
The Translation of Edward Carpenter's *The Intermediate Sex* in Early Twentieth-Century Japan

MICHIKO SUZUKI

The story of translations in the early twentieth century—the movement of texts, terms, and ideas around the globe—is a story of unexpected events and unforeseen effects. Often, a translation was understood or used in its new context in a manner quite different from how it was used in the original work. “Translation” also included such things as synopses, adaptations, and condensed versions; moreover, texts were not always translated directly from the original language. Such aspects of translation during this period complicate the view that sexological texts and ideas were disseminated from the Western “center” to the Asian “periphery” in a predictable, more or less straightforward fashion. Furthermore, the complex processes of transmission do not simply reinforce expected differences and gaps with regard to language and cultural context. They also reveal the realities of a dynamic, coeval modernity in which individuals deployed similar strategies to articulate and circulate new vocabulary, concepts, and ideology about the science of sex.

This chapter examines from several different perspectives the first Japanese translation of Edward Carpenter’s (1844–1929) *The Intermediate Sex* (1908), serialized in 1914 and published in book form in 1919. First, I will focus on specific issues regarding these publications, the context of translation, and the choices that were made in translating terms such as “intermediate sex.” In the latter part of the chapter, I explore some unexpected ways in which Carpenter’s ideas were used in Japan. Differences and similarities

between the original and its Japanese translations (both textual and conceptual) afford important insight into the development of sexological discourses in a global framework.

Edward Carpenter in Japan

Since the mid-nineteenth century, Japan's drive to become a modern empire necessitated a rapid absorption of all things Western. In this context, sexology played an important role in creating new views of gender, sexuality, and national identity. By 1894, an abridged translation of Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* (4th ed.) had already been published, and it was retranslated in a more complete form in 1913 after prominent intellectuals endorsed its importance as a work presenting "new Western knowledge."¹ Indeed, during the 1910s–1920s, there was a sexology boom in Japan: works by Western and Japanese sexologists were widely published and read by both intellectual and popular audiences in a variety of venues, and sexological ideas quickly spread within the cultural imaginary.

Edward Carpenter, though not a medical sexologist, contributed significantly to what Heike Bauer calls "literary sexology,"² especially with regard to discussions of homosexuality. Although various aspects of Carpenter's thought were influential in Japan, his association with socialism originally facilitated the rapid introduction of his works by Japanese socialists and democracy activists. Many of his works, such as *Civilisation: Its Cause and Cure* (1889; trans. 1893), were translated soon after their publication.³ Socialist Ishikawa Sanshirō (1876–1956) played a critical role in promoting Carpenter as one of the great thinkers of the day, publishing in 1912 *Tetsujin Kaapentaa* (Carpenter the sage), a work discussing Carpenter's ideas.⁴ Later Carpenter also became recognized for works on love and sexuality, and his *Love's Coming of Age* (1896) especially reached a wide audience; different abbreviated translations circulated, and a full translation was published in 1921.⁵ In this way, Carpenter came to be considered an important contributor to discourses about sexology and love, as well as social transformation and progress in early twentieth-century Japan.

The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women is Carpenter's collection of essays treating different topics regarding inversion and same-sex relationships. Although it was published in 1908, the essays themselves were written (and some published) over a decade earlier.⁶ Despite controversy, the English-language text went through many editions. Sheila Rowbotham notes that it was "remarkable in addressing a general readership and thus breaking the taboo on how ideas about homosexuality could be communicated."⁷ Carpenter not only presented a positive genealogy of same-sex sexuality to combat degeneration discourse but also suggested

that those of the “intermediate sex” served a critical role in the advancement of society.⁸ In communicating these radical ideas, Carpenter used certain textual strategies. He framed the text as part of scientific, scholarly knowledge, making references to “untranslated European texts throughout” and including “a long bibliographical appendix”; he also skillfully used a style of writing that “made it exceedingly difficult to pin down his precise meaning.” As Rowbotham puts it, what Carpenter said in this text “might appear perfectly clear; what he *meant* was frequently opaque.”⁹ By sustaining multi-layered levels of meaning in his work, Carpenter was able to navigate the restrictions of his day.

In discussing same-sex intimacy in these essays, Carpenter focuses on male–male relationships.¹⁰ Although the work presents some notions of female inversion and same-sex attachments, they are not discussed with as much detail and enthusiasm. Although Carpenter was known for his concern for feminist issues, girls and women are secondary (and at times negatively presented) in these discussions.¹¹ In Japan, however, it was women who translated and published this work amid growing interest in female same-sex love and sexuality. In addition to Carpenter’s bona fides in Japan as a “sage,” the discussion of recent Western sexological ideas relevant to female–female sexuality, combined with an opaque and sexually nonexplicit style of writing, made *The Intermediate Sex* an attractive and relevant text for translation.

The Intermediate Sex and Female Same-Sex Love in Japan

The Intermediate Sex was translated by socialist feminist Yamakawa (Aoyama) Kikue (1890–1980) with the title *Chūseiron* (Theories about the intermediate sex) and serialized in *Safuran* (Saffron, 1914), a short-lived journal published by the feminist artist Otake Kōkichi (1893–1966).¹² Later the translation was changed in some parts, retitled *Dōseiai* (Same-sex love) and printed in book form together with a translation of a section of Lester Ward’s (1841–1913) *Pure Sociology* (1903) in 1919. The excerpt from Ward’s work, titled *Josei chūshinsetsu* (Gynæocentric theory), discusses the idea that the female sex, rather than the male, is the primary, originary sex. *Dōseiai* was probably published together with this text because both translators were socialist activists, and both works addressed the evolution of society and the changing aspects of sex/gender as critical manifestations of modernity.¹³

Although Carpenter’s *The Intermediate Sex* primarily featured male identity, in Japan its publication was imbricated with various issues and questions about modern female sexual identity and the development of feminist movements. During the 1910s there were many discussions and reports in the media about the new, “modern” phenomenon of female

same-sex love, particularly among schoolgirls. Especially following a high-profile love suicide in 1911, there was much debate regarding the true nature of female–female love, whether it was sexual and abnormal (or platonic but emotionally excessive), innate or temporary, and how it related to questions of masculinity and femininity, as well as sexual identity and gender roles.¹⁴ Proliferating images of the so-called New Woman rebelling against traditional Confucian values also led to widespread interest in various forms of “new” female identities and their impact on society.

