Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

CHAPTER 6

CULTURAL TRANSFERS BETWEEN TOKUGAWA JAPAN AND CH'ING CHINA TO 1800

Benjamin A. Elman

After the year 1600 the new Tokugawa leadership in Japan did not acknowledge the Ming government as the leading power in East Asia. Nevertheless the Tokugawa sought to discourage conflict with the Ming authorities and allowed the tally trade (J. *kangō*, Ch. *k'an-ho*) to resume. Earlier the Ming court had issued tallies for trade to representatives of the Japanese Ashikaga regime (1338–1573) as a tributary state. Unhappy with the precedent that the Ashikaga had formally asked for and received recognition as a tributary to the Ming emperor, the Tokugawa shogunate avoided accepting tributary status under the Ming dynasty and then the Ch'ing, which impeded direct trade. In 1715 for the first time the Tokugawa government began to issue its own trade credentials, which were meant to imply Ch'ing subordination to Japan. From then on, to enter Nagasaki harbor, where the shogunate confined overseas trade after 1635, vessels from China formally had to accept Japanese terms in order to receive trading credentials (J. *shinpai*, C. *hsin-p'ai*) from Nagasaki authorities.[1]

One of the chief Tokugawa ministers who played a pivotal role in drafting the 1715 regulations was Arai Hakuseki (1657–1725), a sinophile in the shogun's inner circle who was proud of his ability to write Chinese poetry. He feared that the export of metals through the Nagasaki trade to China was causing shortages that hampered domestic trade and was increasing smuggling. He contended that about 75 percent of the gold and 25 percent of the silver expenditures in Japan were spent on foreign trade. The goal of the new regulations was to restrict the Nagasaki trade in metals, especially copper and silver, to no more than thirty Chinese ships visiting Nagasaki each year. Tokugawa had already tried to place a general ban on exporting silver in 1668, but this ban did not become fully effective until 1763. Arai was also concerned

[1] Kikuchi Yoshimi, "Shōtoku shinrei to Nagasaki bōeki no henshitsu," in *Kinsei taigai kankei shiron*, ed. Nakada Yasunao (Tokyo, 1979), pp. 154–61. My thanks to Martin Heijdra for his corrections and comments.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

about Ch'ing expansionist policies, and he feared that the K'ang-hsi emperor was maneuvering to weaken Japan.

Nagasaki's registered population had dropped from 64,523 in 1696 to 42,553 in 1715, when the new trading regime started.[2] In the eighteenth century, Nagasaki also was home to a Chinatown (Tōkan), which during the peak of the trading season brought some 10,000 Chinese and overseas Chinese traders and seamen to the port. The Tokugawa government forced a decline in the annual number of Chinese ships arriving in Nagasaki over the eighteenth century from seventy to fewer than twenty. In comparison, Dutch ships arriving in Nagasaki during this period declined in annual number from five or six to one or two.[3] Some southern Chinese merchants who did not receive new trading credentials from the Nagasaki officials complained to their home-port authorities. They charged that the Tokugawa era name on the new Japanese trading credentials was treasonous for a tributary state such as Japan. Local officials on the Fukien and Chekiang coast responded by confiscating Nagasaki trade credentials and then reported the matter to Peking. When the Tokugawa government was informed of the dispute by one of the ships that escaped and returned to Nagasaki with its Japanese credentials intact, the Japanese accused the Ch'ing government of ignoring foreign statutes. Cooler heads prevailed, and the dispute blew over. The Tokugawa did not want to antagonize the Ch'ing government any further, and the K'ang-hsi government needed Japanese copper for minting coins as well as silver in the domestic economy.[4]

Pragmatism generally prevailed in eighteenth-century relations between the two countries. The Japanese tallies proved effective in managing the trade with Chinese merchants. As a result, Chinese ships with the proper trade credentials continued to visit Nagasaki throughout the remainder of the Tokugawa era. The Ch'ing state allowed trade with both Japan and Russia (after 1689 in Nerchinsk) to continue outside the tribute system. However, Japanese Buddhist missions to China, which recurred during the eighteenth century, followed earlier tributary protocols. One group of monks from the Enryakuji Temple on Mount Hiei in Kyoto, for instance, prepared diplomatic

[2] Tashiro Kazui, "Foreign relations during the Edo period: *Sakoku* reexamined," trans. Susan Downing Videen, *Journal of Japanese Studies* 8 No. 2 (1982), pp. 283–306.

[3] Ōba Osamu, "Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period (Part one: Forgotten Sino-Japanese contacts)," trans. Joshua A. Fogel, *Sino-Japanese Studies* 8 No. 1 (1995), pp. 40–52; and Marius B. Jansen, *China in the Tokugawa world* (Cambridge, MA, 1992), pp. 5–14.

[4] For the 1715 dispute between Japan and China, see Matsuura Akira, "Kōkitei to Shōtoku shinrei," in *Sakoku Nihon to kokusai kōryū*, ed. Yanai Kenji, Volume 2 (Tokyo, 1988), pp. 29–53. See also Mizuno Norihito, "China in Tokugawa foreign relations: The Tokugawa bakufu's perception of and attitudes toward Ming–Qing China," *Sino-Japanese Studies* 15 (2003), pp. 108–44.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

papers in the fall of 1732 that were filed with Ningpo officials upon their arrival in Chekiang in early winter 1733. The diplomatic papers prepared by the Tendai monks were presented in the name of the "country of Japan" (*Nihon koku*), and the Ch'ing realm was referred to as the "T'ang" (J. *Kara*).[5]

TOKUGAWA ASSESSMENTS OF THE EFFECTS OF THE MANCHU CONQUEST

The Manchu conquest of the Ming empire was of concern to the Japanese authorities. Kumazawa Banzan (1619–91) openly discussed the strategic problems posed by the threat of an imminent Ch'ing invasion of Japan. He was an eccentric samurai best known for his efforts to adapt the teachings of Wang Yang-ming (1472–1529) to Japan at a time when most Tokugawa scholars still tended more toward the Sung learning brought earlier by Ch'an (J. *Zen*) monks associated with the Kamakura (1185–1333) state and the five main Zen temples (J. *Gozandera*). The understanding of Chu Hsi's teachings had been updated by Korean scholars uprooted to Japan during the invasion by Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1536–98). Banzan stressed Japan's lack of preparedness in his 1686 *Daigaku wakumon* (*Questions on the Great learning*). No one took Banzan's approach to classical learning too seriously at first, but the Tokugawa regime shared his fear that the Manchu conquest might spill across the Yellow Sea, just as, 400 years earlier, the Mongol conquest of Korea and attempts to invade Japan had threatened trade between Korea and Hakata.[6]

In 1674, the Tokugawa government pointedly charged Hayashi Gahō, the rector of the newly endowed shogunal college for classical learning in Edo known as the *Senseiden* (Hall of Earlier Sages), with assessing the threat posed to Japan by the Manchu conquest. Gahō's father, Hayashi Razan (1583–1657), was one of the leading Confucian scholars in early Tokugawa and had founded a private college in 1630. Under the Ashikaga regime, such policy assignments would have been given to Buddhist monks in the major Zen temples in Kamakura or Kyoto because the monks were able to read and document difficult classical Chinese sources. For much of the sixteenth century, Confucian learning, particularly Chu Hsi's teachings, had been their prerogative. Buddhist spirituality and Chinese classical learning went hand in hand. The rulers of the Ashikaga government had relied on Buddhist

[5] See Denkyō taishi nyū Tōchō, manuscript memorandum, 1773, Hieizan Kokuhōden, Kyoto.

[6] Ian James McMullen, "Kumazawa Banzan and 'Jitsugaku': Toward pragmatic action," in *Principle and practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and practical learning*, ed. William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (New York, 1979), pp. 337–71. See also Abe Yoshio, "The characteristics of Japanese Confucianism," *Acta Asiatica* 25 (1973), pp. 1–21.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

clerics, as masters of classical Chinese in an era of warrior dominance on the battlefield and aristocratic pre-eminence in cultural affairs, for their official interactions with the Ming dynasty. During the widespread destruction of the Ōnin War from 1466 to 1477, however, Zen monks began to lose their influence, when major temples in Kyoto were burned to the ground and their monks dispersed.[7]

Hayashi Razan and Hayashi Gahō represented a new constellation in Tokugawa state and society: classical scholars (J. *jusha*, "Confucians") who were commoners (J. *heimin*), not samurai. Like Razan, many of their families were originally from Buddhist ranks, but after the pummeling Buddhism took in the sixteenth-century wars, they had turned to the teachings associated with Confucius for their new calling. Their skill in reading and writing classical Chinese led the Tokugawa shogunate to rely on them rather than on Buddhist clerics to learn about the tumultuous events in China.[8] Hayashi Gahō compiled an account of current events in China that he called *Ka i hentai* (*Reversal of civilized and barbarian*). In the preface, Hayashi described China's transformation from "civilized" (J. *ka*) to "barbarian" (J. *i*) because of the Manchu conquest. The fall of the Ming dynasty suggested to Hayashi and others that East Asian cultural superiority had passed to Japan, despite its earlier failures to conquer Korea and Ming under Toyotomi Hideyoshi.[9]

Arrested briefly because he had publicly rejected the Ch'eng–Chu orthodoxy, the troublesome samurai-scholar Yamaga Sokō (1622–85) also argued that the Manchu conquest proved Japan's superiority over China. He contrasted Japan, whose military had always repelled foreign conquests, with China's repeated subjugation by barbarians. The Manchus were simply the latest in a long line of outsiders ruling in China. Japanese beliefs in its unbroken imperial lineage and its divine origin also evidenced their country's superiority. As Yamaga put it, "Our ruling dynasty (*honchō*) is descended from [the sun goddess] Amaterasu, and its lineage has remained intact from the time of the deities until today."[10]

Asami Keisai (1652–1711), who was Yamaga Sokō's contemporary and a follower of Yamazaki Ansai's (1618–82) Kimon school of thought that

[7] Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen monastic institution in medieval Japan* (Cambridge, MA, 1981); and David Pollack, *The fracture of meaning: Japan's synthesis of China from the eighth through the eighteenth centuries* (Princeton, 1986), p. 189. Compare Willem Jan Boot, "The adoption and adaptation of Neo-Confucianism in Japan: The role of Fujiwara Seika and Hayashi Razan," D. Lit. University of Leiden, 1983, pp. 83–5. Boot stresses the continuity between Ashikaga Buddho-Confucians and Tokugawa classicists in the rise of Chu Hsi learning in Japan.

