

**THE ADOPTION AND ADAPTATION
OF NEO-CONFUCIANISM
IN JAPAN:
THE ROLE OF FUJIWARA SEIKA
AND HAYASHI RAZAN**

BY

W.J. BOOT

>>> VERSION 3.0 <<<

© W.J. Boot, Leiderdorp
Printed: Leiden, December 1992
Revised: Leiderdorp, August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	1
INTRODUCTION	2
 CHAPTER I : THEORIES AND CONTENTIONS CONCERNING THE RISE OF NEO-CONFUCIANISM IN THE BEGINNING OF THE EDO PERIOD	 13
A. The discovery of Confucianism	14
1. Fujiwara Seika and Kang Hang	14
2. The Seika Legend	35
B. The Line of Succession	49
Kan Tokuan	49
Nawa Kassho	51
Hori Kyōan	53
Matsunaga Sekigo	53
Hayashi Razan	56
 CHAPTER II : THE SOURCES OF THE NEW CONFUCIANISM	 69
A. The Middle Ages	69
1. <i>Shōmono</i>	70
<i>Daxüe</i>	72
<i>Zhongyong</i>	74
<i>Lunyu</i>	76
<i>Mengzi</i>	78
2. Printed works	81
3. Evaluation	83

4.	Conclusions	95
B.	The Bunroku–Keichō Period (1592–1614)	98
1.	Korean influences	99
	Conclusions	117
2.	The education of Razan	119
3.	Evaluation and conclusions	131
CHAPTER III : THE DOCTRINES		138
A.	Fujiwara Seika	142
1.	The doctrine	146
2.	Conclusions	167
B.	Hayashi Razan	174
1.	The Doctrine	175
2.	Conclusions	203
APPENDIX : On <i>Qi</i>		212
APPENDIX : On <i>Ling</i>		215
CHAPTER IV : CONFUCIANISM AND THE BAKUFU		220
Nakae Tōju		250
Serving the bakufu		260
Conclusions		290
BIBLIOGRAPHY		302

PREFACE

This is a new version of the text of the dissertation I defended in Leiden on January 19, 1983. Over the last few years I have retyped the original text, because the original version, composed on an Apple-II, proved to be unusable and inconvertible. My intention was to retype the text as it was originally published, but this turned out to be impossible. I could not refrain from changing the wording and correcting the more egregious mistakes, and from taking into account some books that appeared after I have finished the original. This explains the intrusion of references to works that were published in 1982 or later, e.g. the translation of *Kanyangnok* that appeared in the Tōyō Bunko and Gernet's *Chine et Christianisme*. Basically, however, the text is the same as that of the original dissertation.

I have decided to make the text available in this form, first, because I intend to make a thorough revision of the whole book, taking into account the recent publications of Herman Ooms and Watanabe Hiroshi, to name only a few of the studies that have appeared in recent years, and rechecking all the translations and references. The second reason is that every now and then colleagues ask me for a copy of the original publication. Since at the time I had only 150 copies printed, these can no longer be obtained. Making the text available in this form is the next best thing, until I have completed the second revised edition.

Leiden, December 1992

On the occasion of this digital publication of my thesis I have again made a number of corrections. Perfection is only approached asymