

Bushidō in Early English-Language Japanology¹:

A Comparison between F. Brinkley's *Japan* and B.H. Chamberlain's *Things Japanese*

Alexandra MUSTĂŢEA

*"When you read a work of history, always listen out for the buzzing.
If you can detect none, either you are tone deaf or your historian is a dull dog.
{...} By and large, the historian will get the kind of facts he wants.
History means interpretation."* (E.H. Carr, *What is history?*)

Keywords:

early Japanology, bushidō, B.H. Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, Captain Francis Brinkley, *Japan – Its History, Arts, and Literature*, The Japan Mail

From the publication of Nitobe Inazō's *Bushidō — The Soul of Japan* in 1900, bushidō as an ultimate symbol of the "Japanese spirit" and tradition has remained — in one form or another — among the most persistent stereotypes that still haunt Japanology to this day, despite recent scholarly attempts to "expose" its essentially modern nature and its intimate connection to the state-formation process of the Meiji period. From explaining Japan's victory in the war against Russia in 1905 or the droves of kamikaze pilots in WWII to attempting to crack the mystery of Japan's economic recovery in the '60s and of the corporate culture of the '70s and '80s, bushidō's stubbornness as a blanket culturalist explanation for Japan's success of any kind has been redoubtable. Especially in the '80s, bushidō was widely considered as vital to Japan's economic growth and writings such as Nitobe's *Bushidō* (1900), Yamamoto

Tsunetomo's *Hagakure* (1716) or Miyamoto Musashi's *Gorin no sho* (1645) were often bought by businesspeople² fascinated with "the Japanese miracle." This appetite for a glammed-up bushidō seems to have reached a peak with James Clavell's 1975 novel *Shōgun*, which became a uniquely widespread phenomenon not only in the United States, but also came to dominate the cultural imaginary of the entire Western world. In 1980, in his "Introduction" to *Learning from Shōgun*, Henry Smith notes that "anywhere from one-fifth to one-half of all students who currently enroll in college-level courses about Japan have already read *Shōgun*, and not a few of these have become interested in Japan because of it. With over six million copies of *Shōgun* in print (and more sure to follow after the television series), it would appear that the American consciousness of Japan has grown by a quantum leap because of this book,"³ and "while none of the earlier novels about Will Adams appear to have enjoyed any great success, *Shōgun* has become one of the most widely-read popular novels in recent American history."⁴

On all these aspects, as well as the role played by Nitobe — or by other famous bushidō theorists of the Meiji period, such as Inoue Tetsujirō — in the popularization of bushidō, the literature abounds. By now, scholars have already uncovered numerous primary sources in Japanese that paint a complex picture of this fascinating phenomenon. Among the most recent studies in English, Benesch's 2014 monograph of bushidō in Meiji Japan has become an essential work of reference in the field. In his account of bushidō's modern destiny — built on an extensive number of primary sources in Japanese — he also briefly mentions the role played by the foreign press in spreading the mantra of bushidō outside of Japan. Yet, as of now, little else is known about how foreign intellectuals residing in Japan at the time — journalists, *yatoi*,

or scholars — who witnessed the emergence of this modern national myth first-hand — approached this process.

In this context, the present paper explores early Japanology's take on bushidō and its modern intensions by analyzing the texts of two leading English scholars of the Meiji period, B.H. Chamberlain's *Things Japanese* (the chapter "Bushidō or The Invention of a New Religion") and Captain Francis Brinkley's *Japan: Its History, Arts, and Literature* (the chapter "Bushidō or The Way of the Samurai").

In the field, Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850–1935) does not need any introduction. Among the foreigners residing in Japan in the Meiji period, he was a highly respected figure. His name, alongside E. Satow's and W.G. Aston's, stands on the frontispiece of early Meiji Japanology, thanks in large part to his wide-ranging activity as a member of the Asiatic Society of Japan and a professor at Tokyo Imperial University (albeit for a short span of only four years). Captain Francis Brinkley (1841–1912), on the other hand, is nowadays an obscure name, rarely mentioned in the histories of English-language studies in Japan.⁵ The reasons why he has now become only a footnote to early Japanology cannot be fully grasped, yet recent accounts of his activity — scarce as they are⁶ — suggest that his work as an editor for *The Japan Mail* from 1881 to 1912 and the newspaper's financial connections to the Tokyo government might have played an important part. However, while he was not free of criticism in Meiji Japan either, his overall journalistic and scholarly activity, as well as his role in English-language education in Japan or his knowledge on Japanese history, ceramics and arts, were often acknowledged and respected.⁷

B.H. Chamberlain's "Bushidō or The Invention of a New Religion" (*Things Japanese*)

Initially, Chamberlain's text was published as a standalone essay in 1911,⁸ under the title *The Invention of a New Religion*; however, starting with the 7th edition of his book *Things Japanese* in 1927, this text was also added as a separate entry, under a slightly modified title, "Bushidō or The Invention of a New Religion," although no other additions or corrections were made in terms of content.

Written more than 70 years before Hobsbawm's paradigm-changing *The Invention of Tradition*, Chamberlain's essay — in which he discusses Mikado-worship,⁹ the emergence of State Shintō and bushidō as modern phenomena — is an excellent avant-la-lettre analysis on the concept of tradition as a "modern invention:"

"Voltaire and other eighteenth-century philosophers, who held religions to be the invention of priests, have been scorned as superficial by later investigators. But was there not something in their view after all? Have not we, of a later and more critical day, got into so inveterate a habit of digging deep that we sometimes fail to see what lies before our very noses? Modern Japan is there to furnish an example. [...] Japan is teaching us at this very hour how religions are sometimes manufactured for a special end — to subserve practical worldly purposes. [...] Every manufacture presupposes a material out of which it is made, every present a past on which it rests. But the twentieth-century Japanese religion of loyalty and patriotism is quite new, for in it pre-existing ideas have been sifted, altered, freshly compounded, turned to new uses, and have found a new center of gravity."¹⁰

Chamberlain's essay is a fine example not only of his exquisite penmanship but also his courage to openly criticize the Japanese government on its illiberal derailments and obscurantist policies towards the end of the Meiji period. In terms of the evolution of State Shintō,¹¹ his account is largely in line with later research on the topic: in order to avoid a total "abdication of national individualism"¹² and complete moral succumbing to Western values,

Chamberlain notes how Shintō was adopted and *adapted* by the Meiji political elite, in an attempt to strengthen the imperial institution and focus the nation's loyalties on the emperor. They focused on creating a new set of rituals and a renewed and aggressive insistence on the "belief in every iota of the national historic mythology," despite its "palpably fraudulent chronology" and the massive Chinese influence evident in all the institutional and cultural creations arbitrarily claimed as "Imperial Ancestors."¹³ In his account, bushidō played an essential role in the co-optation of the public into this narrative by claiming a high-minded common code, "unknown in inferior lands," which made the population feel like it shared "to some extent in the supernatural virtues of its rulers."¹⁴

On this code, Chamberlain has little else to say, except:

"As for bushidō, so modern a thing is it that neither Kaempfer, Siebold, Satow, nor Rein — all men knowing their Japan by heart — ever once allude to it in their voluminous writings. The cause of their silence is not far to seek: Bushidō was unknown until thirty years ago. The very word appears in no dictionary, native or foreign, before the year 1900. Chivalrous individuals of course existed in Japan, as in all countries at every period; but Bushidō, as an institution or a code of rules, has never existed. The accounts given of it have been fabricated out of whole cloth, chiefly for foreign consumption."¹⁵

To support his claim that bushidō emerged in Japan as a completely modern invention and has no historical legitimacy, the only thing he adds to the sweeping judgement above is a passing reference to medieval Japan, when members of the same clan would routinely take different sides in a conflict, so that no matter what, the family as an institution "might come out as winner in any event."¹⁶ While he acknowledges the existence of examples of devotion to losing causes — like to Mikados in disgrace —, Chamberlain states that these were much less common than "in the more romantic West."¹⁷

This is the extent of his argument against the existence of

bushidō as a tradition. And while in a strict sense he is correct, at least regarding the word itself, Chamberlain's essay overall fails to make a sound argument against bushidō *as a tradition*. While he generally correctly assesses the modern evolution of Shintō and the nationalistic distortions plaguing it, from the note he makes at the end of the entry ("Mr. Nitobe Inazō's *Bushidō, the Soul of Japan* is the chief work championing the view criticized in the foregoing pages"),¹⁸ it becomes evident that his thoughts on the matter of bushidō itself were limited to Nitobe's book and to the undeserved popularity it had achieved in the Occident.

It seems that this had not been the first iteration of Chamberlain's distaste for Nitobe's work. The *Japan Daily Mail* of October 14, 1905 carries an unsigned article — a comment on a review of Nitobe's *Bushidō* published in August the same year in *Athenaeum*. While it is impossible to know for sure, the unsigned *Mail* article most likely belongs to Brinkley: on the one hand, many other interventions by other correspondents were signed (although this was especially the case in the case of authors whose opinion Brinkley did not agree with);¹⁹ furthermore, the text was written at a time when Brinkley was still very active in his editorial, journalistic, and scholarly activity, when his interest for the themes explored by the Asiatic Society of Japan (of which Chamberlain was a noted member), as well as his sympathetic views on bushidō and Nitobe's intellectual activity often materialized in newspaper articles. The review Brinkley comments on is, in its turn, not signed, but there is a distinct possibility that Chamberlain had penned it (as Benesch also notes),²⁰ which means that the Japanologist expressed many of the same misgivings against Nitobe's work as early as 1905. On the one hand, the arguments of the review are strikingly similar in tone and structure to Chamberlain's *The Invention of Tradition*. On

the other hand, while the *Mail* intervention did not refer to the *Athenaeum* reviewer by name, Brinkley's somewhat sarcastic comment — that he recognized the words of “an old friend” who rarely had good things to say about the Japanese — also seems to point to Chamberlain's authorship.

However, Chamberlain fails to make a sound argument against Nitobe, as well. Like the latter's treatment of the concept of bushidō, Chamberlain's analysis is also quite unsatisfactory. On the one hand, while an accomplished linguist, he fails to do an even superficial etymological analysis of the term and the reasons for its emergence in that exact form. Furthermore, he does not refer to any contemporary research on the topic, gives very little historical evidence for his sweeping judgment, and seems to approach Nitobe's view on the matter as the prevailing narrative in Japanese society. With regard to this last point, it needs to be noted that Nitobe's was not by any stretch of the imagination the prevailing thought on bushidō in Japan, and the popularity his book had reached in the West annoyed many contemporary scholars, of which Inoue Tetsujirō is the most famous example.²¹ Some of the most often cited arguments against his interpretation of bushidō were his heavy reliance on Western examples, his scarce understanding of Japanese history and sloppy exemplification, and even the lack of awareness of previous research on bushidō.²²

Written at a time when Chamberlain had become thoroughly disenchanted with Japan, *The Invention of a New Religion* offers little to no information for the reader genuinely interested in the topic of bushidō, either as a traditional code of ethics or as a modern myth. If anything, it seems to serve as an emotional breakup of sorts with Japan. The same year he wrote this essay, Chamberlain left Japan for Geneva, never to return except for a short sojourn. If one is to

read his correspondence with Hearn at the time, it also seems evident that this moment had been quite a while in the making.²³

Although by 1911, when he wrote *The Invention of a New Religion*, the government's chauvinist policies had become quite aggressive, Chamberlain's resentment towards the Tokyo political elite and the rise of patriotic (and later, nationalistic) feelings in Japan had a long history and could be traced back as early as 1894. After the Triple Intervention (Sangoku Kanshō 三国干涉) of April 1894, forcing Japan to recede Liaodong Peninsula despite her victory in the Sino-Japanese War, resentment towards the unequal treaties started gaining momentum in Japan, leading to the renewed Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of July 16 and a wave of patriotic feeling in Japan. As Japan itself was starting to renegotiate its relationship with the West, Chamberlain's own fairytale with his adoptive country seemed to be turning sour:

"Besides this, we are deprived of liberty of the press and of public meeting — no more newspapers, if you please, except the 'Japan Mail.' And to crown the edifice, a great power like England has been induced by Aoki's wiles and the ineptitude of her own diplomats to leave it entirely at Japan's option when (and if) to put the treaty into force, so that whereas our merchants remain absolutely in the dark and know not what arrangements to make, the Japanese may seize any moment that appears to them most favourable to themselves and least to us. [...] and as for crowds of Englishmen trooping into the country, as some Japanese fondly expect, it is rubbish, seeing they have so many nearer and richer places to go, where property is safer from caprice, and *white men's lives and doings are not at the mercy of Oriental officials plus a Western veneer.*"²⁴ [my italics].