[8] Imanaka Kanshi, *Kinsei Nihon seiji shisō no seiritsu: Seikagaku to Razangaku* (Tokyo, 1972).

[9] Mizuno, "China in Tokugawa foreign relations," pp. 136–7.

[10] Yamaga Sokō, "Haisho zanpitsu," in *Yamaga Sokō*, ed. Maruyama Masao et al. (Tokyo, 1970), p. 333.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

combined Shintō and Confucianism, shared some of Sokō's views on China. Asami prepared his account of China for lectures given in 1688 and 1689, which he conveyed in letters to his colleague Satō Naokata in 1700–1. In a short piece with the title *Chūgoku ben* (*Disputations on the Central Realm*), Asami denied China's centrality. He argued that the new geography of the Earth as a sphere or globe described by Europeans revealed that China's claims to be at the center of the world were spurious. He also noted that barbarian areas had been integral parts of the Chou order thousands of years earlier. Shun was a barbarian, for example, who had achieved sagehood and ruled over all under Heaven. Satō Naokata, also a follower of the Kimon school, took a more radical position than either Asami or Yamazaki Ansai. In his 1706 *Chūgoku ronshū* (*Collected arguments about the Central Realm*), Naokata held that both the Chinese classics and the Shintō classics could not be true. Neither the Chinese nor the Japanese imperial line was pure and unbroken, and neither the Japanese nor the Chinese emperor was divine. Thus, for Naokata, neither Japan nor China was the "Middle Kingdom."[11] Yamazaki Ansai sided with Asami in this debate.

The Kimon school's Confucian–Shintō syncretism linked Chu Hsi learning to Japanese nativism. Neither Yamazaki Ansai nor his immediate followers clearly envisioned the concept of a sacred polity (J. *kokutai*), but when Ansai's teachings were later combined with the Mito school's focus on Japanese history and Japanese nativism in the nineteenth century, an unbroken genealogy upholding Japanese national essence emerged in Meiji times. It was not yet explicitly there in the eighteenth century, when "Chinese learning" was dominant in Japanese elite society.[12]

For some writers, Japan was now the "Second China"; that is, Japan had succeeded the Ming empire as the center of civilization. The Tokugawa state dared not express, much less act on, such pretensions. The ill-fated Hideyoshi invasions of Korea in the 1590s still weighed heavily on the shogunate. Given the dangers the Manchus posed to Japan after their invasions of Korea in 1627 and 1637 and their takeover of Peking in 1644, a direct confrontation between the Tokugawa and the new Ch'ing regime was possible. Ming loyalists who had fled to Japan, such as Chu Shun-shui (1600–82), had called on the Tokugawa to aid the Southern Ming resistance. The Manchu leadership showed little

[11] Asami Keisai, "Chūgoku ben," in *Yamazaki Ansai gakuha*, ed. Maruyama Masao et al. (Tokyo, 1980), pp. 416–17. See the translation in William Theodore de Bary et al., eds., *Sources of Japanese tradition*, Volume 2, 2nd ed. (New York, 2005), pp. 91–4. See also Satō Naokata, "Chūgoku ronshū," in *Yamazaki Ansai gakuha*, ed. Maruyama Masao et al. (Tokyo, 1980), pp. 420–5. See the translation in de Bary et al., eds., *Sources of Japanese tradition*, Volume 2, pp. 96–8.

[12] Koyasu Nobukuni, *Edo shisōshi kōgi* (Tokyo, 1998), p. 75.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

interest in Japan, however, as long as Korea posed no threat to their Manchu homelands. They also had their hands full dealing with the rebellion of the Three Feudatories in the 1670s and then with the Russians along the border of their northeastern homelands in the 1680s. Meanwhile, the Tokugawa government showed no interest in officially establishing formal tributary, diplomatic, or commercial relations with the Ch'ing dynasty.[13]

The Tokugawa regime also refused to acknowledge that Chosŏn Korea was a kingdom within a Ch'ing tributary system. It wanted to establish Korea as its own tributary. This produced a miniature tributary system centered on Edo in which the Korean court sent what it thought were diplomatic missions to Edo; there was no return Japanese embassy to Seoul because the Tokugawa authorities regarded them as tributary missions. Altogether, Korea sent twelve official embassies to Edo, making it the only foreign country, in addition to the Ryukyus, to maintain state-to-state relations with Japan until the 19th century. The Ryukyu Islands officially sent fifteen tribute embassies to Japan between 1634 and 1806, although many Japanese considered the Ryukyu leader to be a dependent of Kagoshima in the outer domain known as Satsuma.[14]

In the seventeenth century, the view of the Ming empire as civilized and Japan as barbaric shifted to the claim that became common in Japanese writings under Tokugawa leadership: Japan had surpassed the Ch'ing dynasty in cultural standing. But no one went beyond the limited cultural claims that Yamaga Sokō and later the arch-nativist Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801) would make. Norinaga spent his days making a living by practicing traditional Chinese medicine (then called *kanpō*, "Han prescriptions"), which allowed him the leisure to attack Chinese learning in his evening lectures that promoted so-called Japanese nativist thinking.[15] As Yamaga Sokō was stressing Chinese classical language and ritual as the civilizing criteria for Japan, the only criteria he could have Japan adopt in order to claim superiority would be Chinese classical models. If Tokugawa were to be the "Second China," then its scholars would have to prove that they had mastered ancient classical learning and had become more Confucian than scholars under the Ch'ing dynasty. There was no alternative. Despite the inroads being made by Dutch learning,

[13] See also Kim Seonmin (Kim Sŏn-min), "Ginseng and border trespassing between Qing China and Chosŏn Korea," *Late Imperial China* 28 No. 1 (2007), pp. 33–61; and Yamamoto Hirofumi, *Kan'ei jidai* [Shinsōban] (1989; Tokyo, 1996), pp. 233–4.

[14] Jurgis Elisonas [George Elison], "The inseparable trinity: Japan's relations with China and Korea," in *The Cambridge history of Japan*, Volume 4: *Early modern Japan*, ed. John W. Hall and James L. McClain (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 235–300.

[15] Motoori Norinaga, *Motoori Norinaga zenshū*, ed. Ōno Susumu, Volume 18 (Tokyo, 1968–1993), p. 405.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

through the eighteenth century there were as yet no well-articulated Western statecraft models that Japanese scholars would take seriously.[16]

CHINESE LEARNING AND TOKUGAWA SOCIETY

By the late eighteenth century, Japanese scholars interested in studies involving *kanbun* (Han writing) were adapting the philological research techniques practiced by Ch'ing literati because mastering classical Chinese had become an essential scholarly tool among newly interested Japanese elites. In some instances the transmission of these new techniques occurred by way of Korea, where scholars had more frequent contact with the Ch'ing capital through the tribute missions sent to Peking. More often it occurred when eighteenth-century Tokugawa scholars received copies via Nagasaki of the most recent books on classical studies published in the Ch'ing empire. The process was slow and cumulative.

The commercial and tributary exchanges that transmitted books with new knowledge between China, Japan, and Korea in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries promoted the gradual emergence of an East Asian community of textual scholars who specialized in empirical research and philological studies of Confucian and medical classics, and texts of other kinds as well. Among the important commodities in the two-way trade at Nagasaki after the 1680s were recent Jesuit translations of Western scientific and medical books published in Chinese, which Japanese scholars and shogunal officials desired, and copies of rare classical texts long since lost in China but now made available in Japan, which Chinese traders with scholarly interests sought.[17] Some of the merchants were civil examination failures who maintained a commercial interest in classics as well as in silver and copper.

Japan imported many Chinese translations of European books on science that contained the new Chinese terminology for Sino-Western mathematics, particularly after 1720, when the shogunate relaxed its prohibition of all books related to Christianity. Many of the books had been translated in China after the Tokugawa authorities expelled the Jesuits in the 1630s, and thus were unknown in Japan. Unlike the Chinese translations of European books, which were circulated in Japan, Tokugawa authorities kept secret their sponsored translations of Dutch learning from the second half of the seventeenth century on.

[16] Bob Tadashi Wakabayashi, *Anti-foreignism and Western learning in early-modern Japan: The new theses of 1825* (Cambridge, MA, 1986), pp. 28–9.

[17] Ōba Osamu, *Edo jidai ni okeru Chūgoku bunka juyō no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1984). See also Eiko Ikegami, *The taming of the samurai: Honorific individualism and the making of modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA, 1995).

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

While these international transfers were taking place, Tokugawa society between 1600 and 1800 was transformed from being dominated by a hereditary military elite (samurai) and an imperial aristocracy to being a commercialized society that increasingly empowered merchants (J. *chōnin*) and commoners. One of these social changes was the rise of a restricted group of men of letters (*bunjin*) who identified with the Confucian classical tradition. In Ming and Ch'ing society the literatus could be a scholar, painter, or doctor, a model emulated in Tokugawa. Buddhist scholarship and Japanese classical literature still had strong followings among monks and Kyoto aristocrats, but secular scholars followed a growing avenue for social circulation in the new Tokugawa age of political stability and bureaucratic rationalization based on Chinese classical learning and statecraft.[18]

Early in the Tokugawa period, scholars did not identify themselves primarily as classical teachers or men of letters, but they began to recognize the uses of literacy in classical Chinese in the new age. Some had been Buddhist monks: Fujiwara Seika (1561–1619), Hayashi Razan, Yamazaki Ansai; others were former samurai, such as Nakai Tōju (1608–48), or masterless samurai, such as Kumazawa Banzan; some were practitioners of medicine or the military arts, or the sons of such men: Nagoya Gen'i (1628–96), Hayashi Razan, Yamaga Sokō, Asami Keisai, Ogyū Sorai (1666–1728); some were townsmen, such as Itō Jinsai (1627–1705). These men were still marginal figures in early Tokugawa society, but they were the nucleus of a new, slowly forming cultural elite.[19]

Thousands of Japanese teachers, doctors, and students learned Chinese during the Tokugawa period.[20] The trend began slowly in the seventeenth century, as it became clear that Buddhist clergy had lost their secular functions as advisers in foreign and civil affairs, and peaked in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Many in the Tokugawa educational market were samurai, merchants, physicians, or commoners who were literate in Chinese writing. Many Japanese men began making a living as teachers in a private, merchant, or public school. For instance, Itō Jinsai, a commoner, and Yamazaki Ansai, who began as a Buddhist monk, competed for students by establishing

[18] Nakamura Kyūshirō, "Kōshōgaku gaisetsu," in *Kinsei Nihon no jugaku*, comp. Tokugawa-kō Keishū Shichijūnen Shukuga Kinenkai (Tokyo, 1941), pp. 701–29.