Western sexological discourse on female same-sex intimacy and the identity of the female invert had already been introduced to Japan through texts such as *Psychopathia Sexualis* and Havelock Ellis’s *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1897). In 1914, *Seitō* (Bluestocking, 1911–1916), the first Japanese feminist journal, published a condensed translation of “Sexual Inversion in Women,” a chapter from *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*.¹⁵ Historian Gregory Pflugfelder has suggested that the translation of *The Intermediate Sex* in *Safuran* may have been a response to the Ellis translation, involving some personal issues between feminists and/or a challenge to “Ellis’s somewhat less positive evaluation of ‘same-sex love.’”¹⁶

In *Safuran*’s editorial notes, feminist Kamichika Ichiko (1888–1981) explains that the Carpenter translation came about as a result of a conversation she had with Yamakawa, who explained that Carpenter believed “same-sex love (*dōsei ren’ai*)” was “of a more spiritual nature than the [love] between men and women, and if steered in a good direction, there was no limit as to how one could influence and direct the other [person] [in a good way].” This grabbed Kamichika’s attention, and she asked Yamakawa to translate the work. Kamichika also suggests that Carpenter’s text is valuable because “in Japan too there are men and women of the intermediate sex (*chūsei*) who have begun appearing these days.”¹⁷ But despite this reference to both genders, it seems that the focus is on the phenomenon of female same-sex intimacy as opposed to that between men. The usage of the term *dōsei ren’ai*, strongly associated with female–female love and often considered nonsexual in nature, additionally underscores the spiritual aspects of this love as the main point of interest.¹⁸

The translation of *The Intermediate Sex* was one of the earliest publications by Yamakawa, who would later become an important socialist feminist.¹⁹ She would also publish the full translation of *Love’s Coming of Age* in 1921.²⁰ In an interview published in 1979, Yamakawa explained that Carpenter, “a minister who never married,” recognized that there were many “great geniuses who remained single,” and examined “the important achievements of single people (*dokushinsha*) for society and humanity.” The term “single people” is gender and sexuality neutral (used either inadvertently or strategically), but Yamakawa makes it clear that she wanted to present

such positive views in order to combat the “traditional prejudice against unmarried women” that was still present even among male socialist activists.²¹ Whether the Japanese translation of *The Intermediate Sex* was the result of personal issues between individual women, rivalry between two feminist journals, an attempt to present differing views about female same-sex love, or a feminist defense of spinsterhood, it is important to view it as part of a greater exploration of “new” female sexualities, relationships, and identities.

Translating the Term “Intermediate Sex”

Carpenter's text was certainly read by those interested in male–male sexuality,²² but its translation emerged in the context of widespread concerns of and about women. This likely influenced some choices made in translation; through use of certain words and selective excising, the Japanese version highlights temperament and emotion rather than sexuality. This was no doubt part of a strategy to prevent censorship, and it also helped feminists associated with the text avoid being personally linked with sexual perversity considered the subject of sexological inquiry.²³

In *The Intermediate Sex*, Carpenter focuses on erasing associations of pathology and degeneration with inversion, and promoting ideal aspects of same-sex attachments in general. He is grappling with the realities of censorship while working simultaneously to “rebrand” homosexuality. Thus, already in the original text, special care is taken with wording and language. For example, Carpenter often legitimates same-sex sexuality by, ironically, undermining sexual desire or practice; he tends to emphasize inverted characteristics or temperament, and the notion of love is presented mainly as “the inner devotion of one person to another.”²⁴ These rhetorical strategies were especially crucial for presenting a nonthreatening, less sexualized perspective of male inversion and relationships. In the Japanese translation, such “sanitizing” is further heightened so that love, as opposed to sexuality, is underscored.

Carpenter discusses various ideas about homosexuality by drawing on a range of terms, such as “Urning,” “Uranian” and “intermediate sex.” The word “Urning,” coined by Karl Heinrich Ulrichs in 1864,²⁵ was already in use by Japanese intellectuals during the early twentieth century, translated phonetically as *ūruningu*.²⁶ Probably because in Japan this word already had negative associations as a medico-scientific term for a perverse sexual phenomenon/identity, the translation of *The Intermediate Sex* uses the term only once (in English) when discussing inverts specifically in relation to sexual practices.²⁷ “Uranian,” a less known term, also associated with abnormal same-sex sexuality, is never used. Japanese sexological texts usually rendered this word as *uranisumusū* (Uranismus), and later on often differentiated

“Urning” and “Uranian” as male and female, respectively.²⁸ In either case, usage of such words clearly associated with abnormal same-sex sexuality would not have been desirable for Carpenter’s positive presentation of inverts and same-sex love. Thus, in the Japanese translation of *The Intermediate Sex*, these terms (“Urning,” “Uranian” and “intermediate sex”) are generally all translated using the single neologism “*chūseisha*” (intermediate-sex person, or middle-sex person). This decision was most likely a conscious effort by the translator to eschew known sexological terms with possible negative associations, and use instead “*chūseisha*,” unassociated with overt negative meaning.

Rowbotham notes that “in using the term the ‘intermediate sex’ Carpenter was adapting a concept which was already in circulation.”²⁹ Bauer also comments that “the notion of the ‘intermediate sex’ aligned Carpenter’s theories more closely with the German activist strand of sexology derived from Ulrichs’ inversion theory and further developed by [Magnus] Hirschfeld’s *Zwischenstufenlehre*, which is perhaps most accurately translated into English as the theory of intermediate sexes.”³⁰ For certain readers even in Japan, the term “intermediate sex” may have evoked associations with German terminology and also with Hirschfeld’s ideas. In a 1916 article in the socialist journal *Shin Shakai* (New society) that introduces Carpenter’s ideas from *The Intermediate Sex*, the term “intermediate [sex]” or “*intaamejietto*” is explained as corresponding to “‘*die sexuellen Zwischenstufen*’ in German” and “should be translated as *chūsei*.”³¹ Hirschfeld’s Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, as well as ideas from its annual publication, the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen*, had already been introduced to Japan by the early twentieth century.³² Sexologists and intellectuals with specialized knowledge were likely to have made this connection between Carpenter’s term and the earlier German concept, as well as other related terms.³³

