

JAPANESE SCHOLARSHIP AND THE KING-CH'ING  
INTELLECTUAL TRANSITION<sup>1</sup>

Benjamin A. Elman  
University of Pennsylvania

1. Modernism in Chinese Thought

In recent years the impact of Japanese scholarship has been felt most profoundly in western socio-economic studies. The Naitō thesis propounded by the distinguished Kyoto University professor, Naitō Torajirō 内藤虎次郎, has reached into our textbooks with its claim that in the late T'ang and early Sung dynasties a major change in social, economic, and intellectual patterns was evolving.<sup>2</sup> We are by now accustomed to economic and historical studies that link the Sung dynasty to the rise of early modern China.<sup>3</sup>

It is surprising, however, how little influence Japanese approaches to Chinese intellectual history have had on western scholarship. Western intellectual historians, while aware of the implications of the Naitō thesis in socio-economic terms, for the most part have not as yet turned to the links between the Sung social and economic revolution and the concomitant intellectual revolution. We seem to have forgotten that Naitō Torajirō was also a distinguished intellectual historian of China, and that he saw his delineation of socio-economic modernism in terms of intellectual modernism as well.<sup>4</sup>

The correlation between intellectual and socio-economic factors has been at the heart of Japanese approaches to Chinese intellectual history. As early as 1936, Takeuchi Yoshio 武内義太, basing his work on Naitō's research, wrote his influential Shina shisōshi 支那思想

Editors: James Cole  
Department of History  
Yale University  
New Haven, Conn. 06520

Susan Naquin  
Department of History CO  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19104

Mary Rankin  
1614 44th St. NW  
Washington, D.C. 20007

Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i is published twice a year in June and December. Annual subscriptions are US\$7.50. All correspondence relating to subscriptions should be sent to Mary Rankin at the above address.

Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i publishes articles on all aspects of Chinese history, society, economics, politics, literature, philosophy, religion, art, and bibliography from the seventeenth through the early twentieth centuries. It also will publish news of conferences, exhibitions, publications, and dissertations on the Ch'ing period.

Manuscripts may be submitted to any editor. They should be typed on 8 1/2 x 11 bond, double-spaced. Notes should appear at the end, and characters should be inserted in the text. Both Wade-Giles and pinyin romanizations are acceptable. Full length articles are approximately 25-35 pages. Shorter notes are also published. Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i is abstracted in Historical Abstracts and American History and Life.

史 [History of Chinese thought], in which he linked the late T'ang period to the Ch'ing dynasty and described this epoch in Chinese intellectual history as "kinsei" 近世 [early modern].<sup>5</sup> Pre-war Japanese intellectual historians like Uno Tetsuro 宇野哲人 and Hiraoka Takeo 平岡武夫 contended that the divisions in the development of Chinese thought must conform to the time periods found in the history of China when taken as a whole.<sup>6</sup> Social and economic factors were part and parcel of intellectual history for Japanese scholars.

In the post-war period the most significant study in Japan that continued this line of research was Shimada Kenji's 島田虔次 Ch'ingoku ni okeru kindai shi no zassetsu 中国における近代思想の挫折 [The Frustration of Modern Thought in China], originally published in 1949 and reissued in 1970. From the outset, Shimada, a product of Kyoto University, acknowledged his debt to Naitō Torajirō.<sup>7</sup>

Shimada saw the metaphysical and humanistic studies begun in the Sung and the critical philological studies carried out by k'iao-cheng 考證 [evidential research] scholars during the Ch'ing dynasty as the pillars of Chinese modern thought.

What took on importance for Shimada Kenji was the significance of Ming scholarship, particularly the studies associated with Wang Yang-ming and his school, which fell between Sung and Ch'ing modernism.<sup>8</sup> For Shimada, Ming scholarship was neither a simple continuation of Sung ideas and theories nor an irrelevant period of empty speculation against which the statecraft-minded Ch'ing intellectuals reacted. It was a period of social, economic, and intellectual ferment that followed its own developmental logic.<sup>9</sup>

Shimada saw many parallels between early modern European society

and Ming society, particularly the rise of modernistic elements of individualism, rationalism, the growth of popular culture, and a "modern pathos."<sup>10</sup> These were all important elements in Wang Yang-ming's thought. Yet these promising signs of modernism in the intellectual sphere during the Ming dynasty tragically could not keep pace with the radical individualism and anti-orthodoxy that pervaded the "left-wing" Yang-ming school at the end of the dynasty. The limits of Confucian thought had been reached, and in the reaction against the attack on Confucian ritual by the "left-wing" school, Confucian "modernism" was rejected by the gentry upholders of traditional Chinese society -- hence "the frustration of modern thought in China."<sup>11</sup>

If, however, the modern elements that arose in the Sung and Ming periods were thwarted by the end of the Ming, this did not mean, according to Shimada, that such elements were still-born. Since it was clear that political and economic elements of modernism developed continuously from the Sung through the Ch'ing, how could it be that the Ming and Ch'ing periods were diametrically opposed to each other intellectually?<sup>12</sup> In fact, Shimada concluded that they were not. While discontinuities were evident, significant continuities of thought were passed on. If these continuities were not grasped, then on Shimada's terms it would be impossible to understand early modern Chinese history.<sup>13</sup>