[19] Kurozumi Makoto, "The nature of early Tokugawa Confucianism," trans. Herman Ooms, *Journal of Japanese Studies* 20 No. 2 (1994), pp. 340–1; and Kate W. Nakai, "The naturalization of Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan: The problem of sinocentrism," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 40 No. 1 (1980), pp. 157–99.

[20] See Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of language: The grammarian and society in late antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988). On the sociology of classical learning in China, see Benjamin A. Elman, *From philosophy to philology: Intellectual and social aspects of change in late imperial China*, 2nd rev. ed. (Los Angeles, 2001).

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

their Confucian schools directly across from each other on the banks of the Horikawa River in the center of Kyoto. In 1662 Jinsai established his academy, named *Kogidō* ("Way of Ancient Meanings"), with the help of his son Itō Tōgai (1670–1736). Over a period of forty-five years it attracted 3,000 students (as had Confucius, supposedly) to study the Chinese classics. The Taki family, on the other hand, established a private school of medicine called the *Seijukan* in 1765 in their home in Edo. After the Tokugawa shogunate in 1791 made it the government's official medical school (*igakkan*) for the new *kanpō* traditions of Chinese medicine, members of the Taki family occupied the top teaching posts until the middle of the nineteenth century. Their commentaries on the Chinese medical classics were among the most sound in East Asia in their time, and still circulate in China today.[21]

The *kanbun* teacher's authority emerged from his mastery of the Japanese techniques for reading and writing the classical Chinese language, which he was able to introduce to students. They learned the texts by following a series of practical instructions. This process began by parsing *kanbun* into its constituent parts: types of written characters (J. *moji*), correct phrases and sentences (J. *chōku*), and forms of composition (J. *bunri*). Like his Chinese counterparts, the Japanese grammarian became a preserver and transmitter of the classical language as the repository of articulate utterance in high culture by marking correct punctuation and readings via *kundoku* (marked guides to reading), incorporating voicing marks, and adding interlinear glosses for *kanbun* particles known as *joji* ("connectives," e.g. postpositions, endings), *jitsuji* ("concrete" characters, e.g. names of things), and *kyoji* ("insubstantials", e.g. adjectives and verbs).[22]

The top teachers transmitted traditional readings of the Five Classics. Lesser, more technical teachers taught the medical classics and the mathematical classics along with the highly developed techniques of *wasan* (Japanese mathematics).[23] Unlike in China, mastery of classical texts was not tested for advancement into the civil service, but the leading classical teachers prospered by serving merit-sensitive commoners and merchants who lacked the

[21] Kosoto Hiroshi, *Kanpō no rekishi: Chūgoku, Nihon no dentō igaku* (Tokyo, 1999), pp. 162–7; and Samuel H. Yamashita, "The early life and thought of Itō Jinsai," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43 No. 2 (1983), pp. 455–7. See also Peter Kornicki, *The book in Japan: A cultural history from the beginnings to the nineteenth century* (1998; Honolulu, 2001), p. 152.

[22] See Yoshikawa Kōjirō et al., eds., *Kango bunten sōsho* (Tokyo, 1979). These grammatical divisions derived from Sung–Ming classical scholarship.

[23] See Annick Horiuchi, *Les mathématiques japonaises à l'époque d'Edo (1600–1868): Une étude des travaux de Seki Takakazu (?–1708) et de Takebe Katahiro (1664–1739)* (Paris, 1994); and Mark Ravina, "*Wasan* and the physics that wasn't: Mathematics in the Tokugawa period," *Monumenta Nipponica* 48 No. 2 (1993), pp. 205–24.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

status of high birth. As some commoners rose in social standing because of their classical literacy, some landless samurai fell into poverty and disrepute because hereditary obligations and employment prohibitions gradually submerged them in debt. Many samurai, recognizing that success required literacy more than martial arts, turned to studying in order to become scholars or doctors.[24]

Like his Chinese counterpart, the classicist's membership in the elite in Japan depended on his schooling in classical, medical, and literary texts. Motoori Norinaga, for example, studied medicine in Kyoto from 1753 to 1756 under Confucian teachers who were followers of the Sung–Chin–Yüan traditions of medicine. Norinaga also read works by those who sought to revive ancient Chinese medical practices lost since antiquity. As Japanese mastered the rules governing phonology, morphology, syntax, and diction, their *kanbun* expertise qualified them as members of a civilized society that could compete culturally with China.[25]

The ancient sages of culture and medicine now spoke directly to Japanese readers through the classics, and many listened. Words were the entry to a world of formalism and pedantry, rules and categories, and lexical discussions. The classicist's command of a few classical texts saved him from the base occupations of the unlearned. Weighing individual words, phrases, and verses allowed him and his students the possibility to write their way to fame and fortune, or at least to teach and write for others. Because knowledge of classical Chinese became a prestigious form of writing and speech in the eighteenth century, it also appealed to the Tokugawa lords who wanted a literate bureaucracy to help administer their domains.[26]

The classicist's instruction was embedded in a social system where wealth, distinction, and eloquence differentiated elites from those who were mainly poor, anonymous, and illiterate. Those without classical educations were now more noticeable; before, only Buddhist clergy had been the masters of Chinese language. Confucians now provided the language and values through which

[24] On economic changes, see John W. Hall, *Tanuma Okitsugu, 1719–1788, forerunner of modern Japan* (Cambridge, MA, 1955); and Constantine N. Vaporis, "Samurai and merchant in mid-Tokugawa Japan: Tani Tannai's *Record of daily necessities*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 60 No. 1 (2000), pp. 205–7. On civil examinations in China, see Benjamin A. Elman, "Political, social, and cultural reproduction via civil service examinations in late imperial China," *Journal of Asian Studies* 50 No. 1 (1991), pp. 7–28. On physicians in Japan, see Ann B. Jannetta, *The vaccinators: Smallpox, medical knowledge, and the "opening" of Japan* (Stanford, 2007), pp. 103–4.

[25] On Norinaga's knowledge of *kanpō*, see Motoori Norinaga Kinenkan, ed., *Motoori Norinaga jiten* (Tokyo, 2001), pp. 198–200.

[26] See Herman Ooms and Peter Kornicki, *Tokugawa village practice: Class, status, power, law* (Berkeley, 1996).

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

a changing social and political elite recognized its own aspiring members. The former governing elites of aristocratic courtiers and samurai now shared elite status with commoners with classical educations. Classical literacy (*bun*) signaled enhanced social status. Classical studies provided a modest level of upward social circulation, particularly via access to urban networks of patronage.[27]

As in China since the Sung period, widespread classical literacy and print culture grew in tandem in Tokugawa Japan. The value of classical literacy amidst the pervasive illiteracy of early Tokugawa society made grammar the first step for upwardly mobile students who were drawn to literary culture (*bunka*). In turn, the social and cultural elite valued the classical teacher and hired him to train their young. By opening their own schools and preparing their own textbooks, classical teachers became the agents of cultural transmission and of the civilizing process. Because grammar was the second stage after memorization in a classical education, students had to master many technical rules. Since the grammarian controlled access to the classical language, his profession was embedded in the shared life of the elite. Command of *kanbun* was a useful measure of classical success because it worked so well, unlike the "vulgar" vernacular language of the marketplace. Grammarians taught the forms of classical, medical, and literary analysis and conceptual categories inherited from the past in China and now reproduced in Japan. Some even taught vernacular Chinese for those seeking to read Ming and Ch'ing novels.[28]

Unlike aristocrats and samurai who received stipends, teachers depended on fees and salaries. Physicians could earn livings and even amass wealth by applying their linguistic training in reading Chinese medical texts to a classically informed clinical practice. Although doctors had no hereditary place, beginning in the Tokugawa they were creating new roles for themselves. The stigma of the teaching profession was the need to earn a living in a world of haughty Kyoto and Edo elites. Teachers depended on class size and their students' ability to pay. The professional teacher might draw additional income from his family property, as a landlord, or via his medical practice, among many other options. The renowned sinophobe Motoori Norinaga, for instance, mastered *kanbun* well enough to practice Chinese medicine professionally. The best classicists, such as Ogyū Sorai, received government salaries as retainers

[27] See Eiko Ikegami, *Bonds of civility: Aesthetic networks and the political origins of Japanese culture* (Cambridge, 2005).