His disillusionment with Japan seemed to only intensify in the following years, leading him to write to Hearn, again, on March 9, 1906:

"I want to hear music and see a little of other art, — pictures, statues, cathedrals, — and to rub off colonial rust and readjust the point of view before it is too late. Brinkley and a few others in Japan are ever-present warnings of what might happen to such as remain stuck forever in one rut. Even the London rut is grotesque enough, viewed from

the outside. How much more so the Tokyo or Yokohama rut!"²⁵

F. Brinkley's "Bushidō or The Way of the Samurai" (*Japan: Its History, Art, and Literature*)

Francis Brinkley's chapter on bushidō — included in one of his most well-known historical works, *Japan: Its History, Art, and Literature* (vol. II, published in 1901), was written well before Chamberlain's essay, *The Invention of a New Religion*, and at least four years before Chamberlain's review of Nitobe's *Bushidō: The Soul of Japan* in the *Athenaeum*. As such, the zeitgeist it captures is in many ways very different from Chamberlain's essay, and its tone is very different.

Published between Japan's wars with China (1894–1895) and Russia (1904–1905), Brinkley's investigation into the matter happened during the "first bushidō boom" (Benesch's term). Largely unknown before the 1880s, the term had started to pick up steam in the 1890s, when, following an increased popular interest in the martial arts, the words "budō" and "bushidō" — appearing rarely, but generally interchangeable before the Meiji period — started becoming specialized. As such, the former became primarily associated with martial arts, while writings on samurai history started appropriating the word bushidō.²⁶ Against this background, between the wars, when the Triple Intervention of 1895 had awakened Japan to its predicament on the global stage, and it had started turning inward, searching for an identity based on native values, the term "bushidō" slowly came to infiltrate various aspects of society.

Against this background, Brinkley's chapter, "Bushidō or The Way of the Samurai," seems, at first sight, to have stemmed from the author's interest in the same type of culturalist explanation for

Japan's victory in the war with China that Western readers were craving at the time. However, on closer inspection of both Brinkley's journalistic work at the time²⁷ and the content of his chapter, his account much rather seems to stem from a deep-rooted desire to correct foreign misconceptions of Japanese culture, which abounded at the time, especially with respect to bushidō. While it is not certain if Nitobe's *Bushidō* directly motivated Brinkley to write on the topic, as would be the case later with Chamberlain's essay, the possibility can also not be discarded. What is certain is that Brinkley's account makes for a much more balanced alternative to Nitobe's highly romanticized view of bushidō, and also treats some of its more problematic points — like the issue of Mikado-worship, the image of the bushi as a loyal imperial subject, or his overall idealized portrait — in a much more elegant and thorough manner than Chamberlain.

While the opening paragraph of Brinkley's chapter seems to show traces of the same elated mood holding Japan in its grip between the two wars, by suggesting that

“it is usual to call Buddhism or Shinto the religion of Japan, but if religion be the source from which spring the motives of men's noblest actions, then the religion of Japan was neither the law of the Buddha (Buppo) nor the Path of the Gods (Shin-to), but the Way of the warrior (Bushi-do),”²⁸

Brinkley's argument beyond this point advances in a much more balanced manner.²⁹

In many ways, his chapter makes for a better, more nuanced read than Nitobe's on bushidō as was understood in Japan at the time. Furthermore, it must be noted that in its most essential parts, Brinkley's stance does not differ too much from Chamberlain's when he refers to the easiness with which “the strain of consanguinity snapped” in the presence of ambition or loyalty, to the per-

manent possibility of betrayal and vendettas,³⁰ to the cruelty towards one's foes, or to the bushi's more "discreditable" features of character; here, Brinkley refers first to the "unnatural liaisons" formed on the battlefield among men (giving Oda Nobunaga and Toyotomi Hideyoshi as examples), a commonly encountered idea among Meiji-period Christian observers of Japanese culture. Brinkley also makes note of the Edo bushi's preference for "luxurious and effeminate habits," as well as commerce,³¹ even though frugality and contempt for any breadmaking activities were, supposedly, core tenets of their ethical code. On the modern origin of patriotism in Japan, Brinkley notes:

