

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	11
CHAPTER ONE. THE HISTORY OF THE JAPANESE LEGAL SYSTEM	23
1.1. Edo-Era isolation (1639–1854)	23
1.2. Bakumatsu period and the Meiji Restoration (1854–1868)	29
1.3. The Japanese legal system until the Meiji-era codification	34
1.4. The Importance of law codification for the birth of contemporary nations	38
1.5. Internal and external motives for codifying Japanese civil law	41
1.5.1. Internal motives	41
1.5.2. External motives	45
CHAPTER TWO. JAPANESE ENDEAVOURS TO CODIFY CIVIL LAW, 1868–1889	49
2.1. The first unsuccessful attempts to draft the Civil Code (1868–1879)	50
2.1.1. Drafting the Civil Code under Shimpei Etō's leadership (1869–1873)	50
2.1.2. Drafting the Civil Code under T. Ōki's leadership (1873–1879)	56
2.2. Drafting the Civil Code under the leadership of G. Boissonade and a team of Japanese jurists (1879–1889)	60
CHAPTER THREE. SCHOOLS OF LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP IN JAPAN – THE MAIN ACTORS IN THE CIVIL CODE CONTROVERSY	67
3.1. French School of legal scholarship	70
3.1.1. Law School at the Ministry of Justice	72
3.1.2. Tokyo Law School	74
3.1.3. Tokyo French School	75
3.1.4. Meiji Law School	76
3.1.5. Kansai Law School	77
3.1.6. Kyoto Law School	78
3.2. English School of legal scholarship	79
3.2.1. Old University of Tokyo/Imperial University	81
3.2.2. Senshū School	84
3.2.3. Tokyo Vocational School	85
3.2.4. School of English Law	86

3.3. German School of legal scholarship	87
3.3.1. German Academic Association School	90
3.4. The birth of the Japanese School of legal scholarship	92
3.5. Summary of legal scholarship schools in Japan from the Civil Code Controversy perspective	93

CHAPTER FOUR. THE FIRST STAGE OF THE CIVIL CODE CONTROVERSY – THE DISPUTE UNTIL THE PUBLICATION OF THE CODES	95
4.1. The beginning of the Civil Code Controversy	95
4.1.1. The Association of Jurists’ opinion (English School, postponement faction)	95
4.1.2. R. Masujima’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	98
4.1.3. Zenjirō Tsuboya’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	101
4.1.4. Keijirō Okano’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	103
4.1.5. Yoshito Okuda’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	104
4.1.6. Chū (Makoto) Egi’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	105
4.1.7. Takuzō Hanai’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	108
4.1.8. <i>Nihon no Hōritsu</i> editorial team’s opinion on the succession system (postponement faction)	109
4.1.9. <i>Hōri Seika</i> editorial team’s opinion (postponement faction)	110
4.1.10. <i>Nihon no Hōritsu</i> editorial team’s opinion concerning the publication of Codes (postponement faction)	111
4.1.11. <i>Hōri Seika</i> editorial team’s opinion of Evidence Law drafters (postponement faction)	111
4.2. The decisive faction’s first opinions and the postponement faction’s polemic	113
4.2.1. S. Isobe’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	113
4.2.2. Teijirō Torii’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	116
4.2.3. Misao Inoue’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	117
4.2.4. <i>Nihon no Hōritsu</i> editorial team’s commentary on Saburō Ozaki’s opinion about the illegitimate child system (postponement faction)	119
4.3. Publication of the Civil Code, the Commercial Code and the Code of Civil Procedure	119
4.4. Summary of the first stage of the Civil Code Controversy	126