[28] Emanuel Pastreich, "An alien vernacular: Okajima Kanzan's popularization of the Chinese vernacular novel in eighteenth-century Japan," *Sino-Japanese Studies* 11 No. 2 (1999), pp. 39–49.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

attached to daimyo schools and private incomes as teachers in their own schools. Grammarians were not especially mobile. They were usually limited to Kyoto, Edo, and other regional centers where there were more students. Tokugawa aristocrats still controlled the classicists' appointment or removal as officials, despite the newly found status of men with learning.[29]

In addition, scholars could augment their teaching by preparing textbooks for the growing Tokugawa publishing world. Publishers, especially in Edo, Osaka, and Kyoto, welcomed books that focused on teaching Chinese literary grammar for reading and writing *kanbun*, and they publicized them widely in their advertisements. There were many autodidacts who studied a modicum of Chinese this way and by visiting lending libraries (J. *kashi honya*), some 600 in Edo alone by the year 1800.[30] Minagawa Kien (1734–1807) in Kyoto and Yamamoto Hokuzan (1752–1812) in Edo were particularly prolific in this regard. Minagawa was a model man of letters (*bunjin*) in the ancient capital. He became a leader there in defining the role of Chinese learning and the scope of "sinology" (J. *kangaku*). Besides his learned tomes, he also published a 1798 handbook for learning to read and write *kanbun* entitled *Shūbun roku* (*Record of practicing classical literacy*), and a number of textbooks in Kyoto on language particles and auxiliary connectives that bookstores sold throughout Japan. Minagawa also prepared the 1774 primer/lexicon entitled *I an ruigo* (*Words classified for medical cases*). Yamamoto Hokuzan published a reading and writing primer in Edo *c.*1818 entitled *Sakubun ritsu* (*Rules for writing*).[31]

In the Tokugawa period, the urban or village grammarian depended on his public reputation because there was no civil service examination degree to confirm his expertise for decoding a classical Chinese text into *kanbun*. This was one reason why the Tokugawa classicist was so different from his Ch'ing counterpart. In learning to prepare polished writing, Japanese students were still exposed to the scriptures of earlier religious masters and Chinese classical texts by their secular teachers. The linguistic mixture of religious scriptures and classical texts begun by Buddho-Confucian teachers in the Kamakura and Muromachi periods was by Tokugawa times further enriched with the *kanbun* stock in trade of more secular Confucian grammarians, teachers, and classicists, who disdained Buddhism and Shintō as their chief competitors.

[29] Marleen Kassel, *Tokugawa Confucian education: The Kangien Academy of Hirose Tansō (1782–1856)* (Albany, 1996).

[30] Peter Kornicki, "The publisher's go-between: Kashihonya in the Meiji period," *Modern Asian Studies* 14 No. 2 (1980), pp. 331–44.

[31] More work needs be done to reconstruct the grammar and linguistic registers of the Chinese language that these pioneering Japanese *kanbun* textbooks presented.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

Teachers of *kanbun* had a considerable range in their social origins and their success. They were subordinate to patrons who sent them their sons as students. They enjoyed middling respectability among urbanized elites, particularly aristocrats in Kyoto and samurai officials in Edo and in the various Tokugawa domains. As teachers they had some chance for professional, social, and geographic mobility within their domains and within the shogunal government, but with no access to the highest positions held by the military and imperial court aristocrats. Some became primary consultants in their domains. From samurai, commoner, and medical backgrounds, they were among the respectable classes in the growing cities. (Edo grew to over one million inhabitants early in the Tokugawa period.) Despite their skills and accrued respect, teachers remained closer to the bottom than to the top of the social pyramid. Their status origins remained a handicap, compared to the cultural prestige that a small number of commoners achieved by succeeding in the civil examinations in Ming and Ch'ing times.[32]

How to teach classical Chinese became a matter of dispute in the eighteenth century. Most *kanbun* teachers typically punctuated a Chinese text using *kundoku* markings according to Japanese word order, in which Japanese verbs come at the end of a sentence. Ogyū Sorai objected to this method and preferred to teach his students to speak Chinese and read and write directly in classical Chinese, although when he moved to Edo and opened a school there in 1711, Sorai had called it the *Yakusha* ("Translation Society"). One of Sorai's disciples, Dazai Shundai (1680–1747), also wrote critically of the schooling and the textbooks used for teaching Chinese as *kanbun* in Japan. He upheld Sorai's opinion that students should learn to read and write Chinese in Chinese word order and not transpose the Chinese characters into Japanese word order and pronunciation. The prestigious Edo publisher Suharaya Shinbē released Dazai's *Wadoku yōryō* (*Essentials of Japanese readings of Chinese*) in 1728. In vain, however, Dazai complained that when Japanese read Chinese in Japanese word order, they were no longer reading Chinese. He noted the history of how Chinese was taught in Japan, and concluded that in order to master classical Chinese, Japanese would have to understand the Chinese word order. Otherwise, they would never understand the correct meaning. He, like Sorai, advocated getting rid of the Japanese ways of reading Chinese.[33]

[32] Compare Benjamin A. Elman, "The social roles of literati in early to mid-Ch'ing," in *The Cambridge history of China*, Volume 9, Part 1: *The Ch'ing empire to 1800*, ed. Willard J. Peterson (New York, 2002), pp. 360–427.

[33] Emanuel Pastreich, "Grappling with Chinese writing as a material language: Ogyū Sorai's *Yakubunsentei*," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 61 No. 1 (2001), pp. 119–70. See Dazai Shundai, *Wadoku yōryō* (Edo, 1728) A.1a–b. Compare John Timothy Wixted, "*Kanbun*, histories of Japanese literature, and japanologists," *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10 No. 2 (1998), pp. 23–31.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

Not accepting Sorai's and Dazai's radical pedagogy for learning Chinese, most classical scholars in Japan had profitable careers as grammarians who taught literary style using the conveniently marked *kundoku* readings. Their more traditional textbooks established a basic grammar and sentence structure that enabled students in the eighteenth century to master Chinese classical syntax, even if they mentally transposed sentences into Japanese word order. What attracted the shogunate and daimyo leadership to such classical teachers, in addition to advancing their own careers, was that Chinese classical learning affirmed the virtues the leaders wanted to inculcate. The grammarians affirmed the linguistic and ethical status quo for employers who preferred it. Change, or novelty, for which Sorai and Dazai became famous even though they were not pedagogically successful, was an unintended by-product of learning to read and write. Classical learning became the guide to the right choices. Moral values and Sino-Japanese classical literacy, undergirded further by the legal code, upheld each other.

Chinese learning had the upper hand in Japanese literate society for much of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but tensions between sinophiles and sinophobes were clearly building in mid-Tokugawa. This dispute had its roots in Shintō, but only after Confucian classical learning from China had superseded Buddhism in Japan in the seventeenth century did the challenge from Shintō defenders begin to leave its mark on Japanese Confucians in the eighteenth century. As late as the 1820s sinophiles such as Ōta Kinjō (1765–1825) could still voice their admiration for Chinese learning and even for the Ch'ing regime that had conquered all of the former Ming empire by the 1680s.[34]

The admiration for Chinese learning in Japan before 1800 produced fears that Japanese native learning was imperiled. Motoori Norinaga, a student of the Chinese classics as a youth and a practitioner of traditional Chinese medicine as an adult, in 1771 at the age of forty-two voiced his intense opposition to Chinese civilization in his *Naobi no mitama* (*Rectifying spirit*), which introduced his life's work, the *Kojiki den* (*Commentary on the Record of ancient matters*). Like many other commoners and townsmen, Norinaga had turned from his family's business to Chinese medicine as a way to raise his status and support his scholarly interests. Subsequently he was disdainful of both aristocrats and sinicized Japanese for their pretensions.[35] The intensity of Norinaga's attack on Confucian learning and the Chinese language makes

[34] Benjamin A. Elman, "Sinophiles and sinophobes in Tokugawa Japan: Politics, classicism, and medicine during the eighteenth century," *East Asian Science, Technology and Society: An International Journal* 2 No. 1 (2008), pp. 102–3.

[35] Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga: Three classical philologists of mid-Tokugawa Japan*, trans. Kikuchi Yūji (Tokyo, 1983), pp. 40, 283, 288 n. 73. On Norinaga's training in the Chinese classics, see

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

little sense unless it is seen as a reaction to the boom in Chinese studies in Edo, Osaka, and Kyoto in the eighteenth century. A sinophobe, Norinaga especially rebuked Japanese Confucians who denigrated Japan. The sinophile Dazai Shundai had attacked the ancient custom in Japan of marriage between half-brother and half-sister as violating the Confucian taboo on incest between those of the same surname. From Dazai's point of view, the Confucian classics could be used to civilize the Japanese. Norinaga, on the other hand, painted an image of Ogyū Sorai as an "eastern barbarian" (J. *tōi*) of his time because he worshipped Chinese civilization over Japan's. The recognition of Japan's special place as a sacred community had been subverted by China's Way, which according to Norinaga had deceived the people of Japan.[36]

Classical teachers such as Ogyū Sorai and Dazai Shundai commanded large student audiences as sinophiles who extolled the ancient Chinese language, unlike nativists such as Motoori Norinaga, who as a sinophobe appealed instead to ancient Japanese as the ideal spoken language. However, sinophiles and sinophobes were not always enemies. Each side represented a hybrid with contradictions. Norinaga was an accomplished reader and writer of the Chinese language that he abhorred. For Sorai, the Tokugawa's less bureaucratic, decentralized system was more akin to the time of the ancient sage kings in China, and thus it would be easier, he thought, for Japan rather than China to return to the Ancient Way. Sorai saw himself in Japan as a true heir of the Way, which he thought the Ch'ing had lost. He also studied ancient Chinese music, which he thought China had carelessly lost and now survived only in Japan.[37]

Tokugawa Confucians Japanized the Way of the Chinese sages by detaching Confucianism from China. This tactic allowed them to claim special status as being civilized. Itō Jinsai adopted this approach to affirm the superiority of Confucian values in Japan over current practice in Ch'ing. He believed that Japan could maintain the values and ideals that China had betrayed, thus impugning the Chinese as barbarians for straying from the classics. Jinsai also stressed the continuity of Japanese rulership in contrast to China's frequent dynastic changes. This approach meant they were still judging Japan by Chinese categories and standards. Both Itō Jinsai and Ogyū Sorai as teachers

Shigeru Matsumoto, *Motoori Norinaga, 1730–1801* (Cambridge, MA, 1970), pp. 30–1. See also Motoori Norinaga Kinenkan, *Motoori Norinaga jiten*, pp. 198–200.

36 Wakabayashi, *Anti-foreignism and Western learning in early-modern Japan*, p. 35. See also Najita Tetsuo, "History and nature in eighteenth-century Tokugawa thought," in *The Cambridge history of Japan*, Volume 4: *Early modern Japan*, ed. John W. Hall and James L. McClain (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 619–20.

