“Think in English”—Toyama Masakazu and *Mombushō Conversational Readers*
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Toyama Masakazu (1848–1900) was the first head of the *bunkadaigaku* (College of Literature) and became President of Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku†, before quitting this post in 1897 to serve as Minister of Education. A pioneer in English education, he gained fluency during his six year-long study abroad in Michigan, United States. While there, he adopted a social Darwinian “struggle of the fittest” mentality, and returned to Japan in 1876 convinced that basic and advanced communication skills in foreign language(s) and a nationalized curriculum run, not by missionaries or *oyatoi-gaikokujin* (foreigners hired to facilitate the importing of professional knowledge and techniques from the west especially in, but not limited to institutions for higher education), but by Japanese themselves were pillars for national survival.

In 1889, he published *Mombushō Conversational Readers* (Five Volumes), an English textbook series especially aimed at Japanese youth, and followed up with a teachers’ manual entitled *Eigo Kyōju-hō* in 1897. Versed in the most recent western scholarship including T. Prendergast‡ (1806–1886) and F. Gouin§ (1831–1896), Toyama adapted foreign methods to particular needs of Japanese learners; he integrated speaking, reading, and writing into conversation and dictation exercises, and introduced English sentence structures piecemeal. He incorporated writing into his curriculum, thereby engaging the senses such as hearing. This emphasis on a hands-on approach to colloquial language teaching (*seisoku*), as opposed to the more traditional reading and translation (*hensoku*) curriculum had two aims: first, to “think in English” without translating mentally beforehand; second, to understand nuances in the original texts and incorpo-
rate these in eloquent yet accurate Japanese translations.

Understanding Toyama Masakazu’s English language education program strictly within the history of Teikoku Daigaku is relevant today because egalitarianism became possible in the realm of education; the stark linguistic and economic divide between English-speaking elites and speakers of the native dialect salient in South East Asia is largely non-existent in Japan today. In 1883, Tokio Daigaku announced that all lessons would be conducted in Japanese starting from 1886. This decision to “nationalize” the language of instruction had two major consequences. First, bureaucrats, skilled professionals, bankers, and merchants could access the latest Western knowledge in translation and they all contributed to the modernization of transportation, infrastructure and communication systems. Second, the ability of Japanese to communicate in English declined because of the lack of need to use the language in domestic circumstances.

Part One: “Nationalization” of Education and Changing Institutions

Higher education (kōtō kyōiku) consisted of higher-(middle)-school (kōtō (chū)-gakkō) and university (daigaku) as well as professional schools (senmon gakkō). The term “daigaku” or university was applied to Tokio Daigaku, affiliated with the Department of Education (Mombushō), and Teikoku Daigaku after 1886. Before 1886, foreigners were hired by the Meiji government at the ministry level to teach their specialized subjects such as engineering, medicine, or literature at the respective college affiliated with the ministry. However, these colleges merged together under Tokio Daigaku and was renamed and re instituted as Teikoku Daigaku. Thus, before 1886, the ability to read a foreign language made up a great part of one’s preparation for higher education. However, this changed under the Teikoku Daigaku because language of instruction became Japanese. In this sense, higher education at university (daigaku) was “nationalized” as part of the reforms leading up to 1886.

Moreover, Meiji Japanese education policy-makers at Tokio Daigaku and in the Department of Education (Mombushō), at the higher-education level faced a dilemma; keeping education
in the hands of Japanese was a priority, yet international competition was increasing and direct contact with foreigners seemed imminent.

In 1882, Inoue Kaoru (1836–1915), then Minister of Foreign Affairs negotiating unequal treaty reforms, promised to lift the ban on travel, which at that time restricted foreigners’ movement to the immediate areas around the treaty ports. Although the negotiations for treaty revision fell through, at that time Toyama thought that Japanese regardless of their academic standing and level of schooling would soon be forced to converse with foreigners in order to do business. In 1883, at Jōshū Takasaki First Public School (Daiichi Kōritsu Gakkō) in Gunma Prefecture, Toyama argued that language education was an essential part of common education (futsū kyōiku) especially in an area like Takasaki, where contact with foreigners occurred daily. Toyama compiled and published his five-volume Mombushō Conversational Readers in this kind of pressing atmosphere.

Toyama had always advocated universal access to education. He argued that higher middle schools should be evenly spaced out all over Japan with one public or private middle school in each prefecture. As things stood in the late 1880s, only those who could afford to live in Tōkyō advanced to university. Broadening the student-base meant long-term national strength, prosperity, and political stability. Back in 1881, Toyama had proposed decentralization of education and allocating more funding to provincial schools and giving these governments larger roles in decision making.

...acute centralization especially in education hinders national prosperity. It is a shame that innocent youths from the countryside come to Tōkyō and learn the vices of living in this capital. In order to prevent this, the First Higher Middle School must be downsized and higher middle schools in the prefectures [in the cities of Sendai, Kanazawa, Kyōto, Kumamoto and others] must be strengthened...so that the youth can complete their education there...Schools that take charge of the imperial subjects’ education should be schools that take teaching to heart and can be either private or public. However, schools affiliated with a political party or a religious group should not be in charge of educating Japa-
He also encouraged individual prefectures to invest heavily in education. For example, in 1888, he stated that:

Kōchi Prefecture should set up the first higher middle school in Shikoku. If Kyūshū has two higher middle schools then Shikoku must have at least one...Kōchi must make more effort to build a higher middle school given its high population...If this is accomplished, I [Toyama] will ensure that the school is staffed with well trained teachers...The schools that children attend must be Japanese schools and not schools run by foreign missionaries. Unfortunately, foreign churches monopolize education in Turkey, the Qing Empire, and India. This is very bad for the people of these empires. If the number of mission schools in Japan increases, then we must match this with the number of state run schools...

After 1890 he became more vocal about the need to fund higher middle schools (kōtōchūgakkō), renamed higher schools (kōtōgakkō) in 1894, in the prefectures, keeping all education in the hands of Japanese; calling it a key to preserving Japan’s “national character.” Facing increasing demand for a place in university, Toyama petitioned in 1893 to the then Minister of Education to establish a second university. In 1897, the Imperial University of Kyōto was established. This increase in the number of universities as well as higher middle schools gave more Japanese the opportunity to enter university, a key to climbing the social ladder in the early part of Meiji.

Toyama refers to regular method (seisoku) and literal translation-based (hensoku) English language education; these must be explained in their historical context. In the mid-1870s, ei-gogakkō (government-funded foreign language schools in Tōkyō, Miyagi, Niigata, and other cities) taught all courses in English. According to Saitō Hidesaburō (1866–1929) who attended Miyagi Ei-gogakkō, foreign teachers were hired to teach history, geography, English grammar, physical education, and translation all in English. Japanese teachers taught mathematics and translation. Most exams were written, but for exams involving pronuncia-
tion students were taken to a separate room to be tested. Conversation classes did not use a script, but sections from different texts were dictated. This is the basic picture of *seisoku* education in Eigo-gakkō.

The Tokio Ei-gogakkō merged with Kaisei-gakkō to form the Tokio Daigaku Yobimon or Preparatory School for University of Tokio. It was later reorganized into Daiichi Kōtō(chū)gakkō. This line of government funded institutions leading to University of Tokio (later Tōkyō Imperial University), in which Toyama was based, greatly valued *seisoku* style of education. By contrast, *jinjō chūgakkō* (ordinary middle schools) largely taught in Japanese with only a few schools offering English language, let alone any courses in English. So, many youths who wanted to get into Tokio Daigaku Yobimon left their local middle school to go to Tōkyō, entered a private academy and learnt English or another foreign language before taking the examination for university and professional colleges. Private academies in the first half of the Meiji period emphasized reading and debating which is referred to as the *hensoku* method; the purpose was not attainment of correct pronunciation but reception of foreign ideas through books (*eigaku*).

Before 1882, students from the *seisoku* schools had a higher chance of passing the entrance exam to the Tokio Daigaku Yobimon, a preparatory school attached to the Tokio Daigaku, because only they could pass all reading, writing, speaking and composition sections of the English exam. This disadvantaged students of ordinary middle schools who could only receive instruction in the general courses in Japanese. Toyama pointed out in 1882 that students of the Tokio Daigaku Yobimon were undoubtedly the best amongst those taking the entrance examination, but they were not necessarily the best in the nation; although after 1882 students could take these exams in Japanese and compensate for their lack of foreign language through a one-year intensive English program upon enrolment, Toyama strongly urged that more needed to be done to give youth from the countryside access to higher education. More specifically, he suggested entrance-by-referral-systems and need-based scholarships.