Judging from the translator’s decision to erase earlier terminology from the text, however, I would suggest that the goal was not to emphasize connections between Carpenter’s term and prior sexological discourse. Although in the Western context various terms had emerged from efforts to acknowledge homosexuality as natural and legitimate, words such as Urning in Japan implied for most readers a non-normative sexuality newly defined by the scientific language of sexology. The author of the 1916 article in *Shin Shakai* clearly understood that Carpenter’s representation shows homosexuality in a positive light and that in Carpenter’s view, the intermediate identity is “congenital.” He discusses Carpenter’s idea that “men and women of the intermediate sex express to varying degrees the tendency towards same-sex love” and that these people “fulfill a productive and important function in the social evolution of humanity.”³⁴ The terms *chūsei* (intermediate sex) and *chūseisha* (intermediate-sex person) function well in supporting this

argument and also helped protect the translator and publisher: these words did not have prior “baggage” semantically and they also conveyed a unique nuance in Japanese.

Since the late nineteenth century a great many Japanese words and meanings were created or transformed through Western influences, and it is often difficult to trace the earliest usage and changing definitions. The term *chūsei* is in current use and has a wide range of meanings, although nuances were somewhat different during the early twentieth century. “*Chū*” means “middle,” and in a 1921 dictionary, we see “*sei*” defined as “character,” “quality,” “life,” “sex,” or “gender” (in terms of grammar).³⁵ This dictionary defines “*chūsei*” as (1) “a quality of being in between something,” (2) equivalent to the English phrase “neutral gender” (in terms of grammar), and (3) equivalent to the English word “neutrality” (in terms of science, being neither acid nor alkaline).³⁶ These definitions point to the term’s emergence from grammatical or scientific concepts of being in-between and neutral.

In contemporary Japanese, *chūsei* has additionally come to mean “lacking pronounced male or female characteristics”³⁷ or “a state in which sexual characteristics are not taken as either male or female.”³⁸ Although these definitions are not yet found in the 1921 dictionary, it is likely that the sense of sexual neutrality in a broader sense had already become a part of the term’s nuance. Thus, *chūsei* was perceived not only as a “middle sex” but also as a kind of “neutral sex” that may harbor certain tendencies or desires but does not express them through actual sexual activity. In a 1924 article in a popular women’s magazine, for example, the word *chūseika* (becoming *chūsei*) is used to explain that women who become too educated will lose their sexual drive, become asexual, and abandon the inclination to marry or reproduce. *Chūsei* is also used in this article to describe biological organisms such as worker bees and ants. The writer suggests that they are of a neutral sex and their only function is to work and not reproduce; thus, humans who work too much are likened to these insects because of their diminishing sexual drives. Such usage emphasizes neutralization in terms of loss of sexual desire and lack of sexual activity.³⁹

Chūsei worked well as a Japanese translation for Carpenter’s “intermediate sex” because it suggested a distinct “middle sex” different from male and female sexes. Furthermore, the additional nuance of neutrality or asexuality that did not exist in English (intermediate) or German (*Zwischen*) helped to underscore Carpenter’s “sanitized” representation, highlighting the idea that same-sex love can be a spiritual expression or desire, not necessarily “degenerate” sexual acts. Ultimately, however, neither *chūsei* nor *chūseisha* really became a featured or foundational component of early twentieth-century Japanese sexological vocabulary. Perhaps this was due to the fact that inversion theory and the terminology of *seiteki tentōsha* (sex-inverted person)

were already quite prevalent. And despite the usefulness of the vague meaning of *chūsei* and its “neutral” nuance for translators in this case, the term may have been *too* vague or confusing for use in other sexological contexts.

When the Japanese book version of *The Intermediate Sex* came out in 1919, the title had been changed from *Chūseiron* (Theories about the intermediate sex), used in the serialization, to *Dōseiai* (Same-sex love). The new title used the term originally associated with female same-sex intimacy, considered more spiritual and less sexual than male homosexuality. *Dōseiai* as a word first appeared in the 1910s and became standardized as a term during the 1920s.⁴⁰ Ultimately, it became the generic word for both male and female same-sex love and sexuality. Furukawa Makoto discusses the intense media focus on female same-sex love during the 1910s–1930s and suggests there was a need for a term that defined homosexuality as both a male and female phenomenon, unlike earlier terms such as *nanshoku* that only referred to male–male sexuality/eroticism. Rather than vocabulary that alluded to male–male intercourse and erotic desire, the rise of female–female love, which was believed to be basically nonsexual, led to the eventual adoption of *dōseiai* as the standard term for male and female same-sex love.⁴¹ It can be argued that in 1919, the word would have been flexible enough to suggest both female same-sex attachments and/or same-sex relationships for both sexes with an emphasis on love (*ai*).

The title of Carpenter’s text was doubtless changed for purposes of clarity (that the work was not about pH balance or the grammatical neuter), but the new title could also have been a way to suggest that its content focused on female same-sex love, a popular topic in the media, published as it was together with Lester Ward’s sociological work on the female sex. The changed title also worked well with another publishing trend of the day, in which works about love in general were becoming extremely important. Carpenter’s text, with its stress on emotional attachment that nurtures human and social development, could have been categorized not only as a work of sexology but also as one of many Western and Japanese works on theories about love. Indeed, texts that discussed love as a sign of advancement and a means to achieve male–female equality were becoming widely consumed at the time, and the new title might have been a means to tap into multiple publication trends of the day.⁴²

It is difficult to draw an overarching conclusion about all of the different choices made in translating Carpenter’s text and the terminology of the “intermediate sex.” Translations are often arbitrary and contain mistakes; they also reflect unintended results that stem from quirks of the particular language. However, the fact that the Japanese translation systematically eliminates various sexological terms suggests intent to create distance from prior sexual associations. This, coupled with the unique nuances of the Japanese

word *chūsei*, resulted in further deemphasizing sexual practice and highlighting emotional intimacy and spiritual love. Perhaps it was important for the women who produced this work to distance themselves from medical sexology (a field dominated by men and perceived as focusing on pathology) even as many of Carpenter's essays engaged with sexological ideas. Certainly, the representation of the content as being about broader expressions and experiences of same-sex love helped protect the translator and publisher.⁴³ It bolstered Carpenter's original strategy for "rebranding" male-male intimacy, while reinforcing the existing image of female same-sex love as predominantly nonsexual in nature. In this way, the work ultimately added to the defense of same-sex relationships, particularly as positive means to develop female identity.

