as highly exaggerated Miller’s claim that han’gul is largely derived from the ‘phags-pa script. He also points out that the Tangut script was so doggedly logographic that it virtually rejected the radical and phonetic principle of character formation to develop its own highly sophisticated, logically structured and calligraphically elegant script. Although Tranter deals at length with exotic scripts and little-known ethnic groups, the Japanese specialist will find in this chapter a great deal of discussion, analysis and methodology to assist a fuller understanding of the evolution of kana in Japan.

Chapter 10 offers a morphosyntactic analysis of the breakdown of the rich tense and aspect system of classical Japanese to the impoverished one of modern Japanese. Goto approaches the topic from within the framework of generative grammar. While Old Japanese had past tense markers, -ki and -keri, the aspectual -tu, -mu, -ri and -tari, modern Japanese has only past tense -ta and a few aspect markers like -te iru. She concludes that the tense/aspect markers have developed from functional verbs to functional affixes and that the disappearance of the rich tense/aspect system can be attributed to: the upward tendency in grammaticalisation of functional structure; the head-parameter of the language in question, i.e. head-final; and the language-specific property, agglutination.

The excellent chapter by Simpson and Wu gives a unified account of the similarities and differences in the grammaticalisation of three similar morphemes in Japanese, Chinese and Korean, no, de and kes. The authors reach the conclusion that the three morphemes show remarkable similarity in their patterning over a range of construction types, which indicates that they should be assigned basically to the same category. There are, however, some important differences that are accounted for by the supposition that these morphemes are at different points on the road to grammaticalisation. The chapter provides a model for the gradual nature of syntactic change and then applies it to the analysis of no, de and kes. The gradual rather than ‘catastrophic instantaneous change’ is supported by the fact that the three morphemes in question exhibit multiple grammaticalisations in certain functional structures.

Although the focus is somewhat diffuse and certain papers will appeal to a limited readership, I strongly recommend this volume to anyone with a serious interest in language change in East Asia.

HUGH CLARKE
University of Sydney

Can the Japanese Change Their Education System?

ROGER GOODMAN and DAVID PHILLIPS (eds)
182 pp., tables, references, notes on contributors

Can the Japanese change their education system? Or should they? If so, why and how? These are the questions shared by many working on Japanese education with a comparative perspective. As always, it is easier to ask questions than to answer them. When the issue is complex enough, one wonders whether posing such questions may be all that is shared by the specialists in the field. Can the Japanese Change Their Education System?, edited by Roger Goodman and David Phillips, shows a glimpse of the complexity, difficulty and relish in coming to grips with education reform in Japan.
The seven chapters span a wide range of topics pertinent to the agenda of reform in the post-war era. There is, for example, some scepticism about the need to reform Japanese education at all, expressed by an authority in the field (Cummings), as well as a lucid and well-digested analysis of the 2002 reform at primary and secondary levels (Cave). The volume also offers an informative account of reform of higher education (Tsuruta); discussion about changes in mathematics teaching (Whitburn); a scholarly analysis of education reform in Japan and Germany under the US military Occupation (Shibata); an expert overview of the current reform as a successful extension of the Nakasone-led reform of the 1980s (Hood); and an analysis of the relationship between Japanese nationalism and English language teaching (Aspinall).

This book is a collection of papers presented at a weekly seminar series organised jointly by the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies and the Department of Educational Studies at the University of Oxford in the early months of 2002. The contents are also available on a subscription basis as issue 12(1) of Oxford Studies in Comparative Education. Due probably to the origin of the book, there is no apparent thematic structure in it. Rather, it presents an interesting ‘discursive specimen’ of what educational reform in contemporary Japan was understood to be by the experts working primarily in English at the dawn of the third education reform since Meiji. As Goodman summarises in his excellent introduction, readers will be intrigued by the lack of consensus among contributors about whether reform is necessary or not, to what extent the reform is actually taking place, and what is driving it. Readers who are looking for an easy guide to the current education reform may find the book slightly confusing.

If they do, it will be because of the nature of education reform and its discourse in general. The definition of some key words of education reform has been notoriously ambiguous and deceptive. Goodman’s discussion of key concepts such as individuality, creativity, internationalism and liberalisation is essential for readers not to be lost in the rhetorical forest of education reform discourse. It is hoped that continuing clarification of key concepts will help minimise confusion over terms and focus better on disagreements about specific facts, thereby enabling researchers to develop further inquiry more effectively.