Toyama divided education into three categories; moral, physical, and intellectual. Toyama shrewdly points out that the
balance between these three has shifted due to an influx of western education since the Meiji Restoration and Education Order of 1872. In the Edo period physical education through martial arts was balanced against less intellectually-demanding tasks such as calligraphy and memorization of the five classics. However, children were being exposed to new subjects in the sciences that demand more and more of the student’s ability to think. So, the curriculum had to be adjusted to reflect this trend.

Toyama’s basic stance towards the new era of teaching can be seen in his speech given to elementary and middle school teachers at a conference on education in 1883. In it Toyama emphasized that specialized knowledge in the subject one teaches is not enough. The teacher must pay attention to the individual child and assist them in their learning with strong passion and love. Rote and mindless memorization is harmful to physical and mental health, while observation and an inquisitive mind should be encouraged. Toyama referred to teachers as the “lighthouse for the nation” who play the vital role of transforming a child into an imperial subject who may grow up to become a soldier, a banker, a technician, a politician etc. and campaigned endlessly to increase the salary and benefits of teachers and principals at all levels of education.

More importantly, Toyama’s stance towards English education was that the Mombushō should stop using imported American textbooks and more focus was needed in training teachers in the art of foreign language teaching. Toyama understood the particular difficulties that Japanese faced when learning English as a non-native speaker because he taught first-year English for two hours weekly at Tokio Daigaku as well as courses at the Tokio Daigaku Yobimon, later renamed the Daiichi Kōtō Chūgakkō (First Higher Middle School). According to former student Takada Sanae (1860–1938), Toyama focused on reading comprehension by making each student read one page of text out loud and then getting them to debate the meanings of each word until students accurately understood each sentence. In a report to the Department of Literature dated 1879, Toyama explained his teaching experiences as follows:

> English is taught for 2 hours every week. The objective is to make students thoroughly understand English texts by
leading British and American professionals and literary critics. Thomas Babington Macaulay, John Tyndall, Herbert Spencer are among the texts used. The method of teaching is to first make the student take turns reading out loud one page or one page and a half of text. Then, students ask questions on unclear parts. If there is a particularly difficult passage, even if students do not ask questions, Toyama will ask for clarification or give an explanation. Whenever possible, discussions are done in English. [...] This year, students were not necessarily worse compared to past years. Yet, they still are not well versed in the English language. With the exception of ten or maybe fifteen individuals, students lack vocabulary and are unfamiliar with even sentences that are written in the present tense. To make these students read poetry out loud [which is what foreign teachers of English literature do at Tokio Daigaku] is to lose sight of the purpose of studying English. Thus, each student should first familiarize themselves with short pieces written in the present tense and only after that, gradually read texts including poetry by British and American professionals and literary critics. This order must not be mixed up. Such is the primary guideline by which Toyama conducts his class to first-year students.19

Toyama also published supplementary readers which were very popular.20

As the number of middle schools increased during the 1880’s and 1890’s, the demand for qualified teachers, especially language-teachers, continued to outstrip supply in the countryside. Believing in the importance of language education as part of common education at primary, middle, and higher levels of schools, Toyama encouraged his own students from Tokio Daigaku and Teikoku Daigaku (Imperial University of Japan) to become teachers for local middle schools in the prefectures and thereby minimize the gap in opportunity between the countryside and the cities. Having a special focus on English language teaching, Toyama petitioned directly to Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi (1841–1909), stating:

Today there are not enough Japanese foreign language-
teachers. Even those who are teachers lack the necessary skills or are inadequate. Foreign language education in the jinjō chūgakkō and kōtōgakkō are inadequate [so students quit these schools to come to Tōkyō and enter private language academies in preparation for the University of Tokio Preparatory School entrance examinations]. If these students, instead of coming to Tōkyō, could learn the foreign language at their local schools with competent teachers for three years, their language skills will improve dramatically. The low level of language skills amongst kōtōgakkō graduates is striking.

Today, knowledge of a foreign language is essential in order to become a scholar or professional. Also, such skills are essential in leaders in an age of continual progress. Those who aim to be admitted to the elite of society must learn a foreign language. In the event that the current treaties between Japan and foreigners are altered...the strength of foreign language skills will affect the national interest. Thus, it is of vital importance to better the quality of our foreign language education. The funding for this has tended to decline over the years, so I [Toyama Masakazu] have written this proposal.