"There was in truth nothing in the conditions or incidents of their existence to educate patriotism — no rivalry with other States, no struggle for the safety of altar and hearth. The security and prosperity of the fief to which each bushi belonged were the limits of his mental horizon. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the Meiji era, there suddenly flamed up throughout the nation a fire of patriotism which burned thenceforth with almost fierce strength. The *Yamato-damashii* ceased to be a theoretical sentiment and became a practical inspiration. [...] Nothing in their history suggested the probability of such a display of vigorous patriotism,"³²

His observations are strikingly similar to Chamberlain's, who would later denounce bushidō's claim to historical continuity.³³ Especially on the issue of the loyalty to the emperor — central in Inoue Tetsujirō's imperial brand of bushidō³⁴ —, Brinkley explicitly refutes its personal dimension, as well as its overall historical significance for the members of the bushi class. Quite the contrary, he stresses, the emperor was never much more than an abstraction for the bushi, whose loyalties lay with their direct superior: "The devoted fealty of the samurai towards his feudal chief cannot be said to have extended to his attitude towards the sovereign."³⁵ From a historical perspective, if anything, the bushi could be considered outright "anti-monarchical,"³⁶ Brinkley states. Furthermore, he

found it surprising that this concept had even survived into the modern period, in spite of “frequent encroachments upon the Imperial prerogative and constant display of disrespect” on the part of the bushi.³⁷ He concludes his argument on Mikado-worship by noting:

“In short, like his feverish patriotism, the almost delirious loyalty of the modern Japanese, though its roots may be planted in the soil of a very ancient creed, never showed any signs of vigorous growth until the profound fealty of the bushi towards their liege lords³⁸ was transferred after the abolition of feudalism to the only figure that had survived all vicissitudes, the sovereign.”

Brinkley’s stance here, again, heralds that of Chamberlain’s, as well as more recent theories on Japanese modernity, for that matter. In explaining the source of the fierce patriotism ignited in Japan during the late Meiji period, when the Japanese acknowledged “that in many of the essentials of material civilization their country was separated by an immense interval from Occidental States,”³⁹ Brinkley also emphasizes the role played by the discovery of the Other in Japan’s modern process of nation-formation, but he does so in a much more nuanced and thorough manner than Chamberlain a decade later.

Concluding remarks

The main difference between the two Japanologists’ approaches to the issue of bushidō seems to stem from the importance they attach to the term “bushidō” as a *signifier*. As he would also note later, in response to Chamberlain’s *Athenaeum* review in 1905, Brinkley did not read too much into the linguistic changes surrounding the term in modern Japan.⁴⁰ The language was in continuous flux, and he simply adopted the new word according to the fashion of the time, while what he focused on was grasping the *signified*. It is

true that his profound respect for the military class of the premodern period, as that for modern Japanese generals, is evident throughout Brinkley's entire scholarly and journalistic activity, including his Japan chapter on bushidō. In this sense, he errs in the opposite direction than Chamberlain, most probably on account of his personal experience as a military man who moved to Japan and later married into a Mito samurai family. Unlike Chamberlain, whose attachment to Japan started waning with the country's tumultuous slip into illiberalism, Brinkley's dedication to his adoptive country never seemed to waver. Enamored with Old Japan, with the elegance and principles of the old military elite, and respectful of Japan's arduous search for national identity in the modern period, his opinion on the issue did not seem to change much even after Inoue Tetsujirō's type of imperial bushidō had taken Japan by storm and had permeated the entire education system, from the Army and the Navy to civilian schools.⁴¹ His unwavering respect for bushidō and General Nogi were among the last things he showed to the world: although his health was failing him and he had not been writing since 1911,⁴² Brinkley made it a point to write one last intervention in his role as correspondent to the *London Times* in 1912, shortly before his death — addressing Nogi's suicide and bushidō. To the end, he remained faithful to the role he had ascribed for himself since his arrival in Japan, “an advocate of Japanese points of view against foreign points of view.”⁴³