Translating "Affection in Education" in Japan

To show how Carpenter's ideas were used in broader Japanese discourses about female same-sex relationships and its positive, spiritual qualities, I will focus on how the famous Japanese popular fiction writer Yoshiya Nobuko (1896–1973) used one particular essay in *The Intermediate Sex* titled "Affection in Education."⁴⁴ This essay by Carpenter focuses not on the identity of the intermediate sex but examines same-sex relationships that have been denigrated or viewed with suspicion. He defends same-sex friendships in schools, particularly between older and younger boys and in the mentoring between teachers and pupils; he also critiques the British school system's lack of open discussion and education about sexual matters. Carpenter uses the model of ancient Greece to suggest that affection in schools is critical for successful human development and social progress, and he criticizes educators who see only sexual dangers in such relationships. He argues that for optimal physical and mental growth, "purity (in the sense of continence) is of the first importance to boyhood" and suggests that ideal affection, "whether to the one sex or the other—springs up normally in the youthful mind in a quite diffused, ideal, emotional form—a kind of longing and amazement as at something divine—with no definite thought of distinct consciousness of sex in it."⁴⁵ By emphasizing innocence, Carpenter is able to promote male bonding. His main focus is male-male relationships, but he suggests at the end of the essay that prejudicial views toward such attachments also exist in girls' schools. Unlike boys, girls are "encouraged by public opinion" to cultivate friendships, but due to similar repressive elements in schools, these friendships "are for the most part . . . of a weak and sentimental turn, and not very healthy either in themselves or in the habits they lead to."⁴⁶

This essay is very much part of the broader sexological inquiry regarding the distinction between what is normal and abnormal for same-sex

attachments. In terms of emotional and/or physical intimacy and questions of inversion, adolescence was particularly a difficult time about which to make a definite determination. Carpenter validates innocent “healthy affection” in youth as “the basis of education” and an important component for maturation for both the individual and society at large.⁴⁷ This argument in “Affection in Education” contributes to Carpenter’s broader aim: to elevate male same-sex relationships, often through evocation of Hellenic civilization and Greek love.⁴⁸

It may be, therefore, quite surprising and unexpected that in Japan this work was used to defend schoolgirl same-sex intimacy. Similar to the many other kinds of female romantic friendships around the world, such manifestations in Japan were linked to the emergence of single-sex schools. Sexologists worldwide discussed the nature of such relationships in adolescence as platonic or sexual, as positive or harmful, as temporary or terminal, as an essential part of femininity (such as affection and nurturing impulse) or an inverted expression of masculinity. Although it is difficult to generalize, many sexologists viewed these romantic friendships as “normal.” Havelock Ellis determines in his study of sexual inversion that such relationships are temporary and platonic and do not count as “congenital perversion,” and Japanese sexologist Habuto Eiji notes in his 1920 *Ippan seiyokugaku* (General sexology) that this type of same-sex attachment in adolescence is a normal part of the growth process toward heterosexual maturation.⁴⁹

Such “scientific” determination about female same-sex intimacy helped add legitimacy to a thriving world of girls’ culture, represented by popular girls’ magazines and the literary genre of “girls’ fiction” (*shōjo shōsetsu*), featuring female–female romance often set in schools. This is not to say that all sexological discourse saw such adolescent affection as normal, platonic, or harmless, but sexology’s views of such intimacy as “normal” provided yet another level of sanction to female same-sex love already associated with innocence and emotional closeness. Girls’ culture in general emphasized purity, as can be seen in girls’ magazines, generic plots of girls’ fiction, and even in the famous motto of Takarazuka, the all-female revue troupe: “pure, righteous and beautiful” (*kiyoku, tadashiku, utsukushiku*).⁵⁰

Yoshiya Nobuko, a successful popular literature writer, was at the heart of this girls’ culture.⁵¹ By the late 1910s and early 1920s she was already well established as a best-selling author of girls’ fiction. Because of her “unusual” lifestyle (not marrying but living with a lifelong female partner) and her exceptional literary and financial success, Yoshiya remained a prominent figure into the 1970s. Although often viewed only as a “popular writer,” she actively engaged with important areas of cultural knowledge such as sexology and feminist debates while working within a variety of literary genres.⁵²

Hanamonoogatari (Flower tales, 1916–1924), Yoshiya's representative best-selling girls' fiction, featured romantic friendships between girls and/or women. These short melodramatic stories are not simply a reiteration of broader girls' culture (or a reflection of Yoshiya's own identity and values), they are also complex cultural expressions that explore various views and discourses about girlhood, including sexuality.⁵³ A typical plot revolves around a student–student or student–teacher romance or crush often in a school setting; the stories are sentimental, usually featuring unrequited love or a melancholic end to relationships through death, illness, physical separation, marriage, or graduation. Because of their focus on pure, emotional intimacy and the containment of same-sex love as only a girlhood phenomenon, these stories can be read as part of acceptable mainstream values, stressing girlhood romance as innocent, beautiful, and ultimately ephemeral. On the other hand, they can also be interpreted as having radical implications, expressing resistance to mandated maturity into heterosexuality and rejecting the ideal identity of Good Wife, Wise Mother that was common currency in Japan at this time.⁵⁴ It is important to note that these stories are quite varied in terms of setting and tone; some are simple decorative vignettes, while others seem to have a deeper message. Some persuade girls to be virtuous and pure; others challenge social conventions of marriage and express desire for a same-sex partnership.⁵⁵ While keeping the broad range of explorations of same-sex intimacy in *Hanamonoogatari* in mind, it is important to see that these stories actively negotiate complicity and resistance in their content and literary style, questioning the status quo but at the same time reiterating the idea of a “pure,” nonsexual expression of youthful same-sex love.