Shimada Kenji's thesis was a provocative one in Japanese academic circles and led to a heated debate with the Nagoya University historian Yamashita Ryūji 山下青二.<sup>14</sup> Yamashita criticized Shimada's position by pointing out that the so-called "modern" elements Shimada found in Ming Confucianism were really nothing but traditional rebellious themes found in Chinese thought.<sup>15</sup> Comparable to anti-Confucian patterns

of protest found in Buddhist and Taoist writings, the "left-wing" Yang-ming school in the late Ming was offering a traditional form of radical protest, and the affirmation of human desires and strident individualism found in the "left-wing" school were not roots of an evolving modernism but a throw-back to Wei and Chin dynasty eccentric behavior.<sup>16</sup>

For Yamashita it was a contradiction in terms to speak of a modernism that was historically frustrated. If indeed the roots of modernism were contained in Yang-ming Confucianism, according to Yamashita, it would be a modernism that led nowhere, a dead-end which was untrue to its futurist name.<sup>17</sup> Shimada was overlooking the irrational and religious elements found in the development of the Yang-ming school in his haste to find a counterpart to European modernism.<sup>18</sup>

In an afterword written for the 1970 edition of The Frustration of Modern Thought in China, Shimada Kenji refused to yield on his modernism theme.<sup>19</sup> He contended that the period beginning with the Sung dynasty was comparable to the European "modern age" of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and not the modernism associated with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Europe. Shimada declared that he saw no alternative to this perspective that would adequately illuminate the significance of the Ming period in Chinese intellectual history.<sup>20</sup> He reiterated that his notion of "modernism" was based on Naito's thesis of Sung modernism and Max Weber's discussion of modernism in post-Renaissance Europe.

Shimada went on to admit, however, that, without the external factors brought on by the western powers in the nineteenth century, it was unlikely that China of and by itself would have produced a modern society based on mechanization, capitalism, and a bourgeois class.<sup>21</sup>

Still, "without a tradition of independent mathematical scholarship would it have been possible to create sufficient machinery? Without sufficient machinery would it have been possible to have capitalism [in early modern China]?"<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the roots of modernism in China must be sought in the Chinese tradition, according to Shimada. Without these roots, modernization in China would have been unlikely. Indigenous elements of the Confucian tradition conducive to modernism were not lacking. For Shimada, a dismissive approach to the Confucian tradition and its ties to technical and social development is misguided.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. China and the Theory of Asian Social Stagnation

Cutting across the debate on modernism in Chinese thought is the Japanese handling of the "theory of social stagnation" associated with Asia in general and China in particular. Yamashita Ryūji brings up examples of this approach in Japanese scholarship. He points out that the distinguished Kyoto University intellectual historian Ojima Sukema 小島祐馬 was incapable of envisioning any major changes in Chinese social structure because of his perception of Chinese society as a fixed social entity based on an unchanging division of classes.<sup>24</sup> This made it appear that Confucian thought -- the intellectual correlate to this frozen society -- was an unchanging ideology which showed no signs of development or growth.

Yamashita traced this perspective to the nineteenth century German historian Leopold von Ranke, who saw Asian history as not only stagnant but also retrogressive when compared to the development of western history.<sup>25</sup> This was, according to Yamashita, the result of the ignorance with which western scholars looked at Asia. Yet even Japanese scholars

had come to accept this perception of Chinese society. The most influential intellectual historian in post-war Japan, Maruyama Masao 丸山真男, based his interpretation of Chinese Confucianism on the premise of the formalistic and stagnant nature of Chu Hsi's orthodox school of Confucianism.<sup>26</sup> Maruyama's discussion of the static nature of Chinese history and Confucianism was drawn from G.W.F. Hegel's Reason in History, which described the Chinese empire as a theocratic despotism.<sup>27</sup> This was expanded by Maruyama's student, Nomura Kōichi 野林啓一, to include Max Weber's claim that Confucianism in China "had reduced tension with the world to an absolute minimum."<sup>28</sup> Assimilating Karl Marx to this theme of stagnancy, Maruyama and Nomura concluded that modernism in China only began with the destruction of Chinese isolation by England and the other European powers in the nineteenth century.