Yet both Brinkley and Chamberlain — in spite of their vastly different perspectives and their often-conflicting opinions — seem to have agreed on a few essential aspects which they have tried to debunk, each in their own flawed manner: bushidō's uncritical idealization in the country and its conflation with a perverted sense of loyalty to the throne, the exaggerated and ignorant way it was be-

ing presented and consumed in the West, as well as, most probably, Nitobe's interpretation of the phenomenon. While both Brinkley and Chamberlain criticized Nitobe's brand of scholarship in *Bushidō*, in spite of their timely and more or less thorough interventions, the two Japanologists were eventually unable to counterbalance the former's influence abroad, as well as in Japan.

For all the time that has passed since he wrote that

"the perpetual incense of praise burned in season and out of season before the shrine of bushidō [...] This thing has been overdone. It is the habit of our neurotic age to deal in hyperbole, in sensationalism. The sober tints of the happy mean have little attraction to for people whose minds are keyed up in to twentieth-century pitch."⁴⁴

Brinkley's words still ring just as true today.

¹ This study is mainly based on primary sources available at the *Kanda Sano Repository* and has been realized thanks to the generous support of the *Center for Japanese Studies* at Kanda University of International Studies.

² Benesch 2014:229.

³ Smith 1980:xii.

⁴ Smith 1980:16.

⁵ In Cortazzi and Kornicki's 2016 *Japanese Studies in Britain: A Survey and History*, for example, his name appears only in passim, as one of the members of the British Garrison who came to Yokohama between 1863 to 1875. In the part where the author (Hoare) discusses publications by these military and navy officers, Brinkley's is altogether absent, although other controversial or less active writers are mentioned (e.g. Malcolm Kennedy, a business journalist).

⁶ Hoare 1975, Hoare 1999, Valiant 1974, or O'Connor 2010.

⁷ See, for example, Sawaki 2017 for a survey on Japanese-language obituaries published at Brinkley's death.

⁸ Published in *The Literary Guide* in 1911, according to *The Japan Daily Mail* from Dec 30, 1911.

⁹ In most English-language Japanology texts of the Meiji period, the term "Mikado" is used in lieu of "emperor."

¹⁰ Chamberlain 1985:81.

¹¹ This term was coined later, so Chamberlain does not make a direct reference to it. However, the aspects he discusses in the essay have come to be known nowadays as "State Shintō."

¹² Chamberlain 1985:82.

¹³ Chamberlain 1985:84.

¹⁴ Chamberlain 1985:85.

¹⁵ Idem.

¹⁶ Chamberlain 1985:87.

¹⁷ Chamberlain 1985:87.

¹⁸ Chamberlain 1985:95.

¹⁹ Cf. Brinkley's *The Japan Mail* obituary, written by Walter Denning on Nov 2, 1912 (*The Japan Mail* 1912:517).

²⁰ On the topic of the same *Athenaeum* review, Benesch states that Chamberlain's authorship was commonly assumed at the time. (Benesch 2014:97).

²¹ Oshiro 1968:100–101, Benesch 2014:97.

²² For a detailed account of the popularity of Nitobe's *Bushidō* in the West, as well as its critical reception in Japan, see Benesch 2014.

²³ Cf. his correspondence with Lafcadio Hearn (Koizumi 1936).

²⁴ Koizumi 1936.

²⁵ Id.

²⁶ Benesch 2014: 73–4.

²⁷ An overview of his writings (and editorial work) for *The Japan Mail* and the *London Times* (of which he was the sole Tokyo-based correspondent for almost a decade) reveal Brinkley as a thorough critic of Britain's colonial attitude towards Japan, as well as a staunch but (generally) balanced advocate of Japan, starting with the revision of the “unfair treaties” (leading to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1894, a process in which Brinkley seems to have been an essential negotiator). He had the same critical attitude of foreigners who expected special treatment in Japan and at the same time voiced overly critical opinions about its culture and people, as was the case with Chamberlain.

²⁸ Brinkley 1903:173.

²⁹ Even though he does allow himself the liberty to sometimes dabble in similarly idealistic expressions of bushi ethics, he does make it a point to follow up with counterexamples, or with references to similar, universal, values. (See, for example, p. 183).