Yoshiya also wrote essays about girlhood and was regularly interviewed in the media as an important advocate for girls and the world of girls' culture. In a 1921 essay titled “Aishiau kotodomo” (What it means to love each other), she specifically discusses her views on female same-sex love.⁵⁶ There is also a longer version of this essay titled “Dōsei o aisuru saiwai” (The happiness of loving another of the same sex), published in *Akogare shiru koro* (A time of knowing longing), a 1923 collection of Yoshiya's early writings.⁵⁷ In both the 1921 and 1923 versions of the essays, Yoshiya defends same-sex romantic friendships in schools as an important element of girls' education and development, using ideas from Carpenter's “Affection in Education”; in the 1921 essay, she specifically mentions Carpenter's name and his work.⁵⁸ As someone who had studied English texts in her youth, it is possible she read the original, but it is more likely that she had access to the Japanese translation (either through *Safuran* or the book version), titled “Aijō no kyōiku” (The education of love).⁵⁹

In the 1921 essay “What it means to love each other,” Yoshiya explains Carpenter's views on “*yūai*” (love between friends), applying them directly

to the specific context of girls' schools in Japan: "When it happens between an older girl and a younger girl, or when it happens between a teacher and student, it is extremely beneficial in terms of educational value and its worth is immeasurable." The youth worships the elder and copies her actions, and the older individual is moved by this to become her "protector and helper"; such a relationship is important for developing "a beautiful, moral, social and non-self-centered character." Also, following Carpenter's lead, Yoshiya criticizes educators who reject such relationships as "unnatural" or "the first step to corruption," and who are unable to see the benefit of such love as "a glorious foundation" of human development. Such suppression by educators, Yoshiya explains, makes girls "doubt their own love" and contributes negatively to their growth as individuals.⁶⁰ In the longer 1923 version, direct reference to Carpenter is erased, but Yoshiya uses his strategy of drawing on the ancient Greeks, saying that this love was legally protected and acknowledged by them. She then adds a rather interesting twist, suggesting that such protection must have been afforded to others, "not just to groups of young girls."⁶¹ In other words, she takes Carpenter's use of ancient Greek love to legitimate male-male intimacy and knowingly "translates" this tactic in a context where female-female love was very much in the media spotlight. Carpenter's primary focus and message are transformed, while his arguments and rhetoric to defend same-sex relationships are directly utilized.

In both essays, Yoshiya does not touch upon the negative elements of female attachments mentioned by Carpenter. Actually, the Japanese translation of *The Intermediate Sex* shows some change from the 1914 serialized journal version to the 1919 book version; the earlier translation of Carpenter's criticism of friendships in girls' schools is fairly close to the original, but in the book version, which would have reached a broader audience (and perhaps would have been subject to greater scrutiny by the censors), the translation is more vague, avoiding the earlier definition of these relationships and their results as being "unable to be called very healthy"⁶² and only elusively stating that they are "unable to be called quite perfect."⁶³ But even if Yoshiya was not aware of such translation issues, it is clear that she ignored Carpenter's negative presentation of female-female intimacy and instead adapted his positive arguments about male-male attachments. In both the 1921 and 1923 essays, Yoshiya's fundamental premise is that girls' school relationships are nonphysical and beneficial; Yoshiya expresses her wish that these emotions of love, intrinsic to virginal purity, be recognized and valued by society.⁶⁴

To be clear, Yoshiya was not burdened with the need to defend same-sex intimacy in schools with the same sort of vigilance and care required of Carpenter writing about similar male relationships. During the early twentieth century, some girls' schools specifically discouraged friendships between older and younger students, but by the 1920s many educators and sexologists

suggested that love between schoolgirls was harmless, in distinction to the immoral sexual practices between boys.⁶⁵ In many ways, schoolgirl same-sex romance became an accepted part of girls' culture, particularly if it manifested itself through girlhood-associated virtues of selflessness and purity. Yet this did not mean that it was never viewed with suspicion or worry, as something that could be pure but dangerous (leading to suicide or eventual manifestation as inversion), or an extension of the disease that was female adolescence itself. Sexologists and educators throughout the prewar period extensively discussed what was normal or abnormal in girlhood same-sex relationships, as they tried to understand identity in terms of gender, sexuality, developmental stage, class, and social context—a whole new realm of categories with which to conceptualize the modern Japanese.

In her essays, Yoshiya uses Carpenter's authority as a known theorist of love, adapting his argument in order to enhance legitimacy for same-sex love. In effect, she defends her own melodramatic literary productions that dramatize these relationships; she is suggesting that her own works are not vacuous or detrimental but have educational value for teaching girls about this innocent love suitable in their stage of maturity. In her girls' fiction, Yoshiya consistently emphasizes the fundamental nature of this love as transitional, terminal, and "pure"—ideas enhanced by the authoritative worldview of sexology—and in this way she enabled herself to explore themes that otherwise would have been viewed with disapproval or suspicion, including the rejection of marriage and the prioritizing of same-sex relationships. Later, she would go on to use sexological terminology and ideas in examining adult inversion in the context of nonsexual romance in her privately published magazine for a select, older readership.⁶⁶

Conclusion

Yoshiya's use of Carpenter shows how the transformation and dissemination of Western sexological concepts often occurred in unexpected ways. This was, as demonstrated, also very much the case for the Japanese translation and publication of *The Intermediate Sex*. In translating this collection of Carpenter's essays, the primary motivating factor was not to advocate for inverts or to promote male–male relationships, but most likely to present a work by a British socialist well known in Japan and to address the rising interest in female same-sex love. The way in which most of the established sexological terms for inversion were erased in the translation, and the emphasis on purity or asexuality created by the neologism *chūsei*, also underscore the different concerns and nuances of the Japanese text. However, despite such differences, these examples of Carpenter's translation and transmission very much highlight the notion of a coeval modernity. Here, we see how similar

ideas and methods were used in both the West and Japan to articulate and defend same-sex relationships through the limited vocabulary and venues of the times.