Aware of the socio-economic scholarship that demonstrated that Chinese history was a dynamic and developing process, Yamashita reacted very strongly against this static picture of Chinese Confucianism. In intellectual terms this meant that there had been growth and progression in Chinese thought. Ch'ing textual scholarship, for example, was not simply the same old Confucian saw, according to Yamashita.<sup>29</sup> Elements of populism, skepticism, rationalism, and anti-authoritarianism had begun to develop from within the Confucian orthodoxy.<sup>30</sup>

The most strident rejection of the theory of stagnancy in Chinese history has been made by the Tokyo University economic historian Tanaka Masatoshi 田中正俊.<sup>31</sup> Tanaka has discussed the origins of the theory of stagnancy and its links to Marx's notion of a unique Asian mode

of production.<sup>32</sup> In the process Tanaka brings out into the open the often unacknowledged connection between the stagnancy theory and the so-called "positive role" western and Japanese imperialism played in forcing China down the "inevitable" road to modernization. Given the evidence for social and economic change in Ming and Ch'ing China, particularly in the Lower Yangtze provinces, Tanaka contends that what we have been given before as explanations for the frozen nature of Chinese society was in fact little more than the apologetics for imperialism.<sup>33</sup>

Tanaka Masatoshi's attempt to trace important elements of social and economic change before the nineteenth century overlaps significantly with the attempt by Japanese intellectual historians of China to discern modern elements in Confucian ideas and institutions. This has been one of the major reasons for the Japanese focus on the Ming-Ch'ing transition period as a time of the "sprouts of capitalism" on the one hand and a period of intellectual ferment and progression on the other.<sup>34</sup>

### 3. The Ming-Ch'ing Intellectual Transition

Although Shimada Kenji and Yamashita Ryūji have disagreed on the question of modernism, they both share a refusal to dismiss Ming developments as irrelevant when considered from the vantage point of the seventeenth century and the rise of the Manchu state.<sup>35</sup> The view that Ming

and Ch'ing intellectual developments were indivisible was first formulated in Japan by Goto Motomi 後藤基巳 in an influential article entitled "Shinsho seiji shiso no seiritsu Katei" 清初政治思想の成立過程 [The Process of Formation of Early Ch'ing Political Thought] published in 1942.<sup>36</sup> Goto maintained that the elements usually associated with the early Ch'ing statecraft scholars -- nationalism and

the rise of a popular culture -- were drawn from the late Ming period. According to Goto, it was during the Ming, after all, that the critical spirit and practical emphasis so highly prized by Ch'ing scholars were first enunciated and practiced. The early Ch'ing was not a period when a singular reaction against the Wang Yang-ming school was the predominant trend among Chinese intellectuals.<sup>37</sup>

Continuing Goto's perspective, Yamanoi Yū 山井湧 in 1951 linked the Ming and Ch'ing periods and described them as a period when a "philosophy of material force" (*ki no tetsugaku* 氣の哲學) replaced the Chu Hsi "philosophy of principle" (*ri no tetsugaku* 理の哲學) as the dominant framework for analysis in Confucian scholarship.<sup>38</sup> Yamanoi traced the development of this line of thought from the Ming scholar Lo Ch'in-shun 羅欽順 (1465-1547) to Tai Chen 戴震 (1724-1777) and Juan Yüan (1764-1849) in the Ch'ing period, stipulating a total of twenty-four Ming-Ch'ing scholars who could be connected to the rise of a philosophy of material force.<sup>39</sup> This turn away from Chu Hsi's philosophy represented for Yamanoi a turn from abstract, conceptual thought to an emphasis on concrete, verifiable ideas. This included a turn away from subjective to objective criteria for thinking and a return to mundane human considerations in the face of the transcendental philosophy of principle.<sup>40</sup>

In 1961, Yamashita Ryūji published an article entitled "Ka Kinjun to Ki no tetsugaku" 羅欽順之氣の哲學 [Lo Ch'in-shun and the Philosophy of Material Force] in which he continued Yamanoi Yū's approach.<sup>41</sup> Later Abe Yoshio 阿部吉雄 in 1965, completing work he had begun in earlier essays, published his *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen* 日本朱子學之朝鮮 [Japanese Chu Hsi Studies and Korea]

in which he linked Yamanoi's notion of a philosophy of material force as found in Lo Ch'in-shun's thought to the development of the Yang-ming school and its concern with concrete human questions.<sup>42</sup> According to Abe, these ideas were then passed on to Korea and Japan, where their impact on the rise of the *Kogaku* 古學 [Ancient Learning] school during the Tokugawa period was considerable.

Yamashita Ryūji has gone on to praise this approach to the Ming-Ch'ing period because it is true to the complex nature of Ming-Ch'ing intellectual developments and because it does not repeat the earlier, facile divisions between Ming and Ch'ing intellectual history in which the former was labelled as "vacuous" while the latter was called "concrete" scholarship.<sup>43</sup> Shimada Kenji also has accepted this thesis and has incorporated it into his own work on Wang Yang-ming. Shimada contends that although it may appear that the Yang-ming school was based on a philosophy of idealism, it was intimately connected to the concrete philosophy of material force and the Ming turn to immediate human concerns.<sup>44</sup>