The kōtō shihan gakkō [higher normal school] outputs teachers in many specialized subjects. However, no institution is geared to training language-teachers.... Only the kyōin gakuryoku kentei [examination for teachers] exists. Those persons with competent language skills choose an occupation that has better pay, benefits, and social standing than an ordinary middle school or higher middle school teacher. In a time when we would like to increase the number of middle and high schools in each prefecture, this shortage problem has worsened. Thus, I propose the following:

First, an institution for the training of language-teachers be created.
Second, the treatment of current teachers should be improved.\textsuperscript{21}

In 1890, Toyama, Kanda Naibu (1857–1923), and Motora
Yujirō (1858–1912) established the Regular Method Preparatory School (Seisoku Yobikō), later renamed the Regular Method Higher School (Seisoku Kōtōgakkō), a private preparatory school open to students from all over Japan as an alternative to private schools which only crammed knowledge into students’ heads so they would pass the entrance exams for higher middle school. Toyama states three organizing principles:

1. Provide high quality inter-period education for youths from all over Japan
2. Research ways to reform education in Japan through both theory and practical experience
3. Help parents and guardians provide moral guidance to children thereby keeping moral teaching out of religious clergy’s hands

Regular Method Preparatory School also functioned as a platform for teachers. The Research of Japanese Education Group (Nihon Kyōiku Kenkyūkai) head office was set up inside the school. Teachers from all over Japan sent questions or ideas for reforms. In 1883, the Greater Japanese Education Association (Dai Nihon Kyōikukai) had been established as the arm of the Mombushō, but Toyama felt this consisted of bureaucrats that did not listen to the teachers’ ideas enough.

In terms of English language education, Toyama’s school was especially important because it was a lab trying to make students “think in English.” Toyama argued that the current curriculum set up by the Mombushō was counterproductive because English translation, reading, grammar, and conversation were taught separately and only one aspect was emphasized at one time, leading students to translate into Japanese. As a result of his experiments at the Regular Method Preparatory School, he came to reassert the view that:

American children who use these texts already understand their native language just like Japanese children understand Japanese before officially starting school. Textbooks which are designed for children who already know their mother tongue cannot be used for non-natives no matter how simple the individual sentences may be. This is because native
speakers can understand the meaning of a sentence after reading it once, but non-native speakers cannot. When using imported textbooks to teach English to Japanese students, the teacher must translate each sentence into Japanese after having read it out loud. In sum, using imported textbooks to teach foreign languages ultimately leads to *hensoku* or over-emphasis on translation.25

In the “Introductory Remarks” to the *Readers* as well as his *English Teacher’s Manual* (1897), he recommends that schools use his *Readers* designed to familiarize students with English so they can “understand and assimilate the meaning and uses of the commonest words, idioms and constructions of the language.”26

**Part Two: Textbook Analysis**

Toyama’s *Mombushō Conversational Readers* published in 1889 aimed to replace the so-called *hensoku* system or system of literal translation with a *seisoku* system where Japanese children mastered a language to the point that they could think in it rather than break up the sequence of the English text in order to make it conform to the requirements of Japanese syntax.27 It consists of five volumes: volumes one and two introduced the alphabet, clause, and vocabulary in stages and focused on attaining correct pronunciation, fluency, and idiomatic usage. Volumes three to five focused on reading comprehension, oral communication and critical thinking skills. Due to limitation of space, only the first volume is analyzed by comparing and contrasting against ideas posed by T. Prendergast and F. Gouin.

Toyama stressed two types of oral exercises in volume one of the *Readers*. The first type is called “practicing reading out loud after the teacher” exercise or *hanpuku ondoku renshū*, where students repeat the teacher word for word before being given the explanation for each word. During this exercise, a sentence is introduced in parts. Also, Toyama believed that understanding sentence structure is crucial. For example, “This is a rat.” is first broken down into separate clauses “This is” and “a rat.” Then, another way to say “This is” is introduced. “That is” for example. To make the student understand these are interchangeable, “This is a rat.” and “That is a rat.” both appear in the textbook.
The teacher is responsible for explaining the relationship. Once the child understands which words are interchangeable, he has a better understanding of the sentence structure. Then he can distinguish nouns from adjectives or verbs.