37 On Sorai, see Yoshikawa, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 87, 198, 201–5. See also Ōba Osamu, "Ogyū Hokkei, Sorai to Rakusho kōetsu," *Tōhō gaku* 91 (1996), pp. 90–105.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

and classical scholars had internalized their sinophilism – that is, "Japanized it" – and used it as criticism against China.[38]

APPROPRIATION OF MING–CH'ING LAW AND THE "SACRED EDICT"

The shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune (1684–1751; r. 1716–45) nurtured a new jurisprudence (*ritsuryō no gaku*) based on eclectic borrowings from the Ming and Ch'ing legal codes, which were then adapted by the central authorities in Edo and the autonomous domains of the daimyo. One famous eighteenth-century legal case dealt with the conflict between the duties to be filial to one's father and loyal to one's husband when a wife reported that her father had murdered her husband. Arai Hakuseki, the Tokugawa chief minister until 1716, recommended exonerating the daughter. He cited several Chinese precedents that a wife's loyalty to her husband was comparable to the duty of an official's loyalty to his ruler and thus trumped filial obligation to the father in this case. Serving the shogun, Muro Kyūsō (1658–1734) also argued for the daughter's exoneration.[39] Hayashi Nobuatsu (1644–1732), the head of the now officially patronized Hayashi family academy, staunchly opposed their arguments. A devoted Sung learning moralist who championed the teachings of Chu Hsi, Nobuatsu argued for the primacy of filial obligation toward the father. He was overruled by the more powerful Hakuseki. Under the Ming and Ch'ing codes, the wife would have been found guiltless. For some, however, the case was an example of the excessive Confucianization and bureaucratization of the Tokugawa regime. The solution was distinctly Japanese, in that the authorities allowed the woman to enter a Buddhist convent. Despite this compromise, it was clear to contemporaries that criminal law in Japan was moving from harsh military discipline to a softened, civilian system of penalties. Sinophiles such as Arai Hakuseki were predominant, but sinophobia was apparent even among those accomplished in Chinese studies, like Confucian gadfly Ikai Keisho (1761–1845).[40]

In 1723, Ogyū Sorai's younger brother, Ogyū Hokkei (1669–1754), then serving as court physician for the shogun Yoshimune, completed a

[38] Wakabayashi, *Anti-foreignism and Western learning in early-modern Japan*, pp. 22–7.

[39] Ōba Osamu, "Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period (Part six: A profile of the unruly Shōgun Yoshimune)," trans. Joshua A. Fogel, *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10 No. 2 (1998), pp. 43–59. See also Dan F. Henderson, "Chinese influences on eighteenth-century Tokugawa codes," in *Essays on China's legal tradition*, ed. Jerome Alan Cohen, R. Randle Edwards, and Fu-mei Chang Chen (Princeton, 1980), pp. 270–301.

[40] Henderson, "Chinese influences on eighteenth-century Tokugawa codes," pp. 273–4.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

comprehensive legal commentary. Using *kunten* (punctuation marks) readings for the Ming code (*Ta Ming lü*), he prepared a more accurate version than found in the 1720 translation, *Dai Mei ritsurei yakugi* (*Translation of the Great Ming code*), prepared by Takase Kiboku (1668–1749). Sorai also prepared a punctuated edition of the Ming penal code for Yoshimune.[41] Yoshimune ordered the distribution of a Ming–Ch'ing composite text known as the *Liu yü yen-i* (*Amplifications of the Six admonitions*, J. *Rikuyu engi*), based on the "Six Admonitions" that had been issued by Ming T'ai-tsu (r. 1368–98) and reissued by Ch'ing emperors to educate and civilize their subjects. A 1652 version of what is known as the Shun-chih emperor's "Sacred edict" (*Sheng yü*) with a colloquial commentary was taken to the Ryukyu Islands and from there presented to the daimyo of Satsuma, from whom in turn it was passed on to Yoshimune in 1721. The Ryukyu kingdom ostensibly was a Ch'ing tributary, but it was also a dependency of the outer domain of Satsuma, and thus, along with Korea, served as one of the Tokugawa's unofficial intermediaries to the Ch'ing. Ch'ing civil service licentiates (*sheng-yüan*) had to write out the "Sacred edict" from memory for local examinations. Intending to use the edict for indoctrination in Japan, Yoshimune ordered his Confucian adviser Ogyū Sorai to provide it with *kunten* markings so the colloquial Chinese commentary could be understood as *kanbun* by Japanese readers.[42]

The shogun also asked Muro Kyūsō to prepare a simple Japanese translation and commentary for the "Sacred edict," which was then distributed to Buddhist temples as a model for calligraphy practice in an effort to communicate Confucian values to the populace. After the Japanese version became public, Satō Issai (1772–1859) noted that an expanded and illustrated edition of the *Liu yü yen-i* compiled by Katsuda Tomosato was already widely used to improve public morals. Increasingly, rural schools and some chartered and private academies also used it as a morality textbook. Nakai Riken (1732–1817) used it as a text at the *Kaitokudō* merchant academy in Osaka, for example. Subsequently, another revised version of the "Sacred edict," completed in 1724 under the auspices of the Yung-cheng emperor with the title *Sheng yü kuang hsün* (*Amplified instructions for the Sacred edict*), arrived in Nagasaki in 1726 on a Chinese merchant vessel. Like its predecessor, it was reprinted sixty-three

41 Henderson, "Chinese influences on eighteenth-century Tokugawa codes," p. 271, has confused some of the information. The Ch'ing code had been revised in 1723–7 and republished in 1727. This version remained definitive in the Ch'ing period after some changes were added in 1740.

42 Tao Demin [Tō Tokumin], *Nihon kangaku shisōshi ronkō: Sorai Nakamoto oyobi kindai* (Suita-shi, 1999), pp. 26–37; and Henderson, "Chinese influences on eighteenth-century Tokugawa codes," pp. 274–5. See also Dan F. Henderson, "Chinese legal studies in early eighteenth century Japan: Scholars and sources," *Journal of Asian Studies* 30 No. 1 (1970), pp. 21–56; and Ōba, "Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period (Part six)" pp. 45–8.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

years later in Japan in 1789 in its original format. The director of the *Kaitokudō* academy, Nakai Chikuzan (1730–1804), wrote a preface for the reprint, and he and his younger brother Riken used it as a teaching text at the academy. Although a scholar steeped in *kanbun* learning, Ikai Keisho thought such steps went too far. He opposed the new Nakai version because it implied that the K'ang-hsi emperor and his Manchu successors had superseded the Japanese emperor and his imperial line as the source for correct social values.[43]

MEDICAL PRACTICE AND MEDICAL PHILOLOGY IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY JAPAN

Classical teachers were motivated in part by their hope for respect in the increasingly fluid urban world, but their equivocal social standing prompted them to despise doctors and merchants, just below them, who strove to climb higher. Classicists such as Itō Jinsai criticized doctors as money-oriented *nouveaux riches* who misleadingly equated their "lesser" learning with the Confucian classics. Similarly, Ogyū Sorai remarked how physicians exploited the Chinese classics to try to rise in urban society. Many sons of doctors became classicists throughout the Tokugawa period; classicists for their part became masters of the medical classics.[44]

For commoners in eighteenth-century Tokugawa society, practicing traditional Chinese medicine, like Chinese classical studies, offered an avenue for modest upward mobility. The draft by Asada Sōhaku (1815–94) for his *Kōchō ishi* (*History of physicians in our era*), later published as *Kōkoku meii den* (*Biographies of famous physicians of our august country*), was modeled on the Ming work of 1547 by Li Lien (1488–1566) entitled *I shih* (*A history of physicians*). Asada described how many of the leading physicians who favored the revival of "ancient medical prescriptions" (J. *koihō*) in the eighteenth century entered the profession from commoner or lower samurai ranks.[45] Particularly instructive is the career of Yoshimasu Tōdō (1702–73), who became a proponent of *kanpō* ("Han prescriptions") in Nagasaki and Kyoto. His ancestors had been military officials who lost their samurai status and became local physicians during the

43 Tao, *Nihon kangaku shisōshi ronkō*, pp. 26–37; and Henderson, "Chinese influences on eighteenth-century Tokugawa codes," pp. 274–5.

44 Itō Jinsai, *Kogaku sensei shibunshū*, comp. Miyake Masahiko (Tokyo, 1985), pp. 3.1a–3a; Ogyū Sorai, "Sorai sensei yigen," manuscript, compiled by Nakamura Genshun, 1767, Fujikawa Bunko, Kyōto Daigaku, Kyoto, pp. 1b–3a.

45 Asada Sōhaku, "Kōkoku meii den," in *Asada Sōhaku*, comp. Ōtsuka Keisetsu and Yakazu Dōmei, Volume 99 (Tokyo, 1982–3). Shigehisa Kuriyama, "Between mind and eye: Japanese anatomy in the eighteenth century," in *Paths to Asian medical knowledge*, ed. Charles M. Leslie and Allan Young (Berkeley, 1992), pp. 21–43.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

chaos of the Sengoku era (1482–1558). Initially Tōdō had hoped to restore his family to samurai status by taking up a military life, but he realized that "a period of great peace was no longer the right time to succeed as a soldier."[46]

Medicine allowed for upward mobility, but a career as a physician required years of training in classical Chinese medical texts, and the support of appropriate patrons, to master the new therapies (that is, standard "formulas") that had emerged during the Ming–Ch'ing revival of ancient Chinese medicine. Those Japanese physicians who later became interested in Western medicine, such as Sugita Genpaku (1738–1818), focused on first mastering classical Chinese and then Ming and Ch'ing medical books entering Nagasaki from China.[47] These Chinese currents of medicine took the form of a clash between those who favored reviving ancient medicine, particularly the *Shang-han lun* (*Treatise on cold damage disorders*), and those who continued to practice more recent Sung–Chin–Yüan medical currents based on the *Huang-ti nei-ching* (*Yellow Emperor's inner canon*), which itself comprised parts, including the *Su-wen* (*Basic questions*) and the *Ling-shu* (*Divine pivot*).[48]

The *Huang-ti nei-ching*, probably compiled in the Han period, had two standard recensions from the T'ang, and was edited and printed during the Northern Sung. It focused on vital functions and dysfunctions and their cosmic correlates in the part called the *Basic questions*, while applying these understandings to acupuncture and moxibustion in the *Divine pivot*. This classic paid little attention to details of therapy; its focus was on hygiene and preventative medicine.[49] Later a medical treatise by Chang Chung-ching (150?–219?) applied the *Huang-ti nei-ching* to drug therapies for clinical practice. Chang allegedly wrote his book between 196 and 220 CE in response to Later Han epidemics. He called it the *Shang-han tsa-ping lun* (*Treatise on cold damage and miscellaneous disorders*). Subsequently Chang's book was divided and circulated as three books, two of which, the *Shang-han lun* (*Treatise on cold damage disorders*) and the *Chin-k'uei yao-lüeh* (*Essentials of the golden casket*), were widely used from the Northern Sung period on. Literati considered the *Huang-ti nei-ching* to be the font of medical theory, for which Chang's *Treatise on cold damage disorders* provided a guide to clinical practice.