Developing his analysis of the philosophy of material force as a unifying feature in the Ming-Ch'ing transition, Yamanoi Yū has continued his focus on the Ming-Ch'ing transition and in the process sharpened, clarified, and changed his perspective on the pivotal nature of the seventeenth century in Chinese intellectual history.<sup>45</sup> In a 1954 essay entitled "Min-shin no tetsugaku to shūyō" 明清の哲學と修養 [Ming-Ch'ing Philosophy and Moral Cultivation], Yamanoi noted that one of the important differences between the Ming and Ch'ing was the sudden decline in emphasis on moral cultivation during the seventeenth century.<sup>46</sup> Instead, a resurgence of interest in philology, astronomy, geography, and mathematics replaced the Sung-Ming concentration on moral cultivation

as the center of Confucian training and scholarship. Important Ch'ing scholars like Tai Chen made no mention of moral training whatsoever.<sup>47</sup>

Yamanoi found that Ch'ing scholars favored a broad base of scholarship over insubstantial moral speculation. This pattern could be seen in seventeenth century intellectuals like Wang Fu-chih and Huang Tsung-hsi as well. Although both Wang and Huang continued to discuss Sung and Ming themes, neither of them offered any framework in which daily moral cultivation would play an important intellectual role.<sup>48</sup> Yamanoi discerned in the position Wang Fu-chih, Huang Tsung-hsi, and Ku Yen-wu adopted the beginnings of a potential methodology based on evidential research that was only possible once the Sung-Ming focus on moral cultivation was left behind.

In an essay entitled "Yimatsu Shinsho ni okeru keisei chiyo no gaku" 明末清初に於ける經世致用の學 [Practical Statecraft Studies in the Late Ming and Early Ch'ing Periods], also published in 1954, Yamanoi first enunciated a thesis which was to recur in his subsequent writings. He contended that between the decline of the Yang-ming school and the rise of Ch'ing K'ao-cheng scholarship there was a transitional period of theories and ideas that can be categorized under the label of "practical statecraft."<sup>49</sup> Yamanoi was beginning to see problems in Goto Motomi's attempt to reconcile the differences between Ming and Ch'ing patterns of thought, and he was coming to realize that the real differences between Ming and Ch'ing scholarship could not be overlooked.<sup>50</sup>

Yamanoi argued that the subjective and intuitive elements found in the Yang-ming school had very little to do with Ch'ing evidential research, and it was only in the seventeenth century transition that some

earlier patterns of thought continued to survive. The conclusion Yamanoi reached was that statecraft ideas in the seventeenth century marked the end of Ming philosophy and provided the spark for the subsequent development of a commitment to the broad learning and inductive research that dominated the eighteenth century.<sup>51</sup>

In an effort to pin this thesis down to more concrete terms, Yamanoi wrote two essays, one on Huang Tsung-hsi and the other on Ku Yen-wu.<sup>52</sup> In both he came to the conclusion that seventeenth century intellectuals like Huang and Ku were transitional figures. They were neither intimately involved in Sung-Ming philosophical speculation nor solely committed to the objective and inductive scholarship associated with the Ch'ing period. What united their positions was the urgency of the political, social, and economic decay which accompanied the fall of the Ming dynasty and the Manchu triumph. Men like Huang Tsung-hsi, Ku Yen-wu, and Wang Fu-chih, as Ming loyalists, were committed above all to an attempt to resolve the chaos of their times. Therefore, for Yamanoi, even though such men employed empirical methods in their scholarship, they were more concerned with matters of practical statecraft and improving the society in which they lived.<sup>53</sup> As transitional figures, men like Huang Tsung-hsi and Ku Yen-wu did not reject Ming learning in absolute terms, as Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's thesis would have it, but in fact continued and redirected such connections.

To complete the development of his thesis that the seventeenth century, characterized by statecraft scholarship, was a transition period in Ming-Ch'ing intellectual history, Yamanoi published two essays which summarized his views.<sup>54</sup> In the 1961 essay "Mingaku kara Shingaku e no tenkan" 明學から清學への転換 [The Transition From

Ming Learning to Ch'ing Learning], Yamanoi placed his position in direct opposition to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao's 1920 thesis that Ch'ing learning represented a total rejection of Sung and Ming Tao-hsueh 道學 [Studies of the Tao]. Yamanoi also rejected Ch'ien Mu's attempt to link Ch'ing K'ao-cheng scholarship to the late Ming period.<sup>55</sup> Yamanoi noted that while it was generally recognized that statecraft scholarship flourished in the seventeenth century, no one as yet had pointed to the connection between statecraft methodology and the subsequent rise of K'ao-cheng scholarship. What grew out of the attack on late Ming "left-wing" thought was not evidential research but a period of transition in which statecraft ideas flourished. The growth of the K'ao-cheng movement had to wait for a generation less concerned with the social and political issues that the Ming loyalists were confronted with.<sup>56</sup>

In the 1965 essay "Mumatsu Shinsho shisō ni tsuite no ichi kō-satsu" 明末清初思想に於ての一考察 [An Inquiry into Late Ming and Early Ch'ing Thought], Yamanoi gave his most comprehensive account of the Ming-Ch'ing transition. Couched in cautious language, Yamanoi outlined his three-way division of the Ming-Ch'ing period. There was an initial period that encompassed the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was chiefly marked by commitment to the Yang-ming school and its theories of mind. This was followed in the seventeenth century by a transition period of practical statecraft ideas, and this was in turn succeeded by K'ao-cheng scholarship, which dominated the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in China.<sup>57</sup>