CHAPTER FIVE. THE SECOND STAGE OF THE CIVIL CODE CONTROVERSY – THE TRANSITIONAL PERIOD	129
5.1. The reaction of the postponement faction to the publication of the Civil Code and the decisive faction comments	129
5.1.1. <i>Hōri Seika</i> editorial team’s opinion on the new Codes (English School, postponement faction)	130
5.1.2. Tatsuo Kishimoto’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	132
5.1.3. Hikoroku Morozumi’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	134
5.1.4. <i>Nihon no Hōritsu</i> editorial team’s opinion on morality and law (postponement faction)	136
5.1.5. Sentarō Hirayama’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	137
5.1.6. Kiyohiko Nakamura’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	138
5.1.7. Hideo Itō’s opinion (English School, postponement faction)	140
5.2. The controversy during the Imperial Diet’s first meeting	142
5.3. Summary of the second stage of the Civil Code Controversy	146
 CHAPTER SIX. THE THIRD STAGE OF THE CIVIL CODE CONTROVERSY – ESCALATION AND CONCLUSION	 149
6.1. New publications of the postponement faction – Opinions published in 1891	150
6.1.1. <i>The Jurisprudence News</i> editorial team’s declaration concerning the goals and purposes of founding the journal (postponement faction)	150
6.1.2. Yatsuka Hozumi’s opinion concerning the nature of the Civil Code (German School, postponement faction)	151
6.1.3. Zenjirō Tsuboya’s opinion (English School, postponement party)	152
6.1.4. Y. Hozumi’s opinion on the European pre-Christian family system (German School, postponement faction)	154
6.1.5. Y. Hozumi’s opinion on the harmful effects of the entry into force of the Civil Code (German School, postponement faction)	155
6.2. Decisive faction responses – opinions published in 1891	158
6.2.1. <i>The Association of Constitutionalists Journal</i> editorial team’s article regarding the motives of journalistic activity (decisive faction)	158
6.2.2. Kōsaku Handa’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	159
6.2.3. Kentarō Ōi’s opinion (French School, decisive faction)	161

6.2.4. The opinion of Michito Shirome (French School, decisive faction)	163
6.2.5. Kōzō Miyagi's opinion (French School, decisive faction)	166
6.3. Issues during the Imperial Diet's second meeting and the House of Representatives election in 1891	167
6.4. Postponement faction's opinions in 1892	169
6.4.1. Y. Okuda's opinion on the inaccuracies in Personal Law (English School, postponement faction)	169
6.4.2. K. Takahashi's opinion (English School, postponement faction)	170
6.4.3. T. Hanai's opinion concerning the relation between the Codes and the revision of unequal treaties (English School, postponement faction)	171
6.4.4. <i>The Jurisprudence News</i> editorial team's opinion related to the arguments for postponing the date of entry into force of the Codes (postponement faction)	172
6.5. Decisive faction's opinions in 1892	174
6.5.1. <i>The Meihō Journal</i> editorial team's opinion on the goals of establishing the Meihō Association (decisive faction)	174
6.5.2. G. Boissonade's opinion (decisive faction)	175
6.5.3. Kenjirō Ume's opinion (French School, decisive faction)	176
6.5.4. S. Isobe's opinion (French School, decisive faction)	179
6.5.5. <i>The Journal of Law</i> editorial team's opinion on the position of the Ministry of Justice and the Imperial Diet's third meeting (decisive faction)	180
6.5.6. The Association of Constitutionalists' opinion concerning the arguments for the entry into force of the Codes (decisive faction)	182
6.5.7. The Japanese-French Law School Alumni Association's opinion (decisive faction)	183
6.5.8. <i>The Journal of Law</i> editorial team's opinion on the last determination (decisive faction)	186
6.6. Conclusion of the Civil Code and the Commercial Code Controversy during the Imperial Diet's third meeting	187
6.6.1. Debate in the House of Peers	188
6.6.2. Debate in the House of Representatives	193
6.7. The Cabinet's reaction to the end of the Controversy	196

CHAPTER SEVEN. SUMMARY OF THE CIVIL CODE CONTROVERSY	201
7.1. Objections and responses of both factions during the Civil Code Controversy	201
7.2. Reasons for the postponement faction's victory	208
7.2.1. Impact of legal opinions	208
7.2.2. Influence of the Civil Code's guiding principles	210
7.2.3. Contradiction between Civil Code and Meiji Constitution principles	212
7.2.4. Practical flaws of the Civil Code	213
7.2.5. Weakened political position of the cabinet and the Ministry of Justice	214
7.3. Drafting of the revised Civil Code and completion of the codification	216
CHAPTER EIGHT. CONCLUSIONS	219
ILLUSTRATIONS	223
BIBLIOGRAPHY	243
1. Archive documents	243
1.1. National Archives (Kokuritsu Kōbunshokan)	243
1.2. National Diet Library (Kokuritsu Kokkai Toshokan)	245
2. Legal acts, legal act drafts and treaties	247
3. Cabinet announcements and press	249
4. Records of speeches in the House of Representatives and the House of Peers	250
5. Legal opinions	252
6. Monographs and articles	254
INDEX	265