Just as Carpenter relied on the notions of love and intimacy to create new positive ways of articulating inversion as well as male–male camaraderie, Yoshiya emphasized the purity and positive aspects of female–female romance, successfully establishing its key role for the development of modern female identity during the period. If we approach *The Intermediate Sex* from a twenty-first-century perspective, the erasure or undermining of physical sexuality is one-sided, but we can see how ideas of love and affection, and proscribed values such as purity and sexual innocence, were deployed in ways to speak in code about same-sex relationships, transform established negative notions, and create resistant viewpoints. Yoshiya also strategically used the notion of a pure, nonsexual intimacy to question and challenge the status quo in a variety of ways. This is a powerful reminder that sexological views were influential not only in examining the “abnormal,” but also in establishing “normal” spaces from which to safely articulate unexplored identities, lifestyles, and relationships.

In this chapter, then, I have examined the translation and uses of *The Intermediate Sex* in Japan, not only to show the unexpected ways in which sexology traveled around the globe, but also to demonstrate how similar practices and challenges were part of creating legitimacy for same-sex love and developing gender identities. By pursuing the specificities of the transmission and adaptation of Carpenter’s text beyond Euro-American boundaries, we can consider new possibilities in mapping the development of sexological discourse and knowledge during the early twentieth century.

NOTES

All Japanese translations are mine. Cited Japanese publications are published in Tokyo.

1. Saitō Hikaru, “*Hentai seiyoku shinri kaisetsu*,” in *Hentai seiyoku to kindai shakai* 1, vol. 2 of *Kindai Nihon no sekushuariti*, ed. Saitō Hikaru (Yumani Shobō, 2006), 4–6. According to Saitō (6), the 1913 translation was probably based on the 12th, 13th, or 14th edition.

2. Heike Bauer, *English Literary Sexology: Translations of Inversion, 1860–1930* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), esp. 73–81. For Carpenter’s biographical information, see Edward Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1916); Sheila Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love* (London: Verso, 2008); Sheila Rowbotham, “Edward Carpenter: Prophet of the New Life,” in *Socialism and the New Life: The Personal and Sexual Politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis*, ed. Sheila Rowbotham and Jeffrey Weeks (London: Pluto Press, 1977), 25–138; Chushichi Tsuzuki, *Edward Carpenter 1844–1929: Prophet of Human Fellowship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

3. See Chushichi Tsuzuki, "My Dear Sanshiro: Edward Carpenter and His Japanese Disciple," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies* 6, no. 1 (whole number 6) (1972): 1; Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 348.

4. Ishikawa Sanshirō, *Tetsujin Kaapentaa* (Tōundō, 1912), 1–300, facsimile reprint in *Ishikawa Sanshirō senshū*, vol. 5 (Kokushoku Sensensha, 1983). The correspondences between Ishikawa and Carpenter (from 1909) are collected in *Ishikawa Sanshirō chosakushū*, vol. 7 (Seidosha, 1979). On their relationship, including meetings in London and Millthorpe, see "Ishikawa Sanshirō nenpu," in *Ishikawa Sanshirō chosakushū*, 7:406–408; Tsuzuki, "My Dear Sanshiro," 1–9; Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 348–350, 399; Carpenter, *My Days and Dreams*, 276–279.

5. Japanese translations of *Love's Coming of Age* that I have been able to examine (including the 1921 version) do not include the essay "The Intermediate Sex," first included in the 1906 Swan Sonnenschein edition. On this 1906 edition, see Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 281.

6. Edward Carpenter, "Prefatory Note to First Edition," in *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1930), 7.

7. Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 282.

8. Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*, 78; Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 283.

9. Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 283.

10. Rowbotham, "Edward Carpenter," 98.

11. See Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*, 79.

12. Edowaado Kaapentaa [Edward Carpenter], "Chūseiron," trans. Aoyama Kikue, is serialized in *Safuran* 1, no. 3 (1914): 1–22; no. 4 (1914): 130–153; no. 5 (1914): 55–76. Facsimile reprints appear in *Safuran*, 2 vols. (Fuji Shuppan, 1984).

13. The book's foreword explains that both Ward's and Carpenter's texts are "materials with which to study the problem of both sexes." Sakai Toshihiko, "Hashigaki," in Resutaa Wōdo [Lester Ward] and Edowaado Kaapentaa [Edward Carpenter], *Josei chūshinsetsu to Dōseiai*, trans. Sakai Toshihiko and Yamakawa Kikue (Arususha, 1919), 2.

14. For English-language discussions of female same-sex love and sexology discourse in this period in Japan, see, for example, Gregory M. Pflugfelder, "'S' Is for Sister: Schoolgirl Intimacy and 'Same-Sex Love' in Early Twentieth-Century Japan," in *Gendering Modern Japanese History*, ed. Barbara Molony and Kathleen Uno (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2005), 133–190; Jennifer Robertson, "Dying to Tell: Sexuality and Suicide in Imperial Japan," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25, no. 1 (1999): 1–35; Michiko Suzuki, "Writing Same-Sex Love: Sexology and Literary Representation in Yoshiya Nobuko's Early Fiction," *Journal of Asian Studies* 65, no. 3 (2006): 575–599; Michiko Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women: Love and Female Identity in Prewar Japanese Literature and Culture* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010), 23–33.

15. Erisu [Ellis], "Joseikan no dōsei ren'ai," trans. Nomo, foreword by Hiratsuka Raichō, *Seitō* 4, no. 4 (1914): furoku 1–24. For the original English text, see Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (New York: Random House, 1942), 1:195–263.

16. Pflugfelder, "'S' Is for Sister," 169. See also 165–169.

17. "Henshūshitsu nite," *Safuran* 1, no. 3 (1914): 157–158, facsimile reprint in *Safuran*, vol. 1. Also see Pflugfelder's translations and discussion in "'S' Is for Sister," 168–169.

18. For this term, see Furukawa Makoto, “Dōsei ‘ai’ kō,” *Imago* 6, no. 12 (1995): 205–207.

19. See “Yamakawa Kikue chosaku mokuroku,” in *Yamakawa Kikue no kōseki: Watashi no undōshi to chosaku mokuroku*, ed. Sotozaki Mitsuhiko and Okabe Masako (Domesu Shuppan, 1979), 99.