46 Asada Sōhaku, Kōchō ishi, manuscript, 1834, Fujikawa Bunko, Kyōto Daigaku, Kyoto. See also Yoshimasa Tōdō, Tōdō ikō, manuscript, 1785/1812, Fujikawa Bunko, Kyōto Daigaku, Kyoto, *hsia*, pp. 1a–2b.

47 Jannetta, *The vaccinators*, pp. 96, 103–5.

48 For historical background, see Yamada Seichin, Shōkan kō, manuscript, 1779, Fujikawa Bunko, Kyōto Daigaku, Kyoto.

49 Nathan Sivin, "Huang ti nei ching," in *Early Chinese texts: A bibliographical guide*, ed. Michael Loewe (Berkeley, 1993), pp. 198–9. See also Yasuo Otsuka, "Chinese traditional medicine in Japan," in *Asian medical systems: A comparative study*, ed. Charles M. Leslie (Berkeley, 1976), p. 323.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

Late Ming and Ch'ing scholar-physicians challenged medical learning as it had been transmitted since the Northern Sung period. Ch'ing scholar-physicians in particular sought to reverse the adulteration of ancient medical practice caused by Sung learning medical practitioners such as Liu Wan-su (1120–1200) and Chu Chen-heng (1280–1358), who allegedly relied too much on Ch'eng I and Chu Hsi's moral theory. The Ch'ing appeal to the ancient significance of the "authentic" medical classics added to the eighteenth-century denunciations of Sung learning in classical, political, and social matters. Moreover, Ming physicians such as Wang Chi (1463–1539) and Yü Ch'ang (1585–1664) referred to case histories (*i-an*), a new genre, instead of the medical classics, to advertise their therapeutic successes and explain them to students and amateurs.[50]

In Tokugawa Japan, Ch'ing debates between advocates of ancient medical prescriptions (*koihō*) and the so-called latter-day medicine advocates (J. *koseiha*) over the relative standing of early medical texts paralleled the debates between classicists advocating Han learning and those who followed Chu Hsi learning. Some Japanese scholars began to focus on "ancient learning" (*kogaku*) to overcome the recent decline in prestige of the Ch'eng–Chu tradition. The rhetoric of the "return to the ancients" that Itō Jinsai and Ogyū Sorai pioneered early in the eighteenth century carried over by mid-century to the discussion of ancient and modern medical texts. Like Ch'ing period scholars of Han learning, Tokugawa scholar-physicians began by studying Han dynasty medical texts because they were allegedly more ancient. They rejected Sung dynasty medical sources, which Muromachi scholar-physicians had relied on, because of their questionable authority and greater separation from antiquity. Sorai declared that the *Basic questions*, which Sung medical sources cited, was a composite work compiled by Han dynasty medical experts and not the work of the Yellow Emperor himself.[51]

Philological approaches to the *Huang-ti nei-ching* also led scholars in the eighteenth century to investigate the original content of the *Treatise on cold damage disorders* and the role of heat-factor illnesses (*je-ping*). Making critical editions of the ancient medical texts also enabled Japanese scholar-physicians to re-examine their original import. New works appeared on the *Huang-ti nei-ching*, Chang Chung-ching's *Shang-han lun*, and Chang's *Chin-k'uei yao-lüeh*. A proliferation of annotations emerged, with more works published in China

[50] Joanna Grant, "Medical practice in the Ming dynasty – a practitioner's view: Evidence from Wang Ji's *Shishan yi'an*," *Chinese Science* 15 (1998), pp. 37–80. See also Christopher Cullen, "*Yi'an* (case statements): The origins of a genre of Chinese medical literature," in *Innovation in Chinese medicine*, ed. Elisabeth Hsu (New York, 2001), pp. 297–323.

[51] See Ogyū Sorai, "Sorai sensei Somon hyō," manuscript, 1766, Fujikawa Bunko, Kyōto Daigaku, Kyoto, pp. 9a–b.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

and Japan on the *Shang-han lun* than ever before. This era of Japanese medical philology (J. *i kōshō gaku*), which focused on the Chinese medical classics, reached its height between 1780 and 1840.[52]

Like evidential scholars of the Confucian classics, Ch'ing and Tokugawa scholar-physicians thought their rediscoveries were practicable. They wanted to improve contemporary medical therapies for high fevers by inducing purging through vomiting or sweating. In their view, Japanese scholars of ancient medicine had revealed the true meaning of the *Shang-han lun*, and thus surpassed scholars in China in understanding medicine. The Tokugawa scholar-physicians were reviving the best ancient medical prescriptions and practices. Japan, the "eastern place" (*tōhō*), focused on recovering knowledge from antiquity through the pioneering studies of Jinsai and Sorai, thus enabling the Japanese to surpass Sung–Chin–Yüan scholars in the "western land" (*seito*), which had lost its ancient heritage. This induced some Japanese to began to use the name *Shina*, derived from a medieval Sanskrit term (Ch. *Chih-na*), to refer to China and to further destabilize its "central" position in East Asia.[53]

JAPANESE EDITIONS OF BOOKS IN CHINESE AND THEIR WAY BACK TO THE CH'ING EMPIRE

Kamakura Zen masters and Muromachi admirers of the Kiyohara family at the Kyoto court had been the first to prioritize Ch'eng–Chu learning, and they were followed in this by Hayashi Razan and others in Tokugawa scholarly circles in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. From the 1720s, Tokugawa classical scholars were increasingly sympathetic to the turn to "ancient learning" (*kogaku*) pioneered by Itō Jinsai, the eldest son of a Kyoto merchant. Jinsai attempted to recover what he considered the true message of the teachings of Confucius, particularly as they were presented in the master's *Analects*. Jinsai's distinguished son, Itō Tōgai, noted that "his father favored the *Analects* because it was the most precious treasure in the world."[54] Jinsai and his son both rejected the claims made by Chu Hsi and others in the Sung dynasty that the *Great learning* had been composed by Confucius as a separate work.

[52] Kosoto, *Kanpō no rekishi*, pp. 153–68; and Benjamin A. Elman, *On their own terms: Science in China, 1550–1900* (Cambridge, MA, 2005), pp. 227–36.

[53] Kosoto, *Kanpō no rekishi*, pp. 160–2. See also Elman, "Sinophiles and sinophobes in Tokugawa Japan," pp. 93–121.

[54] Itō Tōgai, *Shōjutsu sensei bunshū*, comp. Miyake Masahiko (1758–61; Tokyo, 1988), pp. 19.9a, 20.12a–15a. See also "Discussion proving that the Great learning is not an authentic work of Confucius" in appendix 1 of Joseph J. Spae, *Itō Jinsai: A philosopher, educator and sinologist of the Tokugawa period* (Peiping, 1948), pp. 221–31.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

More than Itō Jinsai's followers, who stressed comparing the content of the teachings in the classics with the *Analects*, Ogyū Sorai's students emphasized the need to recover the ancient texts of the Confucian classics and their early commentaries, which depended on locating the most reliable, earliest manuscripts in Japan that could then be traced back to the earliest versions transmitted from China. This was why the manuscripts at the Ashikaga Academy (J. *Ashikaga gakkō*), when discovered, took on such importance in Japanese scholarly circles in the eighteenth century. The Ashikaga Academy was located in Shimotsuke province, northeast of Edo, in modern Tochigi prefecture. It had been a center of learning since the mid-Muromachi period, and was known as a repository of both early manuscript copies and early printed editions of Chinese texts.

Sorai school textual studies and the Ashikaga Academy

In the early eighteenth century, the Ashikaga Academy's archives were known to hold Muromachi manuscript versions of Confucian classics, in addition to many fine Sung dynasty printed editions. The preface by Hattori Nankaku (1683–1749) for his colleague Nemoto Sonshi's (1699–1764) 1750 collation of Huang K'an's (488–545) *Lun-yü i-shu* (*Subcommentary for the meanings of the Analects*, J. *Rongo giso*) noted, "Ashikaga preserves many unusual books that today are no longer available abroad."[55] He went on to praise Nemoto's diligence in traveling there with Yamanoi Konron (d. 1728) to recover and transmit such works to later generations, and to express the hope that the printed version of the *Lun-yü i-shu* would

> not just be widely distributed in the world within the seas [Japan], but also transmitted to the land beyond the seas [China], so that they would know that our country is bountiful and secure in its concern for civilization. In this way, Nemoto's diligence will benefit both our land and China![56]

The Ashikaga holdings attracted the interest of students who studied with Ogyū Sorai in nearby Edo. It is doubtful that, as scholars opposed to Ch'eng–Chu learning and thus critical of Buddhism as well, the Sorai scholars would have been allowed to see manuscripts held in Kamakura or in Zen Buddhist temples in Kyoto. The Sorai followers made a virtue out of necessity and presented the Ashikaga Academy as their archive of choice. They proceeded

[55] Hattori Nankaku, "Kō Kan Rongo giso shinkoku jo," in *Rongo giso*, comp. Nemoto Sonshi (Osaka, 1750), p. 1a.
[56] Hattori, "Kō Kan Rongo giso shinkoku jo," pp. 4a–b.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

there many times for long stays to rediscover and work on texts that were stored there.[57]

Sorai's break with the meditative and moral self-cultivation aspects of Ch'eng–Chu learning and his advocacy for what he termed *kobunji gaku* ("learning based on ancient texts") – that is, interpreting the ancients in accord with the words and language of the time in which they were written – led him to take issue as well with the Ch'eng–Chu commentarial tradition, which had held a pre-eminent position in Japan over the preceding century. His follower, Dazai Shundai, described how Confucius' teachings had been so mixed with Buddhist ideas during the Sung that the two had become thoroughly confused, and ancient glosses for the *Analects* had been lost. Confronting this situation through his comparison of terms found in the *Analects* with the usage in other ancient texts and Han commentaries, Sorai had succeeded in correcting this state of affairs. According to Dazai,

> Now in our country, where we have lived in peace for a hundred years, literati who practiced the arts of the Way arose everywhere. Master Sorai then appeared and surpassed them all ... Taking evidence from the Six Classics ... without distortion and using the ancient glosses to consider their meaning, he cleared away the clouds and mist so that the Way of Confucius could be seen as if on a bright sunny day.[58]

Regarding the value of the so-called "ancient commentaries" (J. *kochū*), particularly those dating from the Han dynasties and the immediately following period, as opposed to the "new commentaries" (J. *shinchū*) compiled by Sung scholars, Sorai himself observed that in the Han period, subsequent to the burning of the books under the first Ch'in emperor at the end of the third century BCE, various scholars had attempted to recover the ancient texts and explain their meaning, which resulted in diverse interpretations. Yet overall each school of interpretation could be traced back to Confucius' disciples, and the efforts of Later Han scholars to gather and collate their commentaries had much merit. "One who, living a millennium later, wishes to pursue the Way of the sages, thus cannot set aside [the commentaries of] the Han scholars and adopt those of others." Ogyū Sorai contended that not only had too many scholars from the Sung period on followed the new interpretations, but also too few had paid due attention to the old commentaries, and therefore good printed editions of the old texts with all the words intact were hard to find.[59]

57 Hattori, "Kō Kan Rongo giso shinkoku jo," p. 1a.

58 Dazai Shundai, *Shundai Sensei Shishien kō*, comp. Kojima Yasunori (1752; Tokyo, 1986), pp. 138–9.

59 Ogyū Sorai, comment (*jo*) on Yamanoi Konan's *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun*, in Ogyū Sorai, *Ogyū Sorai*, ed. Maruyama Masao et al. (Tokyo, 1973), p. 490.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

Like many other Edo Confucian scholars, Ogyū Sorai alluded to the tradition that the Ashikaga Academy had been founded by Ono no Takamura (802–52), an early Heian scholar, and suggested that therefore it retained copies of works brought to Japan by emissaries who had come from the continent during the T'ang period and by figures such as Kibi no Makibi (695–775), sent to China in the Nara and early Heian periods to study and acquire manuscripts.[60] There is little reliable evidence for the school's existence prior to its "revival" in the 1430s by Uesugi Norizane (1410–66), the powerful lord who served as the Muromachi official largely responsible for supervision of the eastern part of the country. Norizane and his successors presented the school with several Sung printed editions of old commentaries, and the school and the Buddhist priests who headed it continued to enjoy the patronage of the Go-Hōjō family, who subsequently extended their power over the region, and later the patronage of Toyotomi Hideyoshi and Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542–1616). Through such connections and those of its heads with major temples in Kyoto and elsewhere, the Ashikaga Academy acquired a notable collection of both imported texts and Japanese manuscript copies. By the early eighteenth century, it had declined as an educational center, but it still had much to offer those seeking old editions and manuscript copies of classical texts and commentaries.

Yamanoi Konron's use of Ashikaga manuscripts

The son of a physician, as were many Japanese classical scholars during the eighteenth century, and a student of both Itō Tōgai and Ogyū Sorai, Yamanoi Konron was responsible for the first famous discoveries of early texts of classics. Yamanoi traveled to Ashikaga in 1720 and again in 1722 in the company of Nemoto Sonshi, also one of Sorai's disciples, in search of early manuscripts at the academy. They located enough old manuscript materials that their joint efforts enabled Yamanoi to compile what he called the *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun* (*Examined texts for seven classics including the Mencius*). Later Sorai noted that Yamanoi had spent three years in Ashikaga painstakingly going through manuscripts there. Hattori Nankaku reported that during this time, Nemoto began to collate the manuscript copy of the *Lun-yü i-shu*, which Yamanoi also used, and the variants in the editions of the *Analects* he had found.[61]

60 Ogyū, *Ogyū Sorai*, p. 490. Regarding the tradition that the school was founded by Ono no Takamura, today largely rejected, see Yūki Rikurō, *Kanazawa bunko to Ashikaga gakkō* (Tokyo, 1959), pp. 155–6; also Kawase Kazuma, *Ashikaga Gakkō no kenkyū* (1948; Tokyo, 1974), pp. 3–9.

61 Hattori, "Kō Kan Rongo giso shinkoku jo," p. 1a. See also Kanō Naoki, *Shinagaku bunsō* (Kyoto, 1927), pp. 178–209; and Noda Bunnosuke, "Yamanoi Konron to Shichi Mōshi kōbun no kōhon ni tsuite," *Tōkyō Shinagaku hō* 1 (1955), p. 206.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

After Yamanoi's death in 1728, the shogun, Tokugawa Yoshimune, ordered Ogyū Sorai's younger brother, Ogyū Hokkei, to enlarge and correct errors in the collection. Yoshimune sponsored its publication upon completion in 1732 under the title *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi* (*Additions to the Examined texts for the seven classics including the Mencius*). The Nagasaki magistrate sent the entire compendium in thirty-two volumes containing some two hundred *chüan* to Ningpo, but it took until the 1760s to draw the interest of classical scholars in Chekiang. Scholars there realized that the *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi* proved for the first time that versions of the Chinese classics lost in China, such as the subcommentary by Huang K'an, had apparently survived in Japan.[62]

Yamanoi's expanded lists of variants for the seven classics (*Book of change*, *Book of documents*, *Book of poetry*, *Tso's commentary*, *Analects*, and *Classic on being filial*, and also the *Mencius*) became popular among scholars devoted to evidential learning in Ch'ing because it was based on allegedly reliable old Japanese manuscripts that had survived in the Ashikaga archives. Some of the Chekiang bookmen who were involved in the Ningpo–Nagasaki trade began to inquire about other such texts when their ships arrived in Japan. Later, the Hangchow salt merchant and bibliophile Wang Ch'i-shu (1728–99?) submitted a copy of Yamanoi's work to the Ch'ien-lung emperor's *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* commission to add to the imperial library in Peking.[63]

The editors in Peking enthusiastically accepted the book, and recopied it into the Ch'ien-lung library, but initially they did not realize that the author was Japanese. They also gave the wrong date of first publication, 1670, before Yamanoi was even born. This was corrected when the Yangchow scholar-official, Juan Yüan (1764–1849), who was completing his own huge project collating the best editions for the thirteen classics (*Shih-san ching chu-shu chiao-k'an chi*), met with Kim Chŏng-hŭi (1786–1856) in 1810. Kim was then visiting Peking on a tribute mission from Korea that arrived in 1809. The first Korean to recognize the importance of Yamanoi's edition, Kim sent Juan Yüan a copy of the original, manuscript version of Yamanoi's *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun*, which he had copied while on a Korean mission to Japan.[64]

[62] Yamanoi Konron, *Shichikei Mōshi kōbun hoi* (Taipei, 1983–6), which includes a *fan-li* that lists on 6b what it calls the "Kō Kan Giso rongo" (or Huang K'an i-shu *Lun yü*).

[63] Kanō, *Shinagaku bunsō*, pp. 126–36. See also Ōba, "Sino-Japanese relations in the Edo period (Part six)" pp. 43–59; and Yoshikawa, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 149–51.

[64] For the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan shu* editors' comment on Yamanoi's *Shichi Mōshi kōbun*, see Wang Yün-wu et al., comps., *Ho-yin ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao chi ssu-k'u wei shou shu-mu, chin-hui shu-mu*, Volume 1 (Taipei, 1971), pp. 677–9. They discussed the problems in the transmission of the supposed Huang K'an commentary to the *Lun yü* at pp. 712–13. See also Fujitsuka Chikashi, *Nichi-Sen-Shin no bunka kōryū* (Tokyo, 1947), pp. 26–7; and Yoshikawa, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 149–51.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

The *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu* editors also were pleased to find that Yamanoi's editions for the various classics contradicted the infamous claims made by Feng Fang (1493–1566) in the Ming period that his new edition of the *Great learning* had been based on a reliable version from abroad. In an ironic twist, the Ch'ing scholars at the Ch'ien-lung court used an eighteenth-century Japanese edition of the classics to confirm that Feng Fang's sixteenth-century edition was a forgery. Yamanoi's collection showed Japanese scholars that they were now the equals of scholars at the Ch'ing capital when it came to collating and editing the classics.[65]

Dazai Shundai and his ancient-script version of the Classic on being filial

Following Yamanoi's lead, another Sorai student, Dazai Shundai, traveled to Ashikaga in the 1720s and found an unknown version of the *Hsiao ching* (*Classic on being filial*, J. *Kōkyō*). He thought it was based on an ancient-script (Ch. *ku-wen*, J. *kobun*) version recorded in the Sui dynasty (581–618) that had been transmitted to Japan in the seventh century, according to Japanese records. That version of the *Classic on being filial* had been endorsed by the Heian court, but in 860 the endorsement was withdrawn because of the texts's dubious transmission history. Instead, a T'ang edition prepared under imperial auspices in Ch'ang-an was recognized and remained in circulation. The ancient-script version that Dazai discovered allegedly dated back to a number of manuscripts written in ancient-style script supposedly discovered in the walls of Confucius' house when it was being enlarged sometime between 154 and 128 BCE. In 1732, Dazai published the *Kobun kōkyo Kōshi den* (*K'ung's commentary to the ancient-script version of the Classic on being filial*), which was his collation of the newly discovered text of the classic along with a commentary he attributed to K'ung An-kuo (156–*c.*100 BCE) of the Western Han dynasty. K'ung's commentary had been lost in China by the mid-sixth century and mysteriously reappeared in the late sixth century under the Sui dynasty. This commentary was carried to Japan, but was lost in China during the Five Dynasties period (907–60).[66]

Dazai hoped that this lost classical commentary would be officially transported from Nagasaki to China as Yamanoi's work had been. He made his request official in 1733, when he asked the daimyo of Numata, where Ashikaga

65 See Wang et al., *Ho-yin ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu tsung-mu t'i-yao chi ssu-k'u wei shou shu-mu*, Volume 1, pp. 712–13, 677–9, on the *Shichi Mōshi kōbun hoi*.

66 Laura E. Hess, "The reimportation from Japan to China of the commentary to the *Classic of filial piety*," *Sino-Japanese Studies* 6 No. 1 (1993), pp. 4–5.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

was located, to see to it that the Nagasaki magistrate send a copy to Ningpo. It is not clear what copy of Dazai's edition made it to China, but it was included in the first collection of the *Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu* (*Collectanea from the Hall of knowing one's deficiencies*), which began to be printed in 1776 by the bibliophile Pao T'ing-po (1728–1814). Later it was critiqued by the compilers who included it in the *Ssu-k'u ch'üan-shu*. In the eighteenth century, the K'ung An-kuo version was doubly questioned by Ch'ing scholars as a "forgery of a forgery" because the consensus among them was that K'ung An-kuo had never prepared any sort of classical commentary. This meant that even a first version of K'ung's commentary, whatever that was, must be doubted. Unlike the more positive assessments accorded the newly discovered Huang K'an subcommentary for the *Analects* in the 1780s, most Ch'ing scholars simply dismissed Dazai's version of the K'ung An-kuo commentary as a later forgery of an originally forged text.[67]

In 1778 a Ch'ing merchant brought printed copies of the 1776 *Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu* collection to Nagasaki. It included prefaces by several Ch'ing scholars praising Dazai's work, although they voiced suspicions that the supposed original Han dynasty version of the K'ung commentary was also a later forgery. In 1781, the Ch'ing prefaces by Lu Wen-chao (1717–96), Wu Ch'ien (1733–1813), and Cheng Ch'en, as well as Pao T'ing-po's original colophon, were reprinted in Edo as a separate volume. Dazai's alleged fame in China cemented his reputation in the Japanese academic world. The influential patron of literature and the arts Kimura Kenkado (1736–1802) prepared a preface honoring Dazai Shundai for the publication of his work in China. A Japanese reprint of the *Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu* edition of Dazai's *K'ung commentary to the ancient script version of the Classic on being filial* was also issued the following year, with a glowing preface by one of his disciples.

The publication of these two works in Japan confirmed Dazai Shundai's reputation as a classicist and polymath in Tokugawa scholarly circles. Moreover, Yamanoi's use of early manuscripts and Dazai's return to texts originating in the Han dynasty ancient-script tradition vindicated the Sorai school's attack on those who uncritically upheld the much later Sung dynasty teachings of Chu Hsi as the core of the classical curriculum.[68] Shundai's edition of the *Classic on being filial* helped to try to reverse the priority previously given to the Ch'eng–Chu editions of the Four Books and Five Classics that dated back

[67] Laura E. Hess, "Qing reactions to the importation of Confucian canonical works from Tokugawa Japan," in *Sagacious monks and bloodthirsty warriors: Chinese views of Japan in the Ming–Qing period*, ed. Joshua A. Fogel (Norwalk, 2002), pp. 135–40.

[68] On Huang K'an's subcommentary for the *Analects*, see Benjamin A. Elman, "One classic and two classical traditions: The recovery and transmission of a lost edition of the *Analects*," *Monumenta Nipponica* 64 No. 1 (2009), pp. 53–82.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

to the Sung dynasty. Shundai's edition of the K'ung An-kuo commentary was reprinted frequently all over Japan, and soon became the most widely circulated version of the *Classic on being filial*. Its success in turn provoked numerous follow-up studies by Japanese scholars on the K'ung commentary, which were both favorable and unfavorable. In essence, Shundai's focus on recovering the *Classic on being filial* of antiquity through its ancient-script version held in the Ashikaga Academy enabled him as a Japanese scholar to surpass the textual authority of the Sung scholars. A classic lost in China had been resuscitated in Japan.[69]

The Cheng Hsüan modern-script version of the Classic on being filial

As a result of the fame achieved by Dazai Shundai, other Japanese scholars sought out missing commentaries, such as the *Hsiao ching Cheng chu* (*Cheng's commentary for the Classic on being filial*, J. *Kōkyo Seichū*), attributed to Cheng Hsüan (130–200). The Cheng Hsüan commentary also had been lost in China during the turmoil of the Five Dynasties period. In Sung it was reimported to China from Japan, and then lost again. In Japan, a seemingly reliable version was discovered within the *Ch'un-shu chih-yao* (*Selections on the essentials of rulership*, J. *Gunsho chiyō*), an important T'ang dynasty compilation lost in China for centuries. The ruler of Nagoya had the manuscripts surviving in Japan collated and printed during the 1780s. Classical scholars realized while collating the T'ang dynasty work that a version of the Cheng Hsüan commentary to the *Classic on being filial* survived within the collection. Okada Shinsen (1737–99) was not the first to publish an edition of the supposed Cheng Hsüan commentary in Japan, but his edition was the first one sent to China. He hoped it would also be honored with publication there. It was immediately reprinted in the *Chih-pu-tsu chai ts'ung-shu* series. When Okada's version appeared in 1794, some Ch'ing scholars accepted his version of the Cheng commentary, while others condemned it as a forgery because it lacked passages that were cited in other surviving versions of the commentary. Without access until 1847 to a widely available reprint of the Japanese version of the *Ch'un-shu chih-yao*, from which the Cheng Hsüan commentary had been extracted, Ch'ing scholars could not corroborate that this collection was a reliable source. They then determined that Okada's version was an abridgment of the Cheng commentary. When compared to Ch'ing classicists' skeptical reception of the ancient-script version of the *Classic on being filial* that accompanied a commentary attributed to K'ung An-kuo, they were much more positive toward the so-called Cheng Hsüan "modern-script" (*chin-wen*) version, despite some reservations. The more

[69] Hess, "The reimportation from Japan to China of the commentary to the *Classic of filial piety*," pp. 6–7.

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

positive reaction was in part due to the elevated status Cheng Hsüan commanded among late eighteenth-century Ch'ing classicists, who regarded him as the key Later Han textual scholar because he had annotated most of the Confucian canon. Evidential scholars regarded him as the father of Han learning (*Han hsüeh*). They relied on his many glosses to unravel the ancient meanings of characters and terms in the Five Classics, and to replace the allegedly anachronistic "meanings and principles" (*i-li*) readings introduced by Sung scholars.[70]

Despite its positive reception in China, Tokugawa scholars did not consider Okada Shinsen's work the equal of Nemoto's, Yamanoi's, or Shundai's. As Sorai scholars, they could count on their master's iconoclasm and widespread influence on classical learning in Japan during the second half of the eighteenth century to enjoy positive responses to their new editions of lost Chinese works. By the turn of nineteenth century, however, a new group of more eclectic classical scholars was emerging in Japan. They tended to denigrate both Jinsai and Sorai and their students for being doctrinaire Confucians with limited philological knowledge, which marked a shift in scholarly standards.[71]

In both China and Japan through the eighteenth century, scholars' turning away from Sung and Ming interpretive approaches to classical texts led to an emphasis on textual criticism and philology, and spurred interest in pre-Sung commentarial traditions. A certain degree of mutual awareness and transfer of knowledge accompanied this shared interest, but until the late eighteenth century the Tokugawa and Ch'ing pursuits of critical textual studies followed relatively independent trajectories based on different sorts of source, mainly printed editions in Ch'ing and manuscripts in Tokugawa. The commonalities between the two traditions increased in the early nineteenth century, when some Japanese scholars argued for adapting the Ch'ing emphasis on evidential learning as the way to approach classical texts.

The incorporation of a philological emphasis survived the prohibition of "heterodoxy" in the Kansei era (1789–1801). After 1790 the shogunate for the first time directly supported the tradition derived from Chu Hsi's learning.[72]

[70] Elman, *From philosophy to philology* (2001), pp. 146, 162.

[71] Nakamura Kyūshirō, "Kinsei Shina no Nihon bunka ni oyoboshitaru seiryoku eikyō," *Shigaku zasshi* 25 No. 2 (1914), pp. 290; and Kanaya Osamu, "Nihon kōshō gakuha no seiritsu: Ōta Kinjō o chūshin to shite," in *Kanaya Osamu Chūgoku shisō ronshū*, Kanaya Osamu, Volume 3 (Tokyo, 1997), pp. 238–90. See also Hess, "Qing reactions to the importation of Confucian canonical works from Tokugawa Japan," pp. 144–9; and Benjamin A. Elman, "The search for evidence from China: Qing learning and Kōshōgaku in Tokugawa Japan," in *Sagacious monks and bloodthirsty warriors: Chinese views of Japan in the Ming–Qing period*, ed. Joshua A. Fogel (Norwalk, 2002), pp. 158–82.

[72] Fujitsuka Chikashi, *Shinchō bunka tōden no kenkyū: Kakai Dōkō gakudan to Richō no Kin Gendō*, ed. Fujitsuka Akinao (Tokyo, 1975). See also Fuma Susumu, "1764 nen Chōsen tsūshinshi to Nihon no Soraigaku,"

Trim: 228mm × 152mm Top: 10.685mm Gutter: 16.871mm
CUUK2978-06 CUUK2978/Peterson ISBN: 978 0 521 24335 3 November 30, 2015 7:34

Although the Ch'eng–Chu persuasion continued in the following years, its proponents failed to block books containing the new classical learning that arrived through Nagasaki. The importation and spread of new studies on the classical texts from south China, the heartland of evidential research after the mid-eighteenth century, provided a philological methodology that was no one's monopoly in China or Japan. It could be used to attack orthodox learning, as Ogyū Sorai had in part done, or to reaffirm it with reservations, as the eclectics did. It was also employed by nativist scholars in Japan who sought to cleanse ancient Japanese chronicles and poetry masterpieces of their Sinitic encumbrances and thereby restore the true spirit of Japanese antiquity.[73]

Shirin 89 No. 5 (2006), pp. 645–77; and Robert L. Backus, "The Kansei prohibition of heterodoxy and its effects on education," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 39 No. 1 (1979), pp. 62–3.

73 Mark McNally, *Proving the way: Conflict and practice in the history of Japanese nativism* (Cambridge, MA, 2005).