Readers would also do well to clearly distinguish between perceptions of Japanese education reform and the educational reform per se. The discourse on education reform in Japan may perhaps be likened to the colour of a cuttlefish which changes depending upon the touch of the analysts. In order not to be dazzled by it, a conceptual matrix might come in handy. The x-axis of the matrix should indicate various stages of a specific aspect of the reform, yutori kyōiku (relaxed education), say. Entries listed along the axis should include: (1) historical backgrounds and hidden agendas of policymakers, (2) political rivalry and manipulations, (3) official reform manifested in laws and regulations, (4) methods of implementation, (5) level of acceptance by schools and teachers, and (6) broader impacts on society. The y-axis, on the other hand, should indicate the factors the researcher brings to the analysis, such as: (1) when the analysis was made, (2) the data and information on which it is based, (3) underlying ideological inclinations and theoretical assumptions, (4) disciplinary background, (5) researcher’s familiarity with English and Japanese literature, and (6) the underlying comparative frame of reference.

In that last broader context it is encouraging to see the book published in Oxford Studies in Comparative Education. The field of comparative education has been going through a stage of reappraisal and reorganisation for some time in the face of globalisa-
tion, internationalisation, and commercialisation of education. The challenge arose in relation to the assumptions inherent in using nation-states as the unit of analysis, and the lack of integration of the knowledge and expertise accumulated in area studies (e.g. Japanese Studies). While the nation-state assumption is shared across the chapters included in the book, the fact that the book is co-edited and post-scripted by David Phillips, who is the series editor as well as editor (1983–2003) of the *Oxford Review of Education*, one of the most established journals of education, is significant. It is hoped that greater integration of educational studies in the field of Japanese and other non-Western societies, as well as those of marginalised groups in each, will help broaden the perspective of comparative education, with a view to developing its own theoretical framework further.

**SHOKO YONEYAMA**  
*University of Adelaide*

---

**Unhappy Soldier: Hino Ashihei and Japanese World War II Literature**  
**DAVID M. ROSENFELD**  
Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002  
xi + 161 pp. + bibliography, index  

Hino Ashihei (1907–1960), a prolific writer and prominent literary figure whose work spanned the wartime and post-war period, is probably best known for his wartime depictions of Japanese soldiers’ lives in China, the so-called Soldier Trilogy (*Mugi to heitai* (Wheat and Soldiers, 1938), *Tsuchi to Heitai* (Earth and Soldiers, 1938) and *Hana to heitai* (Flowers and Soldiers, 1939)). Since he was employed as a writer by the Imperial Army, and since (perhaps not surprisingly under the circumstances) his books were sympathetic to both soldiers and the war effort, Hino was purged during the Occupation. At the same time he was stridently condemned by many of his peers as an uncritical mouthpiece of the wartime government. His subsequent war-related work attempted to deal with the ambiguity of his situation, both explaining and attempting to excuse his sympathy towards the wartime soldier at a time when the image of the soldier, as part of the wartime military effort, was tainted by considerations of war guilt.

David Rosenfeld’s study of Hino’s writings on the war is compelling and well worth reading. It provides insightful analyses of Hino’s most famous wartime and post-war works on the war, and traces the evolution, across the perceived divide of 15 August 1945, of the figure of the soldier, a figure with whom Hino strongly and consciously identified, as Rosenfeld illustrates. The book also situates Hino and his works clearly in the context of the debates about guilt and responsibility that divided not only the literary community but also much of Japanese society in the wake of the war.

A central theme for Hino, and thus for Rosenfeld’s analysis, is the figure of the soldier. Hino’s unwavering devotion, well beyond the defeat, to the patriotic, dedicated and loyal ‘simple soldier’ was just as important in rendering Hino suspect, in certain sections of post-war society, as the fact that he had worked for the despised wartime propaganda machine. Although Hino’s soldiers became more complex in his post-war work (as Rosenfeld’s chapter on *Seishun to deinei* (Youth and Mud, 1950) shows especially well), Hino, like many of his contemporaries, grappled with the problem of