko sensei was a very shy man. His spoken English was rather limited and I suspect that he did not have much '*kaiwa*' in Japanese either. The onus was entirely on me to converse and I soon ran out of things to say. I would dearly like to know what he thought of us ruffians, but he died soon after his return to Japan in 1968 so I can no longer ask him.

Ceadel's grammar and reading course was streamlined to say the least and was clearly designed with a view to learning *kanji*. It did a good job of introducing the simplest characters first, but this approach meant that some rather strange sentences turned up in the examples. I remember learning

about men called Nakada standing in the middle of paddy-fields, carrying bows and arrows and looking at cows. Ceadel was not unkind and had a waspish sense of humour that bubbled to the surface at times, but he had very high standards and was a severe task-master. His initial greeting implied that we were all about to enter hell and that some of us might prefer grazing in easier pastures. He was right, of course, and I have taken to doing the same with my own students on day one. No one ever takes you seriously until week three.

In 1965 someone wanting to read Japanese at University was a true oddity. I compounded the problem by throwing myself whole-heartedly into learning *kanji* and covered every single space of the walls in my room in College with badly written characters. I managed to get to Japan in the first summer vacation by signing up as an interpreter to a group of students from Cambridge and Dartmouth College in Vermont, who were going to kayak from Shimonoseki to Tokyo. It was arranged and paid for by National Geographic. We were provided with beautiful two-man sea kayaks made in Sweden. The only slight catch was that I had never been in a kayak before and it took about a week of falling in and out to get the balance right, but we got through the Inland Sea and made it all the way to Tokyo in the end, with only one portage in the middle to avoid a threatening typhoon. To go as an 'interpreter' after some six months of learning Japanese was foolhardy in the extreme but I somehow managed to survive. The first new word I learned on arrival was '*Kaijō hoanchō*', the second '*bōfū*' and the third '*tenpuku*'.

In those days the cheapest way to Japan was via the Soviet Union by train, plane, train and then boat. After the drab, featureless streets of Moscow and Khabarovsk ('jewel of the Maritime Provinces'), Yokohama was an explosion of noise and colour that took the breath away and got the blood running immediately. But my very first view of Japan was of the north-east coast of Honshu in the very early morning light with mist draped across deeply wooded hills and fishing boats on a glassy sea. It was magical and I knew then that although the initial decision to learn Japanese had been taken quite blind, I had been lucky in my choice.

The second-year course brought with it Ceadel's real love, the poems of the *Kokinshū*. His enthusiasm was curiously infectious and I distinctly remember when we got to the poems dealing with *ume no hana* it was just the right season in Cambridge. Three of us turned up one morning with broken-off branches of plum blossoms and placed them on the table in front of us. Being far more interested in grammar than flowers, he must have been a little non-plussed, but he just smiled wanly and plunged straight into the

next *kakekotoba*.

The rest of the course was long on difficult academic prose and short on the colloquial. It was considered, I think, that the spoken colloquial was something that could not really be taught but should be ‘picked-up’ by the bright student who was sufficiently interested and motivated. Perhaps I should not admit it, but there is an element of truth here. It was taken too far, of course. We could certainly have done with an expert spoken language teacher and it might have been nice to have had the sight of a modern Japanese newspaper from time to time. We have moved on somewhat and classical Japanese is now no longer a compulsory part of the course for a whole host of sensible reasons; but second-year students can still begin to study it if they wish and I know of no one here who would have it any other way.

A MEMOIR

by Douglas Mills

[Douglas Mills was employed as a Lecturer at Cambridge from October 1967 until his early retirement in September 1982. He continued teaching on a part-time basis until 1984.]

My experience of teaching Japanese began in 1944 when, having completed a period of language training as a Translator on a Service course at the School of Oriental and African Studies, I was not sent to the Far East but retained in London to assist in the continuance of such courses; I was regarded as a specialist in the form of Classical Japanese used in military training manuals and military orders. I remained at SOAS until demobilised in 1947.

Wartime teaching of Japanese was of course severely practical. My acquaintance with literary aspects of Japanese culture began when, at the suggestion of Professor Eve Edwards, Head of the Far East Department, I registered as a candidate, working in my spare time from my Army duties, for a London BA in Japanese. As the holder of a wartime BA in French and German at Cambridge, I was able to take this in August 1945, at approximately the same time as the atomic bomb ended the war. The degree available at that time was entitled Classical Japanese. However, the prescribed texts were not all from Classical Literature, many were modern; and we were not expected to do unseen translation from Classical texts. By 1947, when I took up a post as Lecturer at SOAS, the London degree had been considerably revamped, and was no longer called Classical Japanese, though it still required substantial study of Classical texts, along with texts in the modern language; it was a 'degree course', but it did provide a sound practical training in the language.

Somewhat less practical was the course prescribed when Japanese was begun in Cambridge in 1947. In the Preliminary Examination to Part I, neither of the specified texts was in the modern language; one was the Preface to the tenth-century poetic anthology *Kokinshū* and the other was a history of the First World War written in modern expository *bungo*. Though these exams were taken after only three terms of Japanese, they included one paper that required the student to translate passages of Classical Japanese that they had never seen before, and another paper demanded composition in the Classical language. Students certainly studied the modern language, but it was not until 1954 that it was specified for the Composition paper.

The syllabus for other parts of the Japanese Tripos was equally demanding, even, for instance, involving study of specified sections of the most ancient Japanese Chronicle, the *Kojiki*. Not until 1965–66 do the regulations make any mention of a requirement for Oral tests in the use of the modern spoken language.

By the time I took up my University Lectureship at Cambridge in 1967, having taught in the University of California at Berkeley for the previous five years, great changes had come about in the world of Japanese studies in the UK. From the early sixties, steps were taken to foster more 'relevant' studies to expand on the developments in more traditional studies which had taken place at the end of the war. Courses were developed in a range of universities in such subjects as Japanese politics, economics and contemporary history, and in some places Modern Japanese. For the zealots 'classical' became a dirty word. It is good to be able to record that this did not lead to the abandonment of the teaching of classical language and literature in the existing major centres of Japanese studies, London, Oxford and of course Cambridge. However, by the time I joined the Faculty of Oriental Studies important changes had been made in the syllabus. The Specified Texts paper and the Unspecified Texts paper in the Preliminary Examination contained only modern texts and the classical language was not introduced until the second year. Further changes took place in 1971, when the range of papers in Part I was increased, and an option introduced allowing those who were not going on to Part II to take a combination of papers that did not require Classical Japanese. This was intended for students who had taken a Part I in some other subject before taking up Japanese (such students were mostly from Modern and Medieval Languages). From 1965 on, an Oral test in the modern spoken form of the language was required at all levels.

One particularly important change was introduced in 1972: students in Part II were, at my suggestion, required to submit a dissertation of up to about 12,000 words. This gave students a chance to develop their own interests. By the time I retired in the early Eighties, some twenty dissertations had been presented, most of them admirable pieces of work. The distribution of subjects is interesting. Five were in the field of history or economics. One was on a social theme (trouble in schools). One dealt with the History of Ideas (on Kaibara Ekken). Four were literary studies, including one on the modern novelist Endō Shūsaku. Seven were annotated translations of medieval tales (*otogizōshi*) and plays (Noh). Two others were studies of Buddhist tales, but more general (one on Kannon stories and one on stories of King Yama, Enma-o). It is very gratifying to note that the idea of incorporating a dissertation into Part II was later taken up in some other subjects in the Faculty.

An interesting light on the climate of the time is cast by an incident which occurred in 1972. At the time there was no statutory provision for an undergraduate to spend time studying in Japan (or China). One of our best students, who was about to take the Part I examination, was offered the opportunity of working for a year in the office of a patent agency in Tokyo and applied for permission to intermit and then return to take his Part II examination in 1974. It is amusing to recall that, though his teachers (including myself) did not oppose his College's application to the Faculty Board for this permission, we were all slightly apprehensive that a year away from academic work might affect his ability to take it up again satisfactorily after his return. Luckily this pioneer (John Buchanan) not only benefited enormously from his year in Japan, but obtained a Starred First in his final exams. In later years the precedent set by this pioneer was followed by several other students who intermitted for one year during their course in order to gain first-hand experience of life in Japan before their final year of study. There was, however, an intermediate stage. I refer to the visits to Japan which were made possible with financial assistance from the Japan Foundation Endowment Committee. This was the Committee formed to administer the resources made available by the grant of some 300 million yen from the Japanese government to foster Japanese studies in British universities; these funds were commonly referred to as 'Tanaka' money, after the then Japanese Prime Minister, who had been the Japanese principal in the negotiations leading to the benefaction. The money was held by the University of Sheffield, and twice a year the Committee, made up of representatives from the main centres of Japanese studies, plus one other member to represent other institutions with an interest in Japanese studies, met under the Chairmanship of a member of the University Grants Committee to allocate the income from the capital. To my mind the most useful (at least in the early years) project to which we allocated funds was the sponsorship of a trip in the summer vacation by a group of students from various universities to attend a short course of studies in Nagoya. In the end the scheme proved to be financially no longer viable, but it served a very useful purpose while it lasted.

There was one other outside source of funds from which in the Seventies Japanese studies in the Faculty benefited. On more than one occasion we enjoyed the generosity of Mitsui & Co. (Europe) Ltd. We are especially grateful to the deputy General Manager at that time, Mr Oba Sadao, (a gentleman who, incidentally, after retirement stayed on in London as a business consultant, and, some years later devoted much of his time to writing a book about the teaching of Japanese to service personnel at SOAS during the war). One small instance of Mitsui generosity comes to mind; when I asked if the Company had a Japanese typewriter which they no

longer used and could let us have, he made arrangements for one to be shipped all the way from Tokyo. It was, of course, one of the old style of typewriters with a kind of honeycomb board containing individual pieces of type (electronic *wāpuro* were still in the future) and arrived in a crate measuring some 70 cm by 110 cm – a crate which I still find useful as a storage cupboard in my garage at home! More seriously, however, there were two ways in which the Mitsui offer of financial assistance was invaluable to us. One was that they provided funds for a series of lectures covering various aspects of modern Japan – politics, economics, industry, society, etc. Thanks to the aid from Mitsui, we were able to invite specialists from universities all over the country, and the series was highly successful. The other benefit received from the Company was a grant which enabled us to arrange for a series of lectures on Modern Japanese Literature to be given to our undergraduates in the Lent and Easter terms of 1975 by the Japanese scholar Dr Hisaaki Yamanouchi, who had earlier served as our Lector. In 1978 Cambridge University Press published *The Search for Authenticity in Modern Japanese literature,* a book written by Dr Yamanouchi on the basis of his 1975 lectures.

I cannot end this memoir without reference to those who during my time helped us in the capacity of Lectors. These are by definition native speakers whose function is to give practical instruction in spoken and written Japanese. During my time, these were mostly Japanese who happened to be available in Cambridge, and they were not necessarily specialists in Japanese studies. One was working in English medieval mystery plays, though another was a candidate working under my supervision for a Cambridge Ph.D. on one type of medieval Japanese drama. There is, however, someone who I think deserves special mention, namely the Dr Yamanouchi of whose lectures on Modern Japanese literature I spoke earlier. He was an Assistant Professor of English at Tsuda College in Tokyo whose speciality was English romantic poets. He came to Cambridge, having already studied in America, to work for a Ph.D. in the English Faculty, on the subject (God save the mark!) of 'The Theme of Melancholy and Dejection in Wordsworth, Coleridge and Six Other English Poets'. Despite being engaged in work on this depressing subject, he was in fact a wholly delightful person, as was his wife; both were real ornaments to the Japanese section of the Faculty. Both had remarkable command of English; Mrs Yamanouchi's spoken English perhaps flowed a little more than his, which was immaculate, but unhurried. His written English, on the other hand, was phenomenal. In personal terms they were as good ambassadors for Japan as one could possibly have wished for; their contribution to the life of the Japanese section, indeed of the Faculty in general, was immense. When the term of Hisaaki's Lectorship as allowed by the University expired, his wife Reiko

took over, and was equally successful as a Lector as he had been. Though she was a graduate in English, she did not work in the field of English academic scholarship. But she made a considerable name for herself in the field of publishing; among other things, she later translated *Period Piece*, the celebrated book about Cambridge life at the beginning of the century by the grand-daughter of Charles Darwin, Gwen Raverat.

Their stay with us came to an end in 1976, when, loath though they were leave Cambridge, they felt that they had no alternative but to return to Japan. He resumed his career teaching English, for most of the remainder of that career as a Professor at Tokyo University. Throughout that time, however, he rendered great service to the British Council, and his work for Anglo-Japanese cultural relations was in 1996 rewarded by the award of a very prestigious British decoration, the CBE. We would dearly have loved to be able to secure for Hisaaki an appointment in the Faculty to teach Modern Japanese Literature, but unfortunately no such post was available. It is sad that we could find no place for this most cultured man, and one cannot banish a wry smile at the thought that in 1976, when Japan had long since shown itself to be one of the major players on the world stage, a post in Modern Japanese Literature rated no higher a place on the list of desiderata within the faculty than fifth.

A CHRONICLE OF THE YEARS 1984–97

by Richard Bowring

The early 1980s

As Carmen Blacker has suggested, the early 1980 s were a time of crisis. Stringent cuts in the Education Budget meant that the University had to look for savings and Oriental Studies, with its unrealistic staff-student ratio was bound to come in for close scrutiny. In Michaelmas 1980 the General Board established a sub-committee to consider the scope and establishment of the Faculty of Oriental Studies. The report was produced on the assumption of level funding, but by the time it was submitted to the General Board in Lent 1981, it had become clear that the whole financial position of the University was set to deteriorate further and in very short order. Decisions on recurrent funding for the Faculty were therefore postponed, but the Faculty Board was asked to investigate ways of increasing student intake and to take a careful look at teaching provision. The gravity of the situation was underlined by the fact that the first recommendation was that discussions take place with the equivalent Board at Oxford on how certain subjects with very low student numbers might be shared out between the two universities to avoid unnecessary duplication. In particular they asked that 'the future pattern of Japanese in the two Universities' be investigated (*Cambridge University Reporter*, 16 March, 1983, p. 392). Drastic measures indeed, which assumed a willingness to cooperate to an unprecedented degree.

As part of the attempt to reduce staff, the University was encouraging teachers near the end of their tenure to take early retirement on advantageous terms. In the September of 1982 both Charles Sheldon and Douglas Mills decided to accept this offer. In both cases the decision was made for entirely understandable reasons, but the effect was to put a large questions mark over the whole future of the subject, given that the University authorities, looking for cuts, might simply refuse permission to fill. The result of discussions by what became known as the Joint Working Party was revealed in a further report to the University dated 16 March, 1983 . On the subject of Japanese, it said:

> The position of Japanese at Oxford and Cambridge presented the Joint Working Party with a particularly difficult problem. The small number of undergraduates in recent years hardly justifies, on financial grounds, the provision of courses at both Universities. Cambridge has the larger establishment of offices supported by

> U.G.C. funds, with three University Lectureships, two of which are now vacant, and a Lectorship. Oxford has only two such posts, with considerably younger incumbents, but the recent establishment of the Nissan Institute of Modern Japanese Studies on a benefaction supporting a Professorship, two University Lecturerships, and an Instructorship, has strengthened the subject immeasurably so that it is clearly guaranteed at Oxford for the foreseeable future, even though the resources of the Institute are outside the Faculty and almost entirely non-linguistic. Furthermore, it is possible that the establishment of the Institute may further deplete student numbers at Cambridge. On the other hand, although the pattern of retirements at Cambridge, recent developments at Oxford, and the possibility of even fewer undergraduates must put into question the continuation of Japanese Studies at Cambridge, its strength in classical Japanese is unique in the United Kingdom, and it has, in the University Library, probably the largest single Japanese library collection in Western Europe. Moreover, Chinese would be weakened, and its credibility diminished outside the University, without the support of Japanese, which is an essential research tool for Chinese scholars. The termination of Cambridge Japanese would undoubtedly dismay senior academics in Japan, and would also be at odds with other international influences and trends. In the present financial circumstances, however, the Board feel obliged to accept the view of the Joint Working Party that the Cambridge Japanese course could be maintained adequately with an establishment of two University Lectureships and a Lectorship. The Board accordingly propose the suppression of one of the vacant University Lectureships, and they intend, subject to the approval of that proposal, to give permission to fill the remaining vacancy. They look to the Faculty Board, however, to review the working of the proposed new arrangements and to inform the Board accordingly. (*Cambridge University Reporter*, 1983 , p. 396)

These recommendations were accepted. One University Lectureship in Japanese History (that previously held by Sheldon) was suppressed and the other (that previous held by Mills) was advertised. It will be noted that at this point, October 1983, Japanese had only two active posts: the University Lectureship (held by Carmen Blacker) and one Lectorship (held by Haruko Laurie). The Lectureship previously held by Mills was eventually advertised in December 1983 and I myself was appointed as of 1 June 1984.

Carmen Blacker has described what was happening during this difficult time.

Despite the stated view of the Joint Working Party that ‘the Cambridge Japanese course could be maintained adequately with an establishment of two University Lectureships and a Lectorship’, this was clearly not a very realistic proposition in the longer term and the possibility remained that Japanese studies might still collapse at Cambridge, either before or at her own retirement. Sir Hugh Cortazzi, the then British Ambassador in Tokyo, decided to try and raise money in Japan for the endowment of a Chair. He wrote to the *Asahi Shinbun* on 29 April 1983. This brought a response on 14 May and the next day the column ‘Tensei jingo’ took up the subject. By the end of the year and as the result of much work by many people, a benefaction for the Chair was received by Cambridge from the Keidanren. The then Chairman, Hiraiwa Gaishi, had been a prime mover and it is known that TEPCO was the largest donor. The Chair was established at the end of July 1984, advertised in October and the election was made on 19 February 1985.

Meanwhile, in a separate but related development, work had been proceeding on another front. The Japan Foundation had been concerned that Japanese Studies might be badly damaged at Cambridge and eventually agreed to fund, in collaboration with St John’s College, a Senior Studentship for three years with teaching duties in the Faculty. This post was advertised and filled in October 1984 by Peter Kornicki, who was at that time at the Jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo in Kyoto, the first foreigner to hold an established position at a state institution. The Lectureship that I had just vacated was immediately declared vacant and was offered to Peter Kornicki in April 1985. This in turn left the Senior Studentship open and both the Japan Foundation and St John’s College generously agreed to fund this post as of new, for a full three years. It was filled soon afterwards by Mito Takamichi, a PhD student from Toronto working on Japanese oil policy and international relations. It was his job to begin to fill the gap in modern studies and he did this by starting a course in Japanese politics.

By Spring 1985, therefore, the situation had been entirely transformed: in the space of one year the teaching officers increased from two to five.

Interlude: the Ijuin affair of 1985

Spring 1985. Not long after taking up the Chair, I received a visit from a man calling himself Dr Ijuin Kimitake. We met in the Faculty Common Room one morning. He had in tow as interpreter Prof. Sekine Masuru, a scholar of English theatre from Waseda. Sekine had married the daughter of a well-known scholar of W.B. Yeats called Jeffares and was living with his wife’s family in Kinross, writing in English on the No playwright and

theorist Zeami.

Ijuin announced that he was on a hush-hush, private mission from Prime Minister Nakasone. The Japanese Embassy would not know of his visit because it had been arranged by the PM's private office, and he would be obliged if I did not contact the Embassy for the time being because there might be some embarrassment. Things were a little delicate, he explained. As everyone knew, Japan was worried at the size of its trade imbalance with Europe and the United States. Plans were afoot to set up a major Japan Studies Institute in Kyoto (this eventually came to fruition as the Nichibunken) and he had been sent to inquire what could be done about setting up a similar institute in Cambridge. He handed me a four-page proposal for a 'Euro-Japan Institute of Cambridge', which would involve purchasing land in the city. The proposal was in English. Well, this was all very exciting.

It appeared that Sekine had already arranged to introduce Ijuin to a former Treasurer of the University, who had revealed that there was in fact a large chunk of land in the middle of Cambridge that was coming onto the market and that the University wished to buy. He was talking of the empty shell of the old city hospital, known as the Old Addenbrooke's Site. A meeting with the Vice Chancellor had also been set up. I was duly impressed. Dr Ijuin produced a description of his own Japanese Cultural Arts Institute (Getsuritsu-yo) in Yamanashi prefecture, in which he described himself as 'pottery master, author, international lecturer and mathematician'. In conversation it turned out that he had studied at Princeton, knew Marius Jansen, and had a PhD from Dallas. Having passed him my card at the very beginning of the proceedings, I now asked him for his. After some hesitation ('*ma, ii daro'* [well, I suppose it's safe], he said quietly) he gave me his card. At the time I was a little taken aback but assumed that the secrecy of his mission meant that he had to be careful about handing his card to all and sundry at this stage.

Only after he and Sekine had left, did I begin to have second thoughts. A number of things did not quite add up. His name card was a very individualistic one; it had panache but carried no information apart from the name and an address in Yamanashi, not quite the kind of thing one expected from someone connected to the PM's office. And then there was the matter of the name. It was a curious mixture: Ijuin was an aristocratic name from Kyushu, but Kimitake, his personal name, looked as if it were written in the same fashion as the real personal name of the Japanese author and suicide Mishima Yukio. He had been at Princeton but had relied on Sekine to interpret most of the conversation. Most curious of all, he had combined a sober suit and tie with brown leather cowboy boots. Well, I thought, this

may be what special envoys from Nakasone were wearing these days, but I doubted it. I rang the Embassy. No, they said, they did not know of an Ijuin, but they would check and get back. Meanwhile the meeting with the Vice Chancellor went ahead. All the top university officers were present. Sekine presented the plan to buy land and put up a large institute. The meeting lasted forty minutes. I told the Vice Chancellor of my concerns at the end of the meeting and we agreed to wait and see what happened.

The Embassy rang later that week to say that they had no knowledge of Ijuin but were still checking. I had the opportunity to discuss things with Prof. Marius Jansen from Princeton, who was on a short visit to Cambridge University Press, and he confirmed that he knew Ijuin, but not as a student. He had been approached by Ijuin in similar circumstances and mention had also been made of a similar Institute in the States. He had even visited Ijuin's mansion in Yamanashi. I heard nothing for a week, and then came a call from Interpol: could they come and discuss a recent Japanese visitor, please? Apparently he was wanted in Tokyo on fraud charges.

The tale that eventually emerged was highly instructive. It told of the power of personal introductions, the ways in which Japanese institutions could be manipulated, and of the kind of atmosphere that sudden richness in Japan had generated. It also said something about the reputation of Nakasone, in that the whole yarn of being a personal emissary had seemed so plausible. In the end it was a sad story, but one had to admire the genius of a man who could pass himself off in front of the Vice Chancellor without batting an eyelid.

It turned out that Ijuin (aka Kido Kazuo, Sakata Kazuo, Sakata Kimitake) was the eldest son of a Kyushu miner. Born in 1937, he had dropped out of high school, gone to work at the US base at Ashiya and picked up English. He returned home in 1962 just when the mines at Kaijima were closed. Borrowing his father's golden handshake, he married and went to America for his honeymoon. He was divorced in 1967. Off to America again, where he eventually ended up in gaol for three years for fraud and embezzlement. Released in 1971, he returned to Japan. Going to see a famous Hagi potter called Sakata, he asked to be taken on as an apprentice. When this failed, he approached and eventually married the daughter. They had three children but he was again divorced in 1981.

How he had cooked up the idea of becoming a Nakasone envoy I do not know, but it was a touch of genius. What did he hope to get out of it from Cambridge? A letter signed by the Vice Chancellor perhaps? Or was it just the thrill of fooling the whole world and his brother? But while he was acting his new role in Cambridge (and he tried Oxford the next month), things were quickly unravelling in Tokyo. On 26 May, 1985 the *Sankei*

Shinbun revealed that the prestigious Tokyo Department Store Wakō had begun to recall all pottery sold at a one-man exhibition held three years previously. The potter's name was one Ijuin Kimitake. About eighty pieces had been sold at an average of ¥200,000 a piece. It had recently come to light that some of the pieces were by a rank amateur and had been exhibited without his knowledge. It turned out that 'Ijuin' had managed to pass himself off as a master potter, had persuaded Wako to hold an exhibition of his work, and had made a tidy profit from the proceeds.

Takashimaya and Daimaru had also been taken in and run similar exhibitions. the fraud only came to light when an amateur potter in Okayama called Itō, who had never sold a piece in his life, just happened to see some of his own pieces in the catalogue of the Wakō exhibition. He then recalled that Ijuin had visited him some years back saying that he was in politics but was getting fed up with the rat race and wanted to study as a potter. Could he please have some advice as to how to begin as an amateur and could he please borrow some pieces as examples? It was these examples that eventually ended up in the Wakō exhibition.

A year later I heard that our friend Ijuin had been arrested at Narita and was now serving yet another sentence for fraud. Red faces all round. Sekine must have dined out on the story on many occasions, as we have never met since and I can only assume that he was completely conned. Pity about the Old Addenbrooke's Site though; management studies and the natural sciences grabbed it all in the end.

1985–97

The history of the last ten years has been one of steady expansion based on a successful search for funding from sources outside the University. Student numbers increased dramatically for a time but have now levelled off somewhat, reflecting the situation in the country at large.

Starting in the summer of 1985 fund-raising approaches were made via former students working in the City of London, primarily in merchant banks. Miss Haruko Fukuda of Nikkō Securities was a central figure in this effort and the end result was a fund of about £350,000, the major part of which was given by Japanese financial houses such as Nomura, Yamaichi, and Nikkō. This allowed the creation of another language teaching post known as an Instructorship, to which Haruko Laurie was appointed in 1987. As luck would have it, at the same time, the results of the Parker Report entitled 'Speaking for the Future: a Review of the Requirements of Diplomacy and Commerce for Asian and African Languages and Area Studies' commissioned by the then University Grants Committee gave Cambridge a

further lectureship in Japanese. This was filled by the modern historian Stephen Large, who gave up his Readership in History at Adelaide to start teaching in October 1987.

In 1988 Mr Mito left Cambridge to take up a position in banking in London. By October 1988 teaching strength was up to six, with one additional unexpected bonus: Gina Barnes, who had previously been an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Archaeology won a Senior Studentship at St John's College to continue her research and teaching. Dr Barnes was that rare thing, a specialist in Japanese and Korean archaeology, and we had the benefit of her presence, her research and her teaching until she left in 1996 to become Professor of Japanese at Durham.

1988 also brought a personal benefaction from the Japanese educationalist Kawashima Hiroshi, which allowed us to create yet one more lectureship to which Mark Morris was appointed in April 1989. Carmen Blacker was due to retire in 1991 but permission was obtained to fill the prospective vacancy well in advance and Hugh Whittaker was appointed in August 1989.

1990 saw the establishment of the Fuji Bank Lectureship in Modern Japanese Studies, which was first filled by Barry Keehn and is now held by John Swenson-Wright. At the same time the monies in the very first fund we had raised increased to the point where we could envisage improving the position of Haruko Laurie as the person in charge of language teaching. The treatment of language teachers in universities has always been problematic. Dedicated, born language teachers are not always born researchers and so tend to become trapped in positions that do not reflect their worth to the University. Eventually, after much consultation and many committees we finally succeeded in persuading the University that it made sense to establish a post, entitled Senior Language Teaching Officer, that would attract a stipend that would more truly reflect the contribution made while at the same time treating any research done by the officer to be an added bonus rather than a requirement. Haruko Laurie was appointed to the new post in October 1991.

Further benefactions were received from, among others, Yasuda Trust and Banking, for a Research Fellowship in the Faculty; the Daiwa Anglo-Japanese Foundation, for a Research Fellowship at Downing and help for another one at Pembroke; Mr Sorimachi Shigeo, for the buying of books: Mitsui Kaijō Kasai, for the Meiji microfilm collection; and, most recently, Mr Aoi Tadao of Marui Co. Ltd. This last gift of £3 million has allowed us to build a new wing on the University Library that will hold all Chinese and Japanese books and which will give us a proper East Asian reading and reference room for the first time. Anyone who has tried to use the Japanese holdings in the Library will know the difference that this will

make to research. Connections between Cambridge colleges and Japanese universities have also grown: Trinity with Waseda, Downing with Keiō, Pembroke with Nihon, to mention only a few. The only area where almost no progress has been made is in postgraduate studies, where the numbers remain extremely small and there is serious concern that no one seems interested in training to be fill our shoes as teachers.

The next stage of expansion will probably involve moving away from our present location within the Faculty of Oriental Studies to a separate East Asian Institute. This is necessary not only because the present building is now full but also because without this step it is unlikely that Japanese studies will ever be able to create the kind of presence in the University that it warrants. We are now actively seeking funds to make this a reality.

JAPANESE LIBRARIES AND BOOKS IN CAMBRIDGE

by Peter Kornicki

Although Japanese has only been taught at Cambridge since 1947, the Japanese collection in the University Library is now one of the largest in Europe and its only rival is the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. As a result it is an important research library and is used not only by undergraduates working on their dissertations, by graduate students working on their theses, and by the members of staff, but also and increasingly by graduate students and scholars from other countries in Europe who cannot find the sources they are seeking elsewhere. This happy state of affairs is not, however, so much a result of careful planning as of donations and benefactions, for the now prohibitively high cost of Japanese books in sterling terms makes it impossible to keep up with the flood of Japanese publications appearing each year. No university in Britain can afford to buy more than a tiny selection of the scholarly books published in Japan, but the UK Union Catalogue project, helped by Mr Koyama in the University Library and generously funded by the Daiwa Anglo-Japanese Foundation, at least makes it possible for users anywhere in Britain to find out precisely what Japanese books are available in this country and where they are to be found. Often a day trip to Oxford or London will give access to books that are not in Cambridge, and this adds immeasurably to the usefulness of the University Library, now that it can be used with the complementary holdings of other accessible collections as a back-up.

Teaching may have started in 1947, but the first Japanese book to enter the university's library collections arrived as early as 1715, when the library of John Moore, Bishop of Ely, was bought up and presented to the University by George I. This contained a rather curious book: it was half-bound in leather some time in the eighteenth century and bears on the spine the inscription 'Liber Sinensis M.S.', in other words 'Chinese manuscript book'. As it happens the only accurate word in this inscription is 'book', for it is not a manuscript and it is not Chinese! It is in fact a copy of *Azuma kagami* ('Mirror of the East'), a historical work dealing with the foundation and operation of the Kamakura Bakufu; it was published in Japan in the early seventeenth century and bears an inscription written at Oxford in 1626; it was undoubtedly one of the first Japanese books to reach England. It is even possible that this volume is part of a collection of books purchased in Japan by Richard Cocks (?–1624), the manager of the ill-fated and short-lived English Factory at Hirado, which was closed down before the hostility of

the Tokugawa Bakufu made trading conditions impossible for Europeans. Cocks recorded in his diary on 10 November 1616 that he bought a set of 54 books consisting of the chronicles of Japan and this is likely to have been the *Azuma kagami*. At any rate, it is no surprise that there was in Cambridge in the eighteenth century nobody with sufficient knowledge of Japanese to recognise this as a Japanese book, and it may be that the mistaken identification of it as a manuscript was based on the false supposition that printing was unknown in East Asia, whereas in fact printing in China, Korea and Japan was considerably older than in Europe.

A few chance donations of Japanese books came the way of the University Library towards the end of the nineteenth century, but there was no interest in collecting Japanese books at this stage, and when in 1871 Professor James Summers, who had lived in Japan and was professor of Chinese at King's College, London, offered some Chinese and Japanese books for sale to the Library, the offer was turned down. It was in the early years of the twentieth century that the holdings assumed respectable proportions, for in 1911 the Library acquired two important collections. Firstly, a collection of 721 Japanese books from the collection of Baron Heinrich von Siebold (1852–1908) were presented to the Library by his step-daughter. Heinrich von Siebold was the younger son of the great pioneer Japanologist, Philipp Franz von Siebold and he first travelled to Japan in 1872; he worked for a while as an official in the Japanese Ministry of Finance, but most of his career was spent in the service of the Austro-Hungarian legation in Tokyo as an interpreter and then as consul. Later in 1911 William George Aston (1841–1911) offered the University his large collection of Japanese books but he died before the arrangements could be made and in the end the University bought the collection of more than 2,000 books in nearly 10,000 volumes from his executors. Aston had gone out to Japan in 1864 to join the British Consular Service as a student interpreter and his duties were primarily to acquire a command of the Japanese language for the conduct of consular business. He was clearly a gifted linguist, for in 1869 he published the first edition of *A grammar of the Japanese spoken language* and in 1872 *A grammar of the Japanese written language*, both of which went through several editions and were widely used in the nineteenth century. He filled a number of consular posts in Japan and in Korea until ill health forced him to retire in 1899 to Devon, where he devoted the rest of his life to furthering the study of Japan: he had with him a large number of books, mostly woodblock books printed in the Tokugawa period, which he used for his pioneering translation of the *Nihon shoki* (1896) and for his other works, *A history of Japanese literature* (1899) and *Shinto, the way of the gods* (1905). Aston's collection of books, many of which are annotated in his own hand, also contains many items that were given him by another great collector of

early Japanese books, Ernest Mason Satow (1843–1929). Satow had entered the British Consular Service in Japan in 1861, three years before Aston, and remained there until 1884, when his career took him to other parts of the world, although he did return Japan as Minister (ie, ambassador) in 1895. Satow was a compulsive collector of books and his letters and diaries testify to the book-hunting expeditions that he and Aston went on together; his collection is now scattered in various collections around the world, such as the British Library and Nihon Daigaku, but Cambridge University Library contains many rare works he gave to Aston in connection with the latter's history of Japanese literature, especially works of seventeenth-century literature. Aston and Satow made themselves experts on the history of books and printing in Japan and put together an outstanding collection, which contains much that is either unique or of very great rarity; most items were printed with wood-blocks, but there are also a number of manuscripts, some early books printed with metallic movable-type and even some printed with wooden movable-type.

The oldest items in the Japanese collection are four Buddhist invocations (*dhāraṇī*) printed in Japan in the 760s, which by a margin of several hundred years are the oldest printed items anywhere in the Library. Amongst the collection's treasures are a Buddhist doctrinal work printed on Mt Koya in 1288, and some seventeenth-century illustrated manuscripts. At present, only a small part of the collection of early books from the collections of von Siebold, Aston and Satow has been closely studied, and it offers a superb resource for the future study of Japanese mapmaking, travel literature, sinology, drama and prose literature. Following the publication of a complete catalogue in 1991, the University Library became the base of a much larger project which aims to describe all pre-modern Japanese books in European libraries. Information gathered from collections all around Europe, from Moscow to Lisbon and from Stockholm to Naples, is added to the data-base maintained in the Library.

The two priceless collections acquired in 1911 remained dormant for some years, for there was nobody in Cambridge with sufficient knowledge of the Japanese language to be in a position to make use of them, and the University had at this stage no interest in supporting Japanese studies. Consequently, no efforts were made to acquire any modern Japanese books. In 1921, however, the Crown Prince of Japan, the future Emperor Showa (Hirohito) visited Cambridge during his historic tour of Europe and was shown some volumes from the Aston Collection. He promised to make a donation himself and that arrived in 1925: it was a complete set of the 666 volumes of the *Gunsho ruiju*, a compendium of old texts, which came from the Imperial Library in Tokyo.

The superb collection of modern books was largely built up from scratch by Eric Ceadel, a Cambridge graduate in Classics who learnt Japanese early in the war and spent the rest of it either teaching Japanese to intelligence officers or translating captured documents: he was appointed to a lectureship in Japanese in 1947 and in 1967 became the University Librarian. He concentrated mostly on the humanities, and the collection is particularly strong in history and literature, but since 1985 great efforts have been made to expand the range of the collection to take in the social sciences as well. To this modern collection has recently been added a number of books on Japanese bibliography and literature from the collection of the late Mr Shigeo Sorimachi, the leader antiquarian bookseller of Japan and a noted bibliographic scholar in his own right, and a vast archive of microfilms of nineteenth-century books held in the National Diet Library, acquired through the generosity of Mitsui Marine and Fire Insurance. By the end of 1998 the entire Japanese collection will, together with the Chinese and Korean books, be housed in the Aoi Pavilion, an extension to the Library made possible by the generosity of Mr Tadao Aoi of Marui Co. Ltd of Tokyo.

In their final year all undergraduates find themselves making extensive use of the collections of the University Library, particularly for their dissertations. But during the earlier part of their undergraduate careers many do not set foot in the Library and make do with the resources of the library of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, which houses the teaching collection. Here are the dictionaries, which first-years learn to grapple with as they try to make sense of their first Japanese texts, and here are the books and academic journals in Western languages which they use for their initial studies of Japanese literature, history, politics and society. To go from this comfortable collection to the shelves upon shelves of Japanese books in the University Library can be a difficult transition, but by the end of their fourth year most undergraduates are surprised to find how well they can find their way around those initially daunting shelves.

by Koyama Noboru

The Cambridge-Oxford Society

In 1906, the Garter Mission, led by Prince Arthur of Connaught and accompanied by Lord Redesdale among others, carried the Order of the Garter to the Meiji Emperor. In Tokyo, they met members of the 'Cambridge Society', which, according to the description given by Lord Redesdale, comprised of fifty or sixty Japanese men who had been educated in British universities[3] It is probable that the majority had spent at least some time at the University of Cambridge, hence the name of the Society. It is not known when the society was first formed, but 1906 is clearly the terminus ad quem. The next reference to it can be found in the journal of Marie Stopes, who helped to form a 'London University Union' in Tokyo in 1908. 'Cambridge and Harvard, etc. all have their Unions', she wrote, 'why should London be less honoured and remembered by her children?'[4] The committee for this London group included Marie Stopes herself, a Professor S (Sakurai Jōji) and a Baron K (Kikuchi Dairoku), and the Union boasted an initial membership of twenty-two members.

A revised membership list of the 'Cambridge-Oxford Society' can be found in *Matsukata Masayoshi kankei monjo*.[5] Matsukata Masayoshi, a former Prime Minister, had received the honour of Doctor of Civil law from Oxford in 1902. This list records twenty ordinary members from Cambridge and seven from Oxford including Matsukata himself; there were also two honorary members: Fushimi-no-miya (Prince Fushimi Sadanaru) and Ambassador Claude MacDonald. Claude MacDonald had been the British Minister to Japan when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was concluded in 1902 and became the first British ambassador to Tokyo from 1905–12. Hayashi Tadasu, who became the first Japanese ambassador to Britain in 1905, is listed both under Cambridge and Oxford, as he had received honorary degrees from both universities.

It is not known exactly when this list was compiled, but there are some clues. One is Claude MacDonald's tenure of office. The other is the name Inagaki

[3] Lord Redesdale, *The Garter Mission to Japan,* London, 1906, p. 253.

[4] Marie Stopes, *A Journal from Japa : a daily record of life as seen by a scientist*, London, 1910. p. 111.

[5] *Matsukata Masayoshi kankei monjo*, vol. 10. Tokyo, 1989, pp. 459–461

Manjirō, which is missing from the list. Inagaki gained a BA from Cambridge in 1889, initiated and developed the Japanese Club at Cambridge, which held fifteen meetings between 1888 and 1895, and wrote *Japan and the Pacific* in 1899, the book that made his reputation. He later became a well- known diplomat, but died prematurely in 1908. If the list had been compiled before 1908, one would have expected to see his name. We can therefore conclude that it was compiled between 1908 and 1912. The Cambridge society, founded sometime prior to 1906, had therefore become the Cambridge-Oxford Society at some point between 1906 and 1912. Normal English usage would lead one to expect an 'Oxford-Cambridge Society', but perhaps a preponderance of members who had been to Cambridge brought about the unusual reversal.

Japanese Students and the 'Previous Examination'

Britain was of course one of the most important destinations for Japanese students wishing to study abroad during the Meiji period (1868–1912). The earliest official dispatch of students to Britain involved fourteen students sent by the Tokugawa Shogunate prior to the Restoration. The youngest of these was the twelve-year old Kikuchi Dairoku who, like a number of others, was destined to study in London. The students from Satsuma and Chōshū were registered at University College, London. It was not long, however, before Japanese were enrolling at other English and Scottish schools and universities, including, of course, Oxford and Cambridge. Cambridge, in particular, seems to have received relatively large numbers.

In 1890 the Japanese Government conducted a survey of Japanese nationals who were living abroad, one of the earliest surveys of its kind.[6] Japanese resident in Britain were listed in four categories in order, namely Glasgow, London, Cambridge and others. Nine were living in Cambridge at the time, all of them students. When J.J. Edwards, Fellow and Dean of Peterhouse, gave a paper about Japanese undergraduates at Cambridge to the Japan society of London in January 1905, he mentioned that the University had always had between six to ten Japanese students in residence and that on one occasion there had been as many as thirteen.[7]

> Whatever may be the reason for this choice - whether it be the Cambridge rule which remits Littlego Greek in the case of Asiatic

[6] Matsumoto Tokutaro, *Meiji hokan*, [Tokyo], 1892. pp. 993–995.

[7] H. J. Edwards, 'Japanese Undergraduates at Cambridge University', *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society of London*, Vol. III (1905–7), pp. 46–58.

> undergraduates (a remission which some of our academic authorities would wish to see extended to British undergraduates also) ; or whether it be the variety of subjects that may be studied for a degree - it is certainly true to say that the Japanese have always received careful and courteous attention from the teachers of the University and their several Colleges.[8]

What was this remission of Greek in the ‘Littlego’? ‘Littlego’ was a Cambridge term for the entry examination, formally termed the ‘Previous Examination’, without which one could not matriculate, although it was possible to be resident in Cambridge studying for this test before formal acceptance. As early as 1878, the then Board of Oriental Studies recommended that ‘native students from India of non-European parentage' should be permitted to offer Arabic or Sanskrit instead of Greek in the Previous Examination.[9] In 1886, this was reviewed and the Board recommended that such students should try and prepare for the Previous Examination before coming to Cambridge and that in any case they should not be allowed to offer these substitutes for Greek once they had been in residence for more than three terms.[10]

In 1887, a number of Japanese students petitioned that, given such a precedent, they might be allowed to offer Classical Chinese instead of Greed in the Previous Examination.[11] The upshot was that a proposal was made that both Indian and Japanese students (‘natives of Asia’) should be allowed to substitute English for Greek in the Previous Examination. Arabic and Sanskrit were removed as allowable substitutes. Prior to 1888, therefore, Japanese students had been forced to study both Latin and Greek in order to matriculate, but after 1888 English could be substituted for Greek. As H. J. Edwards explained, this may well have been one of the major reasons why Japanese students tended to choose Cambridge over Oxford. Latin was still compulsory, of course, and classical Chinese in place of Latin was not allowed in the regulations until 1906. In 1906 this very issue was raised by the Foreign Office on the behalf of Chinese and Japanese students and a petition for the re-establishment of Arabic and Sanskrit as substitutes was made by Lord Cromer on the behalf of students from Egypt.[12] Ernest Satow, the British Minister to Peking at the time, pointed out that many Chinese and Japanese students who had already received a ‘classical’ education in their own cultures were forced to seek a university education in other European

[8] Ibid. p. 51.

[9] *Cambridge University Reporter*, June 11, 1878, pp. 591–592.

[10] *Cambridge University Reporter*, June 8, 1886, p. 721.

[11] *Cambridge University Reporter*, June 14, 1887, pp. 853–854.

[12] *Cambridge University Reporter*, February 6, 1906, pp. 477–479 and March 20, 1906, p. 649.

countries because of this additional burden of having to learn Latin and Greek. As a result of this plea from Satow, the Special Board for oriental Studies finally recommended that 'natives of Asia' and Africans of non-European parentage be permitted to offer English for one language and either Arabic, Chinese or Sanskrit for the other.

Herbert A. Giles, Professor of Chinese, was appointed as an Examiner in 1906 and 'The Four Books' were offered as the texts to be studied.[13] Along with the introduction of the Chinese Oriental languages Tripos in 1903, this success is regarded as Giles's principal achievement.[14] In December 1906 , ten 'natives of Asia or Africa' were offered an Oriental Language instead of Latin and English instead of Greek.[15] Five offered Chinese. All ten students passed in their Oriental Languages, but two failed in English. Strangely, in this first year none of those who offered Chinese was Japanese; but in the following year Kuroda Nagatoshi became the first Japanese national to do so. Fortunately he passed.

The Twenty Japanese on the Cambridge-Oxford Society List

This list is as follows: Hamao Arata, Hayashi Tadasu, Kikuchi Dairoku, Suematsu Kenchō, Soeda Juichi, Yasuhiro Ban'ichirō, Kuroda Nagashige, Fujimura Yoshirō, Inaba Masanao, Hirosawa Kinjirō, Matsura Atsushi, Soejima Michimasa, Hachitsuka Masaaki, Mori Gorō, Tan aka Ginnosuke, Nabeshima Naomitsu, Imamura Shigezō, Hamaguchi Tan, Iwasaki Koyata, Okura Kishichirō. These were all prominent men, a mixture of those who had studied in Cambridge for a short time and those who had received degrees. Both Hamao and Hayashi had honorary degrees: Hamao was an administrator, laying the foundations for Japan's first university and eventually becoming Chancellor of Tokyo Imperial University. Hayashi was, as we have described, the first Ambassador to Britain. The other eighteen can be conveniently divided into three groups: pioneers, students of the nobility and their followers; and students of families with a business background.

Pioneers

The first Japanese student who studied in Cambridge was Kikuchi Dairoku. On his first visit in 1866, he stayed in London for two years and then returned to Japan. The new Meiji government then sent him to England

[13] *Cambridge University Reporter*, June 16, 1906, p. 1184 and November 13, 1906, p. 242.
[14] L. G. Wickham Legg, *The Dictionary of National Biography, 1931–1940*. Oxford, 1949, p. 338.
[15] *Cambridge University Reporter*, February 5, 1907, p. 539.

again for further study in 1870. He earned the third place in the London University Matriculation Examination and matriculated at Cambridge in 1873,[16] becoming 19th Wrangler in mathematics in 1877.[17] It so happened that the Senior Wrangler and First Smith's Prizeman in the same Mathematical Tripos was Donald MacAlister who turned out to be a very active supporter of the Japanese Club at Cambridge. MacAlister became an Honorary Vice-President of the Club and later a member of the Japan Society in London when it was established in 1891. Kikuchi also received a BA from the University of London in 1875 and it was in this connection that he became a Committee member of the London University Union in Japan.[18] He was later appointed to a series of prominent posts, Minister of Education, Chancellor of both Tokyo and Kyoto Imperial Universities and President of the Imperial Academy.

The second Japanese who received an honours degree (BA and LLB, 1884) was probably Suematsu Kenchō, son-in-law of Itō Hirobumi, Japan's first Prime Minister. He became a politician and scholar in his own right and occupied distinguished posts in the Government. While Cambridge, Suematsu published an English translation of *The Tale of Genji*.[19] He was a son-in-law of Itō Hirobumi who was Japan's first Prime Minister. Suematsu's old school friend, Yasuhiro Ban'ichirō, studied in Cambridge too and received LL.B. in 1887. Yasuhiro entered the Government Service and held the posts of the Chief Secretary of the Cabinet and others.

Students of the nobility and their followers

There was a relatively large proportion of students from the nobility among the Japanese in Cambridge during the Meiji era. Sometimes, those noblemen were accompanied by attendants, who also became students. Inagaki Manjirō, whom we have already had occasion to mention, was a typical example. He came to Cambridge in the company his former Lord of Hirado, Matsura Atsushi who was matriculated in 1890. Another example is Soeda Juichi. Soeda was working for the Ministry of Finance having graduated from Tokyo Imperial University, and was asked to accompany Kuroda Nagashige, a son of the former Lord of Fukuoka to which Soeda belonged. He was matriculated in 1885 and turned out to be an exceptional

[16] H.J. Edwards, 'Japanese Undergraduates at Cambridge University', *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society of London*, Vol.III (1905–7), p. 47.

[17] JR. Tanner, *The Historical Register of the University of Cambridge*, 1910. Cambridge, 1917. p.536.

[18] J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses, Part II, 1752-1900*. Vol. IV. Cambridge, 1951. p.36.

[19] Suyematz Kenchio, *Genji Monogatari*, London, 1882.

economist and businessman, becoming the first President of the Bank of Taiwan and of the Industrial Bank of Japan. His son, Soeda Teiichi also studied in Cambridge matriculating in 1918. Kuroda Nagashige received a BA from Cambridge in 1887. Kuroda was the Vice-Chairman of the House of Peers and a Privy Councillor. His brother, Kuroda Nagatoshi, has already been referred to as the first Japanese to offer Chinese in Previous Examination.

Many of the Japanese students who studied in Cambridge during the Meiji era were related to each other. Matsura Atsushi, for example, a son of the former Lord of Hirado, was the elder brother of both Inaba Masanao who received a BA in 1892 and Okuma Nobutsune, who was matriculated in 1906. Inaba was the adopted son of Viscount Inaba Masakuni and Okuma the adopted son of Okuma Shigenobu, famous politician and founder of Waseda University. Hachisuka Mochiaki, the former Lord of the Awa Clan, was probably one of the first Japanese who studied in Oxford being included under Oxford in the revised list of the Cambridge-Oxford Society. Both his son, Hachisuka Masaaki, and his grandson, Hachisuka Masauji, came to Cambridge. Hachisuka Masaaki was a pupil of H. J. Edwards of Peterhouse and received a BA in 1895.[20] He became the Vice-Chairman of the House of Peers after holding important posts in the Department of the Imperial Household. Hachisuka Masauji who matriculated in 1924, was an ornithologist and explorer.

Other students from the nobility include Hirosawa Kinjirō (LLB, 1893). Hirosawa was the son of Hirosawa Masaomi from Chōshū, one of the most powerful leaders of the new Meiji government who had been assassinated in 1871. Hirosawa Kinjirō was a member of the House of Peers and a Privy Councillor and a Minister to Spain and Portugal. Soejima Michimasa, the son of Soejima Taneomi, a veteran statesman of the Meiji Government, received a BA in 1894. Soejima Michimasa filled executive posts in various companies after working as the Master of Ceremonies and the Chamberlain of the Crown Prince. Mori Gorō received a BA in 1895. A grandson of the former Lord of Chōshū, he was a member of the House of Peers. Nabeshima Naomitsu, grandson of the former Lord of Hizen, received a BA in 1898. Chōshū and Hizen, particularly the former, played a leading role in the Meiji Restoration, and it is noticeable that the majority of these men came from those areas that had played a prominent part in the movement.

Students of families with a business background

[20] H. J. Edwards, 'Japanese Undergraduates at Cambridge University', *Transactions and Proceedings of the Japan Society of London*, Vol.III (1905–7), pp. 52–53.

Students with this kind of background were, of course, closely related to the development of capitalism in Japan. Sons of the nobility also went into commerce and industry. Typical of this group were Iwasaki Koyata and Ōkura Kishichirō. Iwasaki was a son of Iwasaki Yatarō and nephew of Iwasaki Yanosuke, the founder of the Mitsubishi business group. Iwasaki Koyata received a BA honours in 1905 and returned to Japan to lead the Mitsubishi group from 1916 to 1945. Ōkura Kishichirō, who matriculated in 1903, was a son of Ōkura Kihachirō, the founder of the Ōkura Zaibatsu. He was to lead the Ōkura group from 1924 to 1945 after his father's death.

Fujimura Yoshirō (BA, 1891), Tanaka Ginnosuke (LLB, 1896), Imamura Shigezō (BA, 1902), and Hamaguchi Tan (BA, 1902) all played active and important roles in the business world. All except Fujimura, who worked for Mitsui & Co., and was later active in politics, becoming a member of the House of Peers and Minister of Communications, came from the new business family background.

Both Tanaka and Imamura developed their own family banks after graduating from Cambridge. Hamaguchi Tan, who went by the name Tajima while at Cambridge, was a son of Hamaguchi Goryō, a local politician who ran a soy-sauce brewery, is known for having introduced Worcester sauce into Japan, and who was the model for Lafcadio Hearn's 'A Living God'. It was Hamaguchi Tan who showed Natsume Sōseki round Cambridge when he visited in 1900. Hamaguchi Tan was the first graduate of Waseda University (then Tokyo Senmon Gakkō) to receive a degree from Cambridge.

In a sense, the Japanese who studied in Cambridge during the Meiji era can be said to reflect the state of Japan at the time and the specific relationship between Japan and Britain. The pattern of their backgrounds is also an indicator of attitudes in Japan. It is clear that the nobility was fully committed to westernising the country, so readily did it send its sons abroad. They were in turn followed by sons from the newly-developed business families. The changes made to the 'previous Examination' indicate that Cambridge for its part was willing to accommodate itself to students from Japan to a remarkable degree. With the exception of Kikuchi Dairoku, few of these early arrivals went into academic careers, but this too was to change and after the end of Meiji the number of fully-fledged scholars began to increase. So began a process that was to enrich academic life in Japan to an incalculable extent.

Academic staff appointments

E. B. Ceadel	
University Lecturer In Japanese	1947–67
J. R. McEwan	
Faculty Assistant Lecturer in Japanese History	1948–53
University Lecturer in Japanese History	1953–59
D. L. Keene	
Faculty Assistant Lecturer in Japanese	1949–50
University Lecturer in Japanese & Korean	1950–54
C. E. Blacker	
University Assistant Lecturer in Japanese	1955–58
University Lecturer in Japanese	1958–91
C. D. Sheldon	
University Assistant Lecturer in Japanese History	1960–63
University Lecturer in Japanese History	1963–82
D. E. Mills	
University Lecturer in Japanese	1967–82
R. J. Bowring	
University Lecturer in Japanese	1984–85
Professor of Modern Japanese Studies	1985–97
Professor of Japanese Studies	1997–
P. F. Kornicki	
University Lecturer in Japanese	1985–95
Reader in Japanese History and Bibliography	1995–
H. U. Laurie	
Instructor in Modern Languages (Japanese)	1987–91
Senior Language Teaching Officer	1991–
S. S. Large	
University Lecturer in Japanese	1987–93
Reader in Modern Japanese History	1993–

G. L. Barnes	
(Dept of Archaeology) Affiliated Lecturer	1987–96
T. Mito	
Senior Studentship (St John's College)	1985–88
Affiliated Lecturer	1987–88
M. R. Morris	
Kawashima Lecturer in Japanese Studies	1989–
D. H. Whittaker	
University Lecturer in Japanese Studies	1989–
D.B Keehn	
Fuji Bank Lecturer in Modern Japanese Studies	1991–95
N. Pinnington	
Yasuda Research Fellow	1994–95
Temporary Lecturer in Japanese Culture	1995–97
Yasuda Research Fellow	1997–98
T. Nelson	
Temporary Assistant Lecturer	1996
J. Swenson-Wright	
Fuji Bank Lecturer in Modern Japanese Studies	1996–

Japanese language lectors

Kamei Takeshi	1950–53
Honda Minoru	1953–57
Itasaka Gen	1957–60
Ishibashi Hiroko	1960–62
Torigoe Bunzo	1962–64
Kaneko Ryotai	1964–68
Yamanouchi Hisaaki	1968–73
Yamanouchi Reiko	1973–76
Ishii Mikiko	1976–78
Ishii Nobuko	1978–83
Haruko Laurie	1983–87
Okazaki Tomomi	1987–91
Kyoko Akatsu-Read	1991–96
Abe Yuko	1996–97
Fumiyo Nemoto-Smith	1997–

PhDs awarded

Ackroyd, J.	1951	Arai Hakuseki: being a study of his political career and some of his writings, with special reference to the Hamkampu
McEwan, J.	1951	Ogyuu Sorai
Sargent, R.	1951	The Nippon Eitai-Gura and Chōnin ideology in the seventeenth century
Skillend, W.	1956	The vocabulary of the Manyoosyuu as a basis for the comparison of Japanese with other languages
McMullen, J	1969	Kumazawa Banzan: the life and thought of a seventeenth century Confucian
Bowring, R. J.	1973	A study of the works of Mori Ōgai
Ishii, N.	1985	Sekkyō-Bushi: a textual study
Thornton, S.	1989	The propaganda tradtiions of the Yugyo ha
Breen, J.	1993	Emperor, state and religion in Restoration Japan
Pinnington, N.	1994	Strategies of legitimation: an approach to the expository writings of Komparu Zenchiku
Rowley, G.	1995	Yosano Akiko (1878–1942) and the *Tale of Genji*
Weste, J.	1995	The allocation of expectations: the post-war development of the Japanese military industrial lobby
Liscutin, N.	1996	The social grammar of otherness: Sekkyōbushi texts, performers and sociohistorical context

UNDERGRADUATES BY YEAR OF MATRICULATIO N

YEAR OF MATRICULATION	NAME		COLLEGE	COURSE TYPE
1944	Skillend	W.E.	Christ's	Full
1944	Stripp	A.A. M.	Trinity	Part I only
1946	Sargent	G. W.	Christ's	Full
1947	Clifford	D.R.	St John's	Full
1948	Kidd	R.A.	Queens'	Full
1952	Bee	P.J.	Clare	Prelim only
1953	James	P.M.	Corpus Christi	Full
1955	Charlton	F.J.	Jesus	Full
1956	Britton	N.B.	Emmanuel	Part I only
1956	Mason	R.H.P.	Trinity Hall	Part I only
1957	Rangarajan	L.	Selwyn	Prelim only
1957	Whitfield	R.	St John's	Prelim only
1958	Boon	T.G.	Queens'	Part I only
1958	Merritt	H.V.H.	Girton	Prelim only
1959	McMullen	I.J.	St John's	Full
1959	Sergeant	F.B.H.	Queens'	Part I only
1959	Waterhouse	D.B.	King's	Prelim only
1960	McWhor	J.F.	Downing	Part I only
1961	Iliff	D.A.	Trinity	Full (with Chinese)
1962	Huish	D.J.	Queens'	Part I only
1962	Machin	R.D.	Selwyn	Full
1962	Woolnough	B.	Downing	Part I only
1965	Backhouse	A.E.	Christ's	Part I only
1965	Bowring	R.	Downing	Full
1965	Feacham	M.J.	Newnham	Prelim only
1965	Laws	W.H.N.	St John's	Full
1965	Linacre	J.M.	Caius	Part I only
1965	Rice	J.N.H.	Corpus Christi	Full
1969	Bates	R.D.	Selwyn	Full
1969	Cobbett	P.A.	Corpus Christi	Full
1969	Petrie-Hay	V.	Girton	Prelim only
1969	Snowball	J.A.	Christs	Full
1970	Buchanan	J.S.	Corpus Christi	Full

1970	Gardner	R.H.	St Catharine’s	Prelim only
1970	Jayes	M.J.	Clare	Part I only
1971	Djurovic	L.	Girton	Full
1971	Farmer	M.J.B.	Trinity	Full
1971	Nosco	P.E.	Peterhouse	Part II only (affiliated)
1971	Shaw	C.J.	Selwyn	Part I only
1971	Silverman	J.H.	Trinity	Full
1971	Stewart	A.R.	New Hall	Part I only
1971	Vowles	A.B.	Jesus	Part I only
1971	Wallman	A.M.	Newnham	Part I only
1971	Wernly	K.E.	New Hall	Full
1971	Wilkinson	G.M.	Trinity	Full
1972	Blackburn	P.M.	Fitzwilliam	Part I only
1972	Wright	S.J.	Girton	Full
1973	Faulkner	R.F.J.	Peterhouse	Full
1973	Gray	S.M.	Pembroke	Full
1973	Halling	J.	St John’s	Full
1973	Weys	A.N.	Newnham	Full
1974	Ambrose	D.C.	Queens’	Part I only
1974	Armour	D.C.	Clare	Part I only
1974	Bennett	S.C.	Jesus	Full
1974	Bosman	R.T.J.	St Catharine’s	Part I only
1974	Guy	R.	Girton	Full
1974	Nicholls	C.B.	Jesus	Full
1975	Breen	J.	St John’s	Full
1975	Jones	G.D.	Newnham	Part I only
1975	Lugton	P.F.	Girton	Part I only
1975	Thickett	P.J.	St John’s	Part I only
1975	Thompson	S.C.	Newnham	Full
1975	Widdows	S.	Trinity Hall	Part I only
1976	Horton	A.E.	Girton	Full
1977	Butler	A.J.	St John’s	Part I only
1977	Martin	P.	Sidney Sussex	Part I only
1978	Godden	K.E.	King’s	Prelim only
1979	Evans	G.O.	Corpus Christi	Full
1979	Michael	J.M.	Trinity	Prelim only
1980	Cummins	I.D.	Queens’	Part I only
1980	Franklin	G.B.C.	Selwyn	Full
1980	Lane	F.S.	New Hall	Prelim only

1980	Lomonossoff	N.	St John's	Prelim only
1980	North	L.C.	Queens'	Full
1980	Todd	H.A.	Corpus Christi	Full
1980	Williams	A.L.	Trinity Hall	Full
1981	Bolton	D.R.	Trinity	Prelim only
1981	Holt	D.	Robinson	Full
1981	Jubb	A.L.	Robinson	Part I only
1981	Thornton	S.A.	St Edmund's	Part II only (affiliated)
1982	Galliver	C.G. N.	Trinity	Part I only
1982	Howland	D.C.	Peterhouse	Part II only (affiliated)
1982	Jones	S.M.	Clare	Full
1982	Pitman	J.B.	St John's	Full
1982	Schnellbacher	T.	Trinity Hall	Full
1982	Whittome	P.N.	Downing	Full
1983	James	J.C.	King's	Full
1984	Burnett	S.M.	St John's	Part I only
1984	Doyle	C.M.	Clare	Part I only
1984	Fletcher	A.S.	Caius	Part I only
1984	Howard	G.M.E.	Christ's	Part I only
1984	Sculthorpe	E.	Robinson	Full
1984	Weeds	J.I.	Pembroke	Prelim only
1984	Whittle	N.J.	Selwyn	Full
1985	Corpe	P.W.	Pembroke	Part I only
1985	Earl	T.D.	Girton	Full
1985	Elston	P.J.	Trinity	Part I only
1985	Graham-Maw	J.A.	Firtzwilliam	Full
1985	Holland	L.J.	Jesus	Full
1985	Lee	Z.Y.	Newnham	Part I only
1985	Newton	C.R.	Wolfson	Full (affiliated)
1985	Pollard	M.C.	Trinity Hall	Full
1985	Walker	A.G.	St Catharine's	Part I only
1985	Wan	D.	Girton	Part I only
1986	Daintry	N.E.J.	Downing	Full
1986	Farrington	G.	Robinson	Part I only
1986	Guild	J.H.	Robinson	Part I only
1986	Kelly	P.J.P.M.	St John's	Full
1986	King	J.C.	Clare	Full
1986	Losse	N.J.	Queens'	Full
1986	McArthur	M.A.	Emmanuel	Full

1986	Simmons	F.	Wolfson	Full
1987	Carvalho	M.R.	Sidney Sussex	Part I only
1987	Coates	P.A.	Girton	Full
1987	Flanagan	D.J.G.	Magdalene	Part I only
1987	Forbes	A.C.	Clare	Part I only
1987	Grey	J.D.	Magdalene	Part I only
1987	Haskins	A.R.A.	Christ’s	Part I only
1987	Hoddinott	A.J.	Girton	Part I only
1987	Katsumata	M.C.	Robinson	Full
1987	Lazell	J.S.	Downing	Part I only
1987	Ledgard	D.H.	Lucy Cavendish	Full
1987	Marsden	H.L.	St Catharine’s	Full
1987	Moran	N.F.	Caius	Part I only
1987	Nalder	N.F.	Selwyn	Prelim only
1987	Phillips	L.A.	Sidney Sussex	Full
1987	Rohl	N.J.V.B.	Corpus Christi	Part I only
1987	Sherlock	E.S.	Magdalene	Part I only
1988	Brandt	C. W.	Robinson	Full
1988	Browne	J.I.	Robinson	Full
1988	Bycroft	K.M.	Fitzwilliam	Full
1988	Corrie	C.P.	Downing	Full
1988	Doig	S.M.	Corpus Christi	Part I only
1988	Foster	E.S.	St John’s	Full
1988	Freedman	D.	St John’s	Part I only
1988	Ginsberg	B.J.	Fitzwilliam	Full
1988	Jones	W.B.H.	Corpus Christi	Part I only
1988	Jones	I.V.	Pembroke	Full
1988	Mermagen	H.L.	Pembroke	Full
1988	Pitt	L.M.A.	Downing	Full
1988	Shield	K.C.A.	Girton	Full
1988	Stafford	A.J.	St John’s	Full
1988	Thomé	C.M.	Pembroke	Full (with Chinese)
1988	Tucker	E.J.	New Hall	Full
1988	Warner-Johnson	T.P.	Jesus	Part I only
1989	Cusick	L.J.	St Catharine’s	Part I only
1989	Davis	J.S.	St Catharine’s	Full
1989	Hutton	B.M.J.	St John’s	Prelim only
1989	Kendall	A.R.H.	Newnham	Part I only

1989	Merron	M.L.A.	Sidney Sussex	Part I only
1989	Mitter	R.S.R.	King's	Full (with Chinese)
1989	Rowling	M.	Downing	Full
1989	Waymouth	B.	Newnham	Full
1990	Chai	K.	Jesus	Prelim only
1990	Dakin	S.J.	Fitzwilliam	Full
1990	Edwards	M.P.	Pembroke	Full
1990	Hartnell	C.J.	Trinity	Part I only
1990	Kupperman	C.A.	Clare	Prelim only
1990	Oppenheimer	J.L.	Corpus Christi	Full (with Chinese)
1990	Rackowe	P.H.M.	Fitzwilliam	Full
1990	Raynaud	D.P.	Trinity	Part I only
1990	Scott-Joynt	J.C.	King's	Full
1990	Smith	F.A.	Downing	Full
1990	Waldemar-Brown	H.H.P.	Robinson	Full
1990	Williams	L.C.	Fitzwilliam	Full
1991	Bather	S.N.S.	St Edmund's	Full
1991	Carver	J.	Robinson	Full
1991	Cross	B.J.	Newnham	Full
1991	Cryan	A.J.	Corpus Christi	Full
1991	Cunliffe	S.L.	Trinity	Full
1991	Drayton	I.N.	Trinity Hall	Full
1991	Dunn	C. W.L.	Sidney Sussex	Part I only
1991	Hendy	I. J.	Sidney Sussex	Part I only
1991	Mellor	A.M.G.	Robinson	Part I only
1991	Richards	A.B.	Pembroke	Full
1991	Richardson	K.B.	Fitzwilliam	Part I ony
1991	Summers	M.S.	St John's	Part I only
1991	Wheeler	A.J.	Trinity	Part I only
1991	Wober	R.D S.	King's	Part I only
1992	Buckland	R.M.A.	Christ's	Full
1992	Dashwood	C. P.	Girton	Full
1992	Egginton	C. L	St Catherine's	Full
1992	Hall	J.S.	Downing	Full
1992	Hillenbrand	M.	Pembroke	Full (with Chinese)
1992	Hu	J.Z.Z.	Caius	Part I only
1992	Jeffery	E, L.	Downing	Full
1992	McNally	J.P.	Fitzwilliam	Full (with Chinese)

1992	Stubley	E.	St Catharine’s	Full
1993	Butterfill	I.M.	Sidney Sussex	Full
1993	Dixon	T.G.	Selwyn	Full
1993	Dolby	C.M.	Robinson	Part 1 only
1993	Donelian	V.	Trinity Hall	Full
1993	Emeney	J.S.	Pembroke	Part I only
1993	Ferdenzi	A.	St Catharine’s	Part I only
1993	Freeman	T.J.V.	St John’s	Full
1993	Gregor	B.I.	Robinson	Full
1993	Hill	T.	Downing	Full
1993	Jones	C.	Fitzwilliam	Part I only
1993	Martin	I.F.	Selwyn	Full
1993	Ogilvy	J.E.	St John’s	Full
1994	Bryce	C.E.	Girton	Part I only
1994	Edwardes	D.	Robinson	Part I only
1994	Painter	A.	Trinity	Part I only
1994	Pocock	I.	Peterhouse	Full (with Chinese)
1994	Sussman	J.	St John’s	Part I only
1994	Takagi	S.-M.	Lucy Cavendish	Full
1995	Jefferies	T.	Selwyn	Part I only
1995	Woitas	C.	St Edmund’s	Part I only
1996	Gregor	C.	Emmanuel	Prelim only

Student numbers by year

YEAR	PRELIMS	PART I	PART II	TOTAL
1947–48	2	2	0	4
1948–49	1	2	1	4
1949–50	0	1	2	3
1950–51	0	0	1	1
1951–52	0	0	0	0
1952–53	1	0	0	1
1953–54	0	0	0	0
1954–55	0	1	0	1
1955–56	1	0	1	2
1956–57	2	1	0	3
1957–58	2	2	1	5
1958–59	2	0	0	2
1959–60	3	1	0	4
1960–61	1	2	0	3
1961–62	0	1	1	2
1962–63	3	0	0	3
1963–64	0	3(4?)	0	3(4)
1964–65	0	0	1	1
1965–66	6	0	0	6
1966–67	0	5	0	5
1967–68	0	0	3	3
1968–69	0	0	0	0
1969–70	4	0	0	4
1970–71	3	3	0	6
1971–72	8	3	3	14
1972–73	2	7	1	10

1973–74	4	2	4	10
1974–75	6	4	2	12
1975–76	4	5	2	11
1976–77	0	4	5	9
1977–78	2	3	0	5
1978–79	1	2	4	7
1979–80	2	0	0	2
1980–81	7	1	0	8
1981–82	3	5	0	8
1982–83	5	2	4	11
1983–84	1	5	4	10
1984–85	7	1	0	8
1985–86	7	7	4	18
1986–87	9	7	2	18
1987–88	13	11	4	28
1988–89	15	13	3	31
1989–90	7	18	7	32
1990–91	12	6	4 (5)	22(23)
1991–92	13	10	11 (12)	34(35)
1992–93	7	14	3	24
1993–94	12	7	7 (8)	26(27)
1994–95	11	13	8	32
1995–96	8	10	5	23
1996–97	8	11	8(9)	27(28)

Figures in brackets take into account students who were doing Part II (general) (Japanese with Chinese)