20. See Edowaado Kaapentaa [Edward Carpenter], *Ren'ai ron*, trans. Yamakawa Kikue (Daitōkaku, 1921), facsimile reprint as Mizuta Tamae, ed., *Sekai joseigaku kiso bunken shūsei (Meiji Taishō hen)*, vol. 13 (Yumani Shobō, 2001).

21. *Rekishī hyōron* henshūbu, ed., *Kindai Nihon joseishi e no shōgen: Yamakawa Kikue, Ichikawa Fusae, Maruyama Hideko, Tatewaki Sadayo* (Domesu Shuppan, 1979), 26–29. From the context of the interview, it is unclear which particular text she is discussing when she talks about Carpenter’s general views and ideas.

22. For some examples, see Gregory M. Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire: Male–Male Sexuality in Japanese Discourse 1600–1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 307.

23. We see a similar strategy in the 1914 translation of Ellis’s “Sexual Inversion in Women,” in *Seitō*. The Japanese title is rendered broadly as “Same sex love between women” (*Joseikan no dōsei ren'ai*) rather than using the specific sexological terminology of “sexual inversion” (*seiteki tentō*). This term is used in the text, but not in the title. For the 1913 editorial comment about censorship concerns regarding this text, see Yoshikawa Toyoko, “*Ren'ai to kekkon* (Ellen Key) to sekusorōjii,” in *Seitō o yomu*, ed. Shin feminizumu hihiyō no kai (Gakugei Shorin, 1998), 257.

24. Carpenter, “Introductory,” in *The Intermediate Sex*, 15.

25. Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*, 4.

26. For more on this term in Japan, see Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire*, 259; Furukawa, “Dōsei ‘ai’ kō,” 206.

27. Kaapentaa, “Chūseiron,” *Safuran* 1, no. 4 (1914): 139; Kaapentaa, *Dōseiai*, in *Josei chūshinsetsu to Dōseiai*, 207.

28. Habuto Eiji, an important Japanese sexologist of the early twentieth century, differentiates the two terms for male and female in *Hentai seiyoku no kenkyū* (Gakugei Shoin, 1921), 193. Facsimile reprint in *Hentai seiyoku to kindai shakai 2*, vol. 3 of *Kindai Nihon no sekushuariti*, ed. Saitō Hikaru (Yumani Shobō, 2006). See also the explanations on *ūruningu* and *uranisumusū* that focus on sexuality and perversity in Satō Kōka, ed., “Seiyokugaku goi: Gekan,” *Hentai shiryō*, vol. rinji tokubetsu gō (1927): 90–92. Facsimile reprint in *Hentai shiryō*, vol. 3, ed. Shimamura Teru (Yumani Shobō, 2006).

29. Rowbotham, *Edward Carpenter*, 283.

30. Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*, 75. She explains that Carpenter viewed “love between men or between women in Ulrichsian terms as an inversion of the soul” (73).

31. Kuzumi Kesson, “Kaapentaa shi no chūseikan,” *Shin Shakai* 2, no. 5 (1916): 22.

32. See Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire*, 249–250. For more on the Japan-Hirschfeld connection, see also 250, 259–260.

33. Perhaps another related term would have been *das dritte Geschlecht* (the third sex). See Furukawa, “Dōsei ‘ai’ kō,” 202; Carolyn J. Dean, *Sexuality and Modern Western Culture* (New York: Twayne, 1996), 24.

34. Kuzumi, “Kaapentaa shi no chūseikan,” 22.

35. *Gensen: Nihon daijiten*, vol. 3 (Ōkura Shoten, 1921), s.v. “sei.”

36. *Ibid.*, s.v. “chūsei.”
37. *Kōjien*, 5th ed. (Iwanami Shoten, 2005), s.v. “chūsei.” Additional meanings here also include “same as *kansei* (intersex)” and “nature that is neither positive nor negative in terms of electrical charge.”
38. *Meikyō kokugo jiten* (Taishūkan Shoten, 2002–2004), s.v. “chūsei.”
39. Kagawa Toyohiko, “Kyōyō aru fujin to kekkon nan no mondai: 1. Chūseika no kiken,” *Fujin Kōron* 9, no. 6 (1924): 22–27.
40. Pflugfelder, “‘S’ Is for Sister,” 141, 157.
41. Furukawa Makoto, “Sekushuariti no henyō: Kindai Nihon no dōseiai o me-guru mittsu no kōdo,” *Nichibeī Josei Jaanaru* 17 (1994): 44; Furukawa, “Dōsei ‘ai’ kō,” 206–207. Also see Pflugfelder for discussions of earlier male-oriented terms such as *nanshoku*. Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire*, 23–44.
42. For more on such texts, see Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*.
43. The foreword to *Dōseiai* notes that translator Yamakawa does not necessarily agree with all the theories discussed in Carpenter’s text. Sakai Toshihiko, “Hashigaki,” 2. Pflugfelder notes this caveat in “‘S’ Is for Sister,” 168. Although it is difficult to reconstruct Yamakawa’s personal views, this can also be considered part of a strategy to avoid censorship and association with sexual pathology or homosexual activism.
44. Carpenter, “Affection in Education,” in *The Intermediate Sex*, 83–106.
45. *Ibid.*, 93.
46. *Ibid.*, 105.
47. *Ibid.*
48. For Carpenter’s and other writers’ use of the idea of Greek love and civilization see Bauer, *English Literary Sexology*, 7, 77–78.
49. Havelock Ellis, *Sexual Inversion*, 3rd ed., revised and enlarged, vol. 2 of *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (Philadelphia: Davis, 1924), 374; Habuto Eiji, *Kyōiku shiryō: Ippan seiyokugaku* (Jitsugyō No Nipponsha, 1921), 354. For more on the bifurcation of adolescent “pure” female same-sex love and adult “abnormal” female same-sex love, see Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love”; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 23–33.
50. On this motto, see Jennifer Robertson, *Takarazuka: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 151. For discussions of some areas of prewar Japanese girls’ culture and notions of purity, see Kawamura Kunimitsu, *Otome no inori: Kindai josei imeeji no tanjō* (Kinokuniya Shoten, 1993); Kawamura Kunimitsu, *Otome noshintai: Onna no kindai to sexuariti* (Kinokuniya Shoten, 1994); Kume Yoriko, “Kōsei sareru ‘shōjo’: Meijiki ‘shōjo shōsetsu’ no janru keisei,” *Nihon Kindai Bungaku* 68 (2003): 1–15; Satō (Sakuma) Rika, “‘Kiyoki shijō de gokōsai o’: Meiji makki shōjo zasshi tōshoran ni miru dokusha kyōdōtai no kenkyū,” *Joseigaku* 4 (1996): 129–131; Watanabe Shūko, ‘Shōjo’ zō no tanjō: *Kindai Nihon ni okeru ‘shōjo’ kihan no keisei* (Shinsensha, 2007); Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 34–42; Deborah Shamoan, *Passionate Friendship: The Aesthetics of Girls’ Culture in Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2012), 29–57.
51. For some recent works in English on Yoshiya Nobuko, see, for example, Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love”; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 23–62; Suzuki, “*The Husband’s Chastity: Progress, Equality, and Difference in 1930s Japan*,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38, no. 2 (2013): 327–352; Sarah Frederick, “Not That Innocent: Yoshiya Nobuko’s Good Girls,” in *Bad Girls of Japan*, ed. Laura Miller and