This idea of breaking up one sentence into clauses and substituting one clause for another closely mirrors the “syntactic operation” in Prendergast’s mastery system introduced through S. R. Brown in 1872. “Syntactic operation” refers to the “interchange of a word that corresponds grammatically with the word that it disposes.” For example, if there were two sentences consisting of four words each (My brother came in. AND His servant went out.), 16 different combinations of words are possible. For Prendergast long and complex sentences are better than short and simple ones because students have more words to work with. However, Toyama simplified things so that even Japanese students with no prior knowledge of English can understand and go through the same procedure.

Sentences in volume one of the Readers start simple and gradually become complex; vocabulary is introduced in a specific order. For example, the Reader starts with a sentence like: “This is a rat.” (Lesson 4) and introduces adjectives two lessons later: “This is a big rat.” (Lesson 6) Also, a prepositional phrase like “under the shelf” is introduced independently, before being used as part of a complete sentence: “The cat is under the shelf.” (both Lesson 17) The assumption is that once a student thoroughly understands the sentence structure(s) and has a working basic vocabulary, he will combine words into phrases to construct a simple or complex sentence independently.

Care is also taken to teach grammar inductively. For example the following set of sentences: “May they go out and fly their kites?” “Yes, they may go.” (Lesson 23), consist of parts introduced in previous lessons: may (lesson 22), they (Lesson 16), go (Lesson 22), out (Lesson 23), and (Lesson 1), fly, their, kites (Lesson 23), yes (Lesson 13). The only word not introduced is “their,” but if the student listens closely he will be able to deduce that “they” and “their” are related. The difference in tense is introduced gradually, but it is up to the teacher to point out when to use which tense and in what context. Will you give me a pen? (Lesson 24) Who gave you this book? (Lesson 25)

The second type of exercise in the Reader is called a “conver-
sation” exercise. The aim of the conversation exercise was to repeat conversations until the words were engraved into the child’s mind. First the teacher asked the question given in the textbook and the student gave the reply also written in the textbook. Then the roles were reversed. These exercises were done entirely in English with the books open, followed by a second round where the books were closed.29

The emphasis on memory and mental image, which Toyama stresses through his illustrations, is similar to F. Gouin’s series system. Gouin was an educator and scholar who studied the process by which children learn a mother tongue and applied it to adults learning a second language. His book published originally in French in 1880 was later translated into English in 1892. A “series” is “the representation of the life itself in its movement and in its natural development.”30 The title of the series expresses the ends and each line of the series the means for this end. Each line in the series is a simple sentence consisting of a subject, verb, and predicate. Each line expresses one fact. As the series progresses, the verbs of each line explain the process by which one action described in the title is attained.

Gouin focuses on a set of verbs that form an image of a particular action. Gouin states that “[t]he exercise is dictated and not written on paper, but is written upon the ears and by way of the ears it has penetrated into the minds.”31 By “minds” Gouin means the imagination. So, he argues that his exercises are not “read” but “thought.” The “sounds” are not identified as “words” but as “ideas, perceptions and representations” of the English word.32 One may assume that Toyama tries to attain similar effects through illustrations, which appear at the front of each chapter. These describe objects or a situation and serve to introduce new vocabulary to the reader.

In sum, Toyama took care to design his Mombushō Conversational Readers according to Japanese students’ needs, which he understood well because he had taught English at the Tokio Daigaku and its yobimon (preparatory school). The conversation in the Reader is organized with English grammatical rules in mind, particularly those points difficult for Japanese.33 Vocabu-
that students understand these easily by reading out loud and repeating over and over. Emphasis is placed on conversation, listening, and pronouncing because Toyama, like F. Gouin, was convinced that the “impressions are created through one’s ears” and “verbal practice should be emphasized.” The student will over time come to understand the meaning of sentences without any explanation.

Part Three: Speaking, Reading, and Writing

Traditional or classical education in the west consisted of Latin and Greek and the method by which a student learned this was through the study of grammar (verb tenses, irregular verbs, other parts of speech, parsing, etc). Little consideration had been given to oral composition. Today, such a traditional method is referred to as the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). Gouin and Prendergast criticize this as ineffective and impractical because even an erudite scholar of the classics fails to converse the most simple sentences in Latin. Instead, they both focus on colloquial language and devise a method by studying the process by which children acquire their mother tongue. They claim their method is more consistent with nature. The natural process that a child goes through, both believe, can be applied to adults learning a second language whether it be a “living” language like French or German or a “dead” one such as Latin or Greek. Prendergast and Gouin are among the many scholars who support what later came to be known as the Audio-Lingual Method (A-LM). Toyama is focused on making Japanese student “think in English” and speak fluently with foreigners, and in this sense he in the same category as Gouin and Predergast. However, there is one difference.

The order in which speaking, reading, and writing should be taught was debated amongst western scholars in the 19th century and this continues today. Gouin said that first the student must learn his “series system” by ear through listening to a native speaker and conversing with him. Then, he must learn it through the eyes by reading. Lastly, he must use his sense of touch or hands for writing. If this order is mixed up, the child will be left confused. Gouin believes that teaching spelling before one can speak in complete sentences is wrong. “The first
cause of a false accent and pronunciation is the study of languages by means of reading” and if French were taught only by ear there would be no confusion in pronunciation. Prendergast agrees with Gouin on this point. Prendergast omits writing in his mastery system entirely. He states, “When the spelling of a word suggests a variety of different sounds, uncertainty ensues, and a difficulty is gratuitously created which may be avoided by merely learning the sounds, unwritten.”

However, Toyama did not only borrow from Western theory, but he also wanted to apply Japanese characteristics to the study of a foreign language. He found a way to overcome the confusion caused by irregular spelling. His Readers trained students’ ears by introducing rhyming words, and forced the child to compare and contrast the spelling against sounds. Pronunciation is indicated in Webster’s style. The IPA system had been invented in 1888, Webster’s method was used in Japan up until the mid-Taishō period. Toyama instructs the teacher to be accurate about the pronunciation for new words introduced but not to explain the meaning because these can be deduced from the illustrations and context. A gifted child will figure out that even words spelt differently can rhyme phonetically.

As for the writing aspect, Toyama believed that handwriting would help children remember English words, possibly because Japanese children were accustomed to practicing Japanese calligraphy (shūji). In a speech from 1889, Toyama first differentiated Western calligraphy or penmanship from Japanese calligraphy or shūji and argued that Japanese calligraphy should not be relegated to the status of calligraphy in a western curriculum because it was crucial to learning the stroke count and order of strokes when writing Chinese characters. Furthermore, because Japanese children spend so much time memorizing kanji, they cannot follow the curriculum based on imported American textbooks at the same rate that an American child can. More time should be allotted to learning Japanese through calligraphy class at the lower grades, and the kanji must be selected so that it overlaps with the material in kokugo (Japanese language). This will economize time and increase efficiency because kanji is limited to the most important characters.

Later Toyama built on his argument by making a connection between Japanese calligraphy or shūji and Francis Galton’s
“mental imagery.” Galton (1822–1911) was a British scientist and founder of eugenics who influenced Toyama greatly. Toyama repeated that Japanese historically learned to write first through tenarai or penmanship and then by learning the stroke count through shūji. Not only in Japan but also in Western countries, writing out words is important when learning spelling. He also argued that “mental imagery” is useful because if we retain mental image of something we can still observe and research it even after it has disappeared, but needs training on how to focus one’s attention on an object. Also, the ‘law of amalgamation’ (rengō no hō) is associated with the retention of memory (kioku) and must be evoked to strengthen one’s capacity to retain mental images.

Toyama includes the English alphabet at the beginning of his textbook, just like Ollendorf and Dreyspring. Children start Japanese calligraphy with i, ro, ha or the equivalent of a, i, u, e, o today, so Toyama starts the Readers with a, b, c. In Toyama’s Readers, children learn three or more letters in every lesson starting with “A a” up to Lesson 23. They need to be able to name these, as well as write these in cursive form. Toyama later makes students write out one clause before moving on to a full sentence. Toyama also included dictation both as handwriting practice and as a kind of test to see how much the child has retained. The unscheduled test takes place with the textbook closed and children write down what the teacher dictates. However, Toyama limits the length of the exam to prevent overcrowding the child’s memory.

Conclusion

In a time when the language of higher education changed from English to Japanese, Japan was facing the prospect of future direct contact with foreigners. Toyama tried to come up with a systematic way of teaching English for non-native speakers by relying on both Western theory and Japanese characteristics. As head of the bunkadaigaku and later President of the Imperial University of Tōkyō, he had the foresight to try and build a bridge between elementary, middle, and higher education. Some of Toyama’s students became teachers and later principals of ordinary and higher middle schools. Toyama repeatedly sought to
improve the local education systems so that all Japanese gained access to proper education, especially language education.

Toyama borrowed heavily from T. Prendergast’s “syntactic operation” emphasizing both sentence structure and the interchange of words having the same function. Although Toyama may have disagreed with Gouin in that he combined speaking, reading, and writing in the language acquisition process, he did so thinking that the Japanese are prone to memorization through writing as was the case with Chinese characters. Lastly, Toyama believed F. Galton’s “mental imagery” was not unique to the West, but that Japanese also tended to invoke mental images during Japanese calligraphy or during a game of go. These mental images were useful in learning English. Galton’s mental image together with F. Gouin’s series system was incorporated into Toyama’s teaching methods. Toyama’s efforts were successful on many fronts and what he could not complete was left for his students’ generation.

Today, educators discuss benefits and drawbacks of communication-based and reading-based English curriculums in an effort to find out why Japanese are weak in oral communication, despite having had six years of compulsory English education. Professor Saitō Yoshifumi of the University of Tōkyō, for example argues that repeating simple sentences out loud and understanding grammar and sentence structures are keys to language education in general and that the curriculum in Japanese language (kokugo) should be strengthened.

Endnotes
* A note: All quotes from Toyama’s primary sources and articles from journals in the Meiji period have been translated by the author. The “Introduction” to the Mombushō Conversational Readers is the only exception as it was originally written in English.
Japanese names appear with the family name followed by the given name.
The names of institutions appear in rōmaji with the English names given in ( ) only when it is first used.
† This essay limits its scope to the discussion of Toyama and the institutions he is affiliated with, namely Tokio Daigaku Yobimon, Tokio
Daigaku, and Teikoku Daigaku as well as kōtō-(chū)-gakkō. Other institutions of higher learning such as private schools or professional colleges have been omitted. What is called the University of Tōkyō today went through several stages of reforms, reorganization, and name changing. Tokio Daigaku is the school attached to the Mombushō (Department of Education) and to which other ministry affiliated colleges combined to form the new Teikoku Daigaku in 1886. On April 10, 1877, Tokio Kaisei Gakkō and Tokio Igakkō combined to form Tokio Daigaku. Departments of Law, Science, and Literature were established in the former Kaisei Gakkō. Department of Medicine was established in the former Igakkō. Each had its own President and independent curriculum until June 15th, 1881, when the four departments were placed under one President. In 1885, the Imperial College of Engineering was transferred to the control of the Department of Education. On March 1st, 1886, Tokio Daigaku and Imperial College of Engineering were merged into Teikoku Daigaku or Imperial University through an Imperial Ordinance. The term “Tōkyō” was added in 1897 to distinguish it with the second Teikoku Daigaku in Kyōto. The official English names according to the Calendar for the respective institutions are as follows: Tokio Daigaku is University of Tokio, Teikoku Daigaku is Imperial University of Japan, and Tōkyō Teikoku Daigaku is Imperial University of Tōkyō. The spelling of Tōkyō changed.

‡ Thomas Prendergast was born in colonial India and rose up in the ranks within the East India Company. After retirement he settled in Britain, but soon became blind. After this misfortune he channeled his energy towards creating the mastery system. He himself picked up Madras vernacular, Tamil and Telegu by repeating conversational sentences as collector for the Company. A missionary named S. R. Brown introduced Prendergast’s mastery system to Japan as early as 1872, while teaching at a Japanese government run school. Brown published *Prendergast’s Mastery System Adapted to the Study of Japanese or English* in June of 1875 with a copyright secured from the Mombushō. S. R. Brown, *Prendergast’s Mastery System, Adapted to the Study of Japanese or English*. Yokohama, Japan: F. R. Wetmore& Co., 1875.