Allowing for exceptions, limitations, and the lack of clear-cut demarcations in his classification, Yamanoi gave ten major areas of intellectual concern in Confucian scholarship and analyzed how differently

these concerns were manifested in the three periods that made up the Ming-Ch'ing transition. From his original discussion of the development of a philosophy of material force (which became one of the ten fields of concern which Yamanoi employed), Yamanoi's research now carried over into the entire range of Confucian thought from the middle of the Ming dynasty to the end of the Ch'ing.<sup>58</sup>

In the latter essay, Yamanoi also discussed the reasons for the changes that he had found.<sup>59</sup> In the first place, he linked the changes in ideas to changes in political and economic conditions. He pointed to the possible connections between the rise of elements of capitalism in late Ming society and the concurrent rise of materialism in an emerging urban class. This social and economic background coincided with Yamanoi's emphasis on the rise of a philosophy of material force that would tend to be linked with an urban-oriented society.<sup>60</sup> Also mentioned was the influence of Jesuit missionaries in the late Ming and early Ch'ing periods. Although unable to demonstrate the link, Yamanoi indicated that the Jesuit transmission of European astronomy and mathematics to China may have influenced the rise of inductive research methods in textual analysis.<sup>61</sup>

Factors internal to the history of Chinese thought were also considered. Yamanoi proposed the possibility that the subjective elements which constituted Sung and Ming philosophy may have run their course and that an emphasis on objective, empirical criteria for knowledge had been an inevitable development.<sup>62</sup> What set off the reversal, however, was the fall of the Ming and the added psychological blow of the empire's falling into the hands of a foreign army. This forced Chinese intellectuals to come to grips with political and social issues, which in turn produced an emphasis on statecraft studies. With the subsequent rise of a period

162

of strict intellectual control and a return to social normalcy, the mid-century concern with social and political matters fell by the wayside, leaving only K'ao-cheng scholarship in its wake.

In conclusion, Yamanoi argued that the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries represented a transition from feudal to modern ideas, although he left open the possibility for including the mid-Ming period (which Shimada Kenji had already called "modern") as well. 63

Yamanoi's tendency to see a break between Ming and Ch'ing scholarship, albeit not a sharply demarcated one, has elicited criticism from Japanese scholars. Yamashita Ryūji has pointed out that Yamanoi painted an overly subjectivistic picture of Ming philosophy, thereby missing a great deal of the social and political concern and commitment found in the Yang-ming school. 64

In the same vein, Sano Kōzī 佐野公治 has held that, despite the Ming emphasis on moral cultivation and theories of mind, it cannot be argued that Ming intellectuals lacked a concern for political and social affairs. This kind of commitment was closely tied to the process of moral cultivation itself. 65 Sano in addition has disputed Yamanoi's claim that the social upheaval that accompanied the fall of the Ming was responsible for the rise of a commitment to statecraft studies. This was an insufficient argument, according to Sano, both because it presumed the lack of such a concern in the Ming and because such a phenomenon had not occurred after the fall of the Sung dynasty in the thirteenth century when the Mongol army invaded and conquered the empire. Given the same external factors for the fall of the Sung and Ming dynasties, why was it that Yuan scholars continued Sung scholarship, whereas Ch'ing scholars repudiated the Ming? The issue was not so easily resolved. 66 Like Goto Motomi

years before, Sano contends that Ch'ing scholars picked up from and completed currents of thought already in evidence in the Ming. The Wang Yang-ming school provided the preconditions for the formation of early Ch'ing thought. 67

Sakai Tadao 酒井忠夫, in an essay in which he acknowledged Yamanoi Yū's work, argued that although K'ao-cheng scholarship was dominant in the Ch'ing dynasty, it had its roots in the Ming. 68 Concentrating on the appearance of large numbers of popular encyclopedias (類書) oriented to all levels of Ming society, Sakai has been able to document the extraordinary rise in Ming publication of reference works keyed to the examination system that occurred in the midst of a K'ao-cheng-like atmosphere of scholarship and interest in the practical arts. 69 Whereas Sakai agreed with Yamanoi's thesis that the seventeenth century was a transition period, he did not follow Yamanoi on the K'ao-cheng question.