Jan Bardsley (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 65–79; Hitomi Tsuchiya Dollase, “Early Twentieth Century Japanese Girls’ Magazine Stories: Examining *Shōjo* Voice in *Hanamonogatari* (Flower Tales),” *Journal of Popular Culture* 36, no. 4 (2003): 724–755; Shamoon, *Passionate Friendship*, 58–81; Jennifer Robertson, “Yoshiya Nobuko: Out and Outspoken in Practice and Prose,” in *The Human Tradition in Modern Japan*, ed. Anne Walthall (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 2002), 155–174.

52. Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love”; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 23–62; Suzuki, “*Husband’s Chastity*.”

53. See Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love,” 575–586; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 34–42.

54. For some examples of Japanese scholarship that initially pointed out the resistant or liberating aspect of *Hanamonogatari*, see Honda Masuko, *Ibunka to shite no kodomo* (Chikuma Shobō, 1992), 202–219; Kurosawa Ariko, “Shōjotachi no chikadōmei: Yoshiya Nobuko no *Onna no yūjō* o megutte,” in *Onna to hyōgen: Feminizumu hiyō no genzai*, vol. 2 of *Nyū feminizumu rebuyū*, ed. Mizuta Noriko (Gakuyō Shobō, 1991), 87–88; Yoshitake Teruko, *Nyonin Yoshiya Nobuko* (Bungei Shunjū, 1982), 12; Komashaku Kimi, *Yoshiya Nobuko kakure feminisuto* (Liburoporto, 1994), 24–30.

55. See Yoshiya Nobuko, “Hanamonogatari,” in *Yoshiya Nobuko zenshū*, vol. 1 (Asahi Shinbunsha, 1975), 3–356. “Kibara” (Yellow rose), from *Hanamonogatari*, has been translated into English. Yoshiya Nobuko, *Yellow Rose*, trans. Sarah Frederick (Expanded Editions, 2014), Kindle e-book. For discussion on this particular story, see Frederick’s “Translator’s Introduction,” as well as Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love,” 583–586; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 39–42.

56. Yoshiya Nobuko, “Aishiau kotodomo,” *Shin Shōsetsu* (January 1921): 78–80, facsimile reprint in *Senzenki Dōseiai kanren bunken shūsei*, ed. Furukawa Makoto and Akaeda Kanako (Fuji Shuppan, 2006), 3:151. See Pflugfelder’s analysis in “S’ Is for Sister,” 163–165. This essay was also reprinted in Yoshiya Nobuko, *Shojo dokuhon* (Kenbunsha, 1936), 101–105, facsimile reprint as Yamazaki Tomoko, ed., *Shojo dokuhon*, vol. 35 of *Sōsho Joseiron* (Ōzorasha, 1997).

57. Yoshiya Nobuko, “Dōsei o aisuru saiwai,” in *Akogare shirukoro* (Kōransha, 1923), 14–21.

58. See Yoshiya, “Aishiau kotodomo,” 151; Yoshiya, *Shojo dokuhon*, 103. In the 1921 essay Yoshiya calls Carpenter’s work “Ai no kyōiku” (The education of love). The use of Carpenter here has been noted in Pflugfelder, “S’ Is for Sister,” 171; Suzuki, “Writing Same-Sex Love,” 582; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 37.

59. Kaapentaa, “Chūseiron,” *Safuran* 1, no. 5 (1914): 55–65; Kaapentaa, *Dōseiai*, 227–241.

60. Yoshiya, “Aishiau kotodomo,” 151; Yoshiya, *Shojo dokuhon*, 103–105.

61. Yoshiya, “Dōsei o aisuru saiwai,” 19. The discussion about Greece is in Carpenter, “Affection in Education,” 89–90; Kaapentaa, “Chūseiron,” *Safuran* 1, no. 5 (1914): 58; Kaapentaa, *Dōseiai*, 231.

62. Kaapentaa, “Chūseiron,” *Safuran* 1, no. 5 (1914): 65. For the original, see Carpenter, “Affection in Education,” 105.

63. Kaapentaa, *Dōseiai*, 240.

64. For a different take on modern female same-sex love and its role in education (as essentially nonphysical in nature but something to be neither encouraged nor discour-

aged), see Furuya Toyoko, "Dōseiai no joshi kyōikujō ni okeru shin'igi," *Fujin Kōron* (August 1922): 24–29, facsimile reprint in *Senzenki Dōseiai kanren bunken shūsei*, 3:174–175. This essay by a female educator mentions Carpenter by name and engages with his ideas. See Pflugfelder, "'S' Is for Sister," 170–172.

65. See Numata Rippō, *Gendai shōjo to sono kyōiku* (Dōbunsha, 1916), 47–50, facsimile reprint as *Kindai Nihon joshi kyōiku bunkenshū*, vol. 15 (Nihon Tosho Sentaa, 1984); Sabine Frühstück, *Colonizing Sex: Sexology and Social Control in Modern Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 70; Pflugfelder, "'S' Is for Sister," 148.

66. See Suzuki, "Writing Same-Sex Love," 586–593; Suzuki, *Becoming Modern Women*, 54–60.