³⁰ Brinkley 1903:194–5.

³¹ Brinkley 1903:200.

³² Brinkley 1903:207–8.

³³ Chamberlain 1985:85.

³⁴ See, for example, Inoue's 1912 *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* (Outline of the National Morality), pp. 265–287.

³⁵ Brinkley 1903:201.

³⁶ Brinkley 1903:206.

³⁷ Brinkley 1903: 210–211.

³⁸ Also explained by Brinkley in realistic terms, connected to very pragmatic aspects of the bushi's life.

³⁹ Brinkley 1903:208.

⁴⁰ *The Japan Mail*, Oct 14, 1905.

⁴¹ As Chamberlain also notes in his chapter.

⁴² Cf. Brinkley's *The Japan Mail* obituary, written by Walter Denning on Nov 2, 1912 (*The Japan Mail* 1912:517).

⁴³ Brinkley's *The Japan Mail* obituary, written by Walter Denning on Nov 2nd (*The Japan Mail* 1912:517).

⁴⁴ *The Japan Mail*, Oct 14th, 1905.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benesch, Oleg. 2014. *Inventing the Way of the Samurai: Nationalism, Internationalism, and Bushidō in Modern Japan*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Brinkley, Francis. 1903 (1901). "Bushidō or The Way of the Samurai," in *Japan : Its History, Art, and Literature* (vol. II), London: T.C & E.C Jack, pp. 173–228
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall. 1985 (1939). "Bushidō or The Invention of a New Religion," in *Things Japanese* (Complete Edition), Tōkyō: Meichofukyūkai, pp. 80–95
- Davis, Winston. 1976. "The Civil Theology of Inoue Tetsujirō," in *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol. 3 (1), pp. 5–40, Nagoya: Nanzan University
- Hoare, James. 1999. "Captain Francis Brinkley (1841–1912): Yatōi, Scholar and Apologist," in *Britain and Japan: Biographical Portraits* vol. 3, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 99–107
- Hurst, G. Cameron. "Death, Honor, and Loyalty: the Bushidō Ideal," in *Philosophy East and West* vol. 40 (4), *Understanding Japanese Values*, October 1990, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 511–527
- Inoue, Tetsujirō. 1912. *Kokumin dōtoku gairon* (Outline of the national morality), Tokyo: Sanseidō
- Japan Mail Office. 2005–2015. *The Japan Mail {Reprint ed.}* (1870–1917), Tokyo: Edition Synapse
- Koizumi, Kazuo. 1936. *Letters from B.H. Chamberlain to Lafcadio Hearn*, Tokyo: Hokuseidō
- Murdoch, James, Yamagata, Isoh. 1903. *A History of Japan During the Century of Early Foreign Intercourse (1542–1651)*, Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing
- Nagamori, Kiyoshi. 2020. "Francis Brinkley: a Japanophile Englishman in the Meiji Era," in *Research Reports of Tokyo Metropolitan College of Industrial Technology*, available at <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1282/00000243/>
- Notehelfer, E.G. "Review of Nitobe Inazō: Japan's Bridge Across the Pacific," in *The Journal of Japanese Studies* vol. 22 (2), Summer, 1996, The Society for Japanese Studies, pp. 450–453
- O'Connor, Peter. 2009. *The English–Language Press Networks of East–Asia, 1918–1945*, Kent: Global Oriental Ltd.
- Oshiro, George Masaaki. 1985. *Internationalist in Prewar Japan: Nitobe Inazō, 1962–1933* (PhD thesis), The University of British Columbia, available at <https://dx.doi.org/10.14288/1.0096740>
- Ota, Yuzo. 2011 (1998). *Basil Hall Chamberlain: Portrait of a Japanologist*, London: Routledge
- Sawaki, Chieko. 2017. "Nihongo shinbun no shibō kiji ni miru F. Burinkurii no gyōseki to hyōka" (The Evaluation and Achievements of Francis Brinkley by Viewing the Obituaries of Japanese Newspapers), in *Kyōei design kenkyūronshū* vol. 11, February 2017, Meiji University, pp. 1–20
- Smith, Henry. 1980. *Learning from Shōgun: Japanese History and Western Fantasy*, Santa Barbara: University of California Program in Asian Studies