§ François Gouin was a native of Normandy, France. Educated in the College of Séez, he then went to a German University, but initially left because he failed miserably to learn the language. Gouin eventually returned to Germany where he became a professor of French and later moved to other parts of Europe including a brief stay in England. He was active as a reformer and superintendent of a school before he composed the “L’Art d’Enseigner et d’Etudier Les Langues” in 1880 in Geneva and published it in Paris. His student Howard Swan translated it as *The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages* and published it in 1892. Swan eventually came to Japan to teach English. Because Toyama did not read French, he most likely read the English transla-


2. In 1871, Mori Arinori (1847–1889), handpicked Toyama and Yatabe Ryōkichi to go to the United States and assist him as the new ambassador. Mori later became the first Minister of Education.


See also:


14. For the primary source written by Toyama, see

Jun Tokorozawa, “Bungakubu Gakuchō Toyama Masakazu no Ken-
gisho: ‘Daigaku he Tenka no Jinzai wo Fukusō seshimu no Hō’

15. Masakazu Toyama, “Shōgaku Oyobi Chūgaku Kyōin Kokoroe: Kyō-
    ikudannkai ni oite nashitaru Ensetsu,” _Tōyō Gakugei Zasshi_ 25 (1883):
    137–140.

    Nihon Kyōikukai,” _Chūzan Sonkō_ Volume 1, Part 2. (Tōkyō: Maruzen,
    1909), 3–32.

Masakazu Toyama, “Ōkuma Naikaku to Kyōiku,” _Chūzan Sonkō_ Vol-

17. According to Toyama’s biography, he returned to Japan 1879 and was
    hired at Kaisei Gakkō (later Tokio Daigaku Hō-Ri-Bun Gakubu).
    According to the Calendar for Tokio Daigaku (University of Tokio)
    Departments of Law, Science, and Literature for the year 1880–81,
    Toyama is listed under Department of Literature. However, the calen-
    dar for the 1879–1880 year does not list Toyama’s name.

18. Sanae Takada, _Hanpō Mukashi-banashi_ (Tōkyō: Waseda Daigaku Shup-
    panbu, 1927), 37.

    Masakazu to Tōkyō Daigaku Kannkō Eigo Tekisuto,” _Eigakushi Kenkyū_
    Michiaki Kawato, “Meiji Jidai no Eigo-fukudokuhon II: Toyama
    Masakazu to Tōkyō Daigaku Kannkō Eigo Tekisuto,” _Eigakushi Kenkyū_

20. Masakazu Toyama, “Gaikokugo Kyōin Yōsei ni Kansuru Iken,” in _Chu-

21. Masakazu Toyama, “Gaiokokugo Kyōin Yōsei ni Kansuru Iken,” in _Chu-

22. For information on Mombushō side see:
    Masahiro Nishihara, “Teikoku Kyōikukai Eigo Kyōjyuhō Kennkyūbu

    One. (Tōkyō: Imperial Department of Education, 1889). Reprinted in
    Kenkichi Takanashi, ed., _Eigo Kyōkasho Meicho-senshū_ Vol. 11. (Tōkyō:


35. From a linguistics perspective from the 21st century, J. F. Werker had studied infant and children’s ability to distinguish sounds differentiated in their mother tongue from those that are not distinguished in their mother tongue, but are in foreign languages. She has applied the term “universal listeners” to infants of a certain age because they can distinguish all sounds, but as they mature into adulthood lose this ability and can only distinguish sounds that are distinct in their native tongue. For an example of her studies refer to: Janet F. Werker. “Cross-language Speech Perception: Evidence for Perceptual Reorganization During the First Year of Life.” *Infant Behavior and Development* 25 (2002): 121–133.

For a historical overview of English language education in post-war Japan in Japanese, see Torikai Kumiko. For a debate between university professors of English language, see Yoshifumi Saitō. And for recent scholarship in English see Yamada Mieko.


40. For more detailed analysis on vocabulary used in the *Readers*, see:


42. Toyama translated F. Galton’s “Mental Imagery.” See below:
   The term “mental imagery” is used on page 569.


44. Dreyspring and Ollendorff both wrote textbooks for English native speakers learning a foreign language. Both have the alphabet in the foreign language at the beginning of the book.

45. For the most recent development in the MEXT reforms see:
   Yōsuke Miki, “Panel Recommends Making English Regular School
Subject from Fifth Grade.” in Mainichi Newspaper (English). September 27, 2014.
The original article in Japanese was written by Miki, but the translator’s name is not given.
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