Although they disagree with important parts of Yamanoi Yū's thesis, it is clear that Yamashita Ryūji, Sano Kōzī, Shimada Kenji, and Sakai Tadao all regard Yamanoi's contributions as important to their own work and significant in the development of the Japanese understanding of the Ming-Ch'ing intellectual transition. It is therefore unfortunate that Yamanoi's and their work, for the most part, has not received the recognition it deserves in western scholarship. 70



FOOTNOTES

1. This summary of selected Japanese scholarship does not presume to encompass all aspects of Japanese work on the questions that will be discussed below and is meant to serve only as introductory remarks for interested readers. For the most comprehensive listing of Japanese scholarship on the Ming and Ch'ing intellectual transition to date, see Chūgoku shisō shūkyō bunka kankei jombun mokuroku 中国思想宗敎文化關係録 (Catalogue of Essays Related to Chinese Thought, Religion, and Culture) (Tokyo: Kokusho kanokukai, 1976). See also the catalogue compiled by the Tokyo University Chinese Philosophy Department, entitled Gen-Min-Shindai shisō kenkyū bunken mokuroku 元明清代思想研究文献目録 (Catalogue of Research Materials on Yuan, Ming, and Ch'ing Dynasty Thought) (Tokyo: Tokyo Univ. Chinese Philosophy Dept., 1967). My discussion is based on research I completed in Japan from 1977-78 relating to my dissertation topic. While in Japan I was fortunate enough to work with Professor Yamanoi Yū, director of the Tokyo University Chinese Philosophy Department. I was also able to discuss many of the issues involved in Japanese approaches to Ch'ing intellectual problems with Hamaguchi Fujio of Daitō Bunka University. Without their help and guidance, my understanding of the development of Japanese scholarship on Ming-Ch'ing intellectual history and the key issues of debate would never have gotten very far. Thanks are also due to Professors Delmer Brown and Takagi Kiyoko of the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo for their help and understanding.
2. East Asia. The Great Tradition by Edwin O. Reischauer and John K. Fairbank (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960), pp. 183-88.
3. See Robert Hartwell, "Financial Expertise, Examinations, and the Formulation of Economic Policy" in Journal of Asian Studies, 30, 2 (Feb. 1971): 281-314 and "Historical Analogism, Public Policy, and Social Science in Eleventh and Twelfth-Century China" in American Historical Review, 76 (1971): 690-727. See also Mark Elvin's controversial The Pattern of the Chinese Past (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1973), pp. 113-99.

4. See Naitō, Shina shigakushi 支那史學史 [History of Chinese Historiography] in Naitō Konan zenshū (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1969-74, 13 vols.), 11, passim. See also Naitō's Shinchōshi tōron 清朝史通論 [Outline of Ch'ing Dynasty History] in Naitō Konan zenshū, 8, passim. Sakai Tadao 河井忠夫 points out that Japanese scholars themselves have at times mistakenly assumed that if a study was not socio-economic it was not historical. See "Chūgokushi jō yori mira Min-Shin jidai" 中国史上よりみる明清時代 [The Ming-Ch'ing Period Seen From the Standpoint of Chinese History] in Rekishū kyōiku 歴史教育, 12, 9 (1964): 8.
5. See the discussion in Yamashita Ryūji 山下青鳥二, Yōmeigaku no kenryū (10) : seiritstu hen 陽明学の研究(上) 成文篇 [Studies of Yang-ming Learning (I): The Formation] (Tokyo: Genrai jōdōsha, 1971), p. 12. Pages 3-24 of this important book are entitled "How Has the Study of Chinese Thought Developed?"
6. Ibid., pp. 12-13, 14, 15.
7. Shimada Kenji, Chūgoku ni okeru kindai shii no zassetsu (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1970), p. 1.
8. Ibid., pp. 1-3.
9. For more on this, see Okada Takehiko 岡田武彦, "Mindai shisō no dōkō" 明代思想の動向 [Tendencies in Ming Dynasty Thought] in Teoria 才力, 10 (1966): 111-26.
10. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku no kenryū, pp. 111-12. Pages 108-123 of this book discuss post-war Japanese and Chinese approaches to Chinese thought. Cf. Wm. Theodore de Bary, "Individualism and Humanitarianism in Late Ming Thought," in Self and Society in Ming Thought by de Bary and others (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 145-46.
11. Shimada, Chūgoku ni okeru kindai shii no zassetsu pp. 4-5. Cf. de Bary, "Neo-Confucian Cultivation and the Seventeenth-Century 'Enlightenment,'" in The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism by de Bary and others (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1975), p. 190. See also Okada Takehiko, "Mindai shisō no dōkō," pp. 116-18.
12. Shimada, p. 5.

164

13. Note that the major theme of the recent The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism takes this perspective as its starting point. See especially de Bary, "Introduction," pp. 4-5.

14. For a summary of this exchange, see Murayama Yoshihiro 村山吉廣, "Mingaku kara Shingaku e (1) -- kenkyūshi ni yoru tenbō" 明學から清學へ(1)一研究史に於る展望 [From Ming Learning to Ch'ing Learning (1) -- Prospects for Development Based on the History of Research] in Chūgoku koten kenkyū 中国古典研究, 12 (1964): 16-18.

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-18.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 18

17. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, p. 112.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 116-20. See also Sano Kōzi's 佐野公治criticism of Shimada's discussion of Huang Tsung-hsi in which Shimada describes Huang as the "Rousseau of China." This can be found in "Shinsio shisō kenkyū no genjō to mondaiten" 清初思想研究の現状之問題点 [The Present State and Points of Inquiry in Research on Early Ch'ing Thought] in Chūkyō daigaku kyōyō ronsō 中京大学教養論叢, 7 (1966): 147-49.

19. Shimada, pp. 328-31.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 329.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.*, p. 331.

24. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 14-15.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

27. Masao Maruyama, Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1974), pp. 3-6.

28. Nomura Kōichi, "Shimatsu kyōgaku no keisei to kō yūi gaku no reki-shiteki igi (1)" 清末公羊學派の形成と康有為の歴史の意義(一) [Formation of the Late Ch'ing Kung-yang School and K'ang

Yu-wei's Historical Significance (1)] in Kokka gakkai zasshi 国家学芸雑誌, 71, 7 (July 1957): 1-8. Cf. Max Weber, The Religion of China translated by Hans Gerth (New York: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 226-49.

29. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 16-17.

30. It is interesting that, in refuting the theory of stagnancy, Yamashita comes very close to Shimada's position on the Chinese tradition.

31. My thanks to Bin Wong and Peter Perdue of Harvard University for pointing out to me the importance of Tanaka's work for Ch'ing intellectual history.

32. Tanaka, Chūgoku kindai keizaiishi kenkyū josetsu 中国近代経済史研究序説 [Introduction to Research on Chinese Modern Economic History] (Tokyo: Tokyo Univ. Press, 1973), pp. 7-8.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-10.

34. See Sakai Tadao, "Chūgokushi jō yori mita Min-shin jidai," pp. 1-10. This approach is based on Chinese Marxist research. See for example, Shang Yueh 尚銳, Chung-kuo tsu-pen ch'u-i kuan-hsi fa-sheng chi Yen-pien te ch'u-pu yen-chiu 中国資本主義発生及演变的初步研究 [Preliminary Studies of the Appearance and Development Related to Chinese Capitalism] (Peking: San-lien shu-tien, 1956) and Fu I-ling 傅友凌 Ming-tai Chiang-nan shih-min ching-chi shih-tan 明代江南市民經濟試探 [Examination of the Chiang-nan Urban Economy in the Ming Dynasty] (Shanghai: Jen-min ch'u-pan-she, 1957).

35. Murayama, "Mingaku kara Shingaku e," p. 18

36. *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16. Goto's essay can be found in Kangakukai zasshi 康學會雜誌, 10, 2 (Oct. 1942): 69-102.

37. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 110-11. See also Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, Intellectual Trends in the Ch'ing Period translated by Immanuel Hsu (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959), pp. 27-28. Cf. Edward T. Ch'ien, "Chiao Hung and the Revolt Against Ch'eng-Chu Orthodoxy," in The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism, pp. 271-76 for a parallel although much later formulation of this thesis.

38. Yamanoi, "Min-shin jidai ni okeru 'ki' no tetsugaku" 明清時代に

おける儒の哲學 [The Philosophy of Material Force in the Ming-Ch'ing Periods] in Tetsugaku zasshi, 哲學叢誌 711 (1951): 82-103. See also Yamanoi's account in the recently published Ki no shisō 克の思想 [Material Force Thought] edited by Onozawa Seichi, 小野沢精一 and others (Tokyo: Tokyo Univ. Press, 1978), pp. 473-89.

39. Yamanoi, "Ki' no tetsugaku," pp. 94-95.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 100. Cf. de Bary, "Neo-Confucian Cultivation and the Seventeenth-Century 'Enlightenment'," in The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism, pp. 194-204. Professor de Bary writes in terms of what he calls "Neo-Confucian vitalism."
41. Sano Kozi, "Shinsho shisō kenkyū," pp. 149-50.
42. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 113-14. Cf. de Bary, "Introduction," in Self and Society in Ming Thought, p. 24.
43. Yamashita, p. 114.
44. Shimada, Shushigaku to Yōmeigaku 朱子学と陽明学 [Chu Hsi Learning and Wang Yang-ming Learning] (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1967), pp. 146, 159 n. 11.
45. A recurring topic in Yamanoi's essays, which will not be discussed below, is the importance Yamanoi attaches to Tai Chen as a Ch'ing philosopher and social critic. This appears in many of Yamanoi's articles, but is best summarized in the essay entitled "Yōshi jūji soshō no seikaku" 孟字考 著疏證の性格 (The Nature of (Tai Chen's) Meng-tzu tsu-i shu-cheng) in Nihon Chūgoku gakkai hō 日本中国學會報, 12 (1960): 108-26.
46. See Rekishū kyōjū 歴史教育, 2, 11 (1954): 82-88.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
48. *Ibid.*, pp. 87-88.
49. See Tōhōgaku ronshū 東方学論集, 1 (Feb. 1954): 136-50.
50. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 114-15.
51. Yamanoi, "Mimamatsu Shinsho ni okeru keisei chiyo no gaku," p. 136.
52. Yamanoi, "Kō sōgi no gakumon -- Mingaku kara Shingaku e no ichi yōsō --" 黄宗羲の學問——明學から清學への移行の一

様相 [Huang Tsung-hsi's Scholarship -- An Example of the Shift From Ming Learning to Ch'ing Learning] in Tōkyō Shingaku hō 東京支那学報, 3 (1957): 31-50 and "Kō Embu no gakumon kan --" Mingaku kara Shingaku e no tenkan' no kanten kara --" 顧炎武の學問観——明學から清學への転換の観点から [Ku Yen-wu's Scholarship Position -- A Perspective From 'the Transition From Ming Learning to Ch'ing Learning'] in Chūō daigaku bungakubu kiyō 中央大学文学部紀要, 35 (1964): 67-93.

53. Yamanoi, "Kō sōgi," pp. 48-50 and "Kō Embu," pp. 81-90.
54. See Shobō 書報 41 (1961): 12-19 for the first and Tōkyō Shingaku hō 東京支那学報 11 (1965): 37-54 for the second. The latter is more readily available.
55. Yamanoi, "Mingaku kara Shingaku e no tenkan," pp. 12, 19. Cf. Edward T. Ch'ien, "Chiao Hung and the Revolt Against Ch'eng-Chu Orthodoxy," pp. 272-75.
56. Yamanoi, "Mingaku kara Shingaku e no tenkan," p. 16.
57. Yamanoi, "Mimamatsu Shinsho shisō ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu," p. 39.
58. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-50.
59. *Ibid.*, pp. 52-54.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
61. *Ibid.* Note that Nathan Sivin suggests the same link with far more detail and precision in his biography of Wang Hsi-shan in the Dictionary of Scientific Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), 14, pp. 163-65. Cf. Willard J. Peterson, "Fang I-chih: Western Learning and the Investigation of Things," in The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism, pp. 400-01.
62. Yamanoi, "Mimamatsu Shinsho shisō ni tsuite no ichi kōsatsu," pp. 52-53. King-shih Yü gives a much more significant account of this in his focus on the movement from Sung-Ming anti-intellectualism to Ch'ing intellectualism in his recent research. See "Some Preliminary Observations on the Rise of Ch'ing Confucian Intellectualism," in Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies, 11 (1975): 105-46.
63. Yamanoi, "Mimamatsu Shinsho," p. 54. It is interesting that in their

most recent research Yamanoi and Shimada have begun working in each other's time periods, Yamanoi publishing on Sung and Ming thought and Shimada moving into Ch'ing intellectual history. For examples see Yamanoi, "SC-Min no tetsugaku ni okeru 'sei sumawachi ri' to 'shin sumawachi ri'" 宋明の哲学に於ける性即理と心即理の二つの理論 [The theories of] 'Nature equals principle' and 'Mind equals principle' in Sung and Ming Philosophy] in Bunka 文化 (Komazawa daigaku), 3 (March 1977): 1-30 and Shimada, "Chō Gakusei no ichi" 章學誠の位置 [Chang Hsueh-ch'eng's Position] in Tōhōgaku hō 東方學報 (Kyoto Univ.), 41 (March 1970): 519-30. Yamanoi's and Shimada's positions may in some ways be a continuation of the traditional rivalry between Kyoto University and Tokyo University in Japanese academics.

- 64. Yamashita, Yōmeigaku, pp. 114-15.
- 65. Sano Kozi, "Shinsho shisō," p. 154.
- 66. Ibid., pp. 154-55.
- 67. Ibid., pp. 155-58.
- 68. Sakai Tadao, "Shindai kōshōgaku no genryū" 清代考証学の源流 [Origins of Ch'ing Dynasty Evidential Research Scholarship] in Rekishū kyōiku 歴史教育, 5, 11 (1957): 28-34. See also Sakai's article entitled "Confucianism and Popular Education Works," in Self and Society in Ming Thought, pp. 331-66.
- 69. Sakai, "Shindai kōshōgaku no genryū," pp. 32-34.
- 70. The work of Professor de Bary is an important exception to this.

WEI YUAN AND IMAGES OF THE NAN-YANG (南洋)

Jane Kate Leonard  
Associate Professor of History  
Kean College of New Jersey

- 1. The Treatise on the sea kingdoms and the Chinese geographical tradition
- 2. A statecraft approach to geographical writing
- 3. The structure of the Treatise
- 4. Chinese sources and images of the Nan-yang

Conclusions  
Notes

Wei Yuan's Treatise on the sea kingdoms (Hal-kuo t'ü-chih 海國圖志) has been the object of scholarly attention as one of China's first responses to the West during China's initial clash with the British during the First Opium War. Emphasis has been placed on Wei's geographical description of the West and on his use of Western sources, both of which are generally seen as evidence of the impact of the West.<sup>1</sup> While it is quite true that Western sources were used in the text and this contributed to the expansion of Chinese geographical knowledge of the West, this Western information did not significantly alter Wei Yuan's view of the maritime tributary order nor the nature of the maritime world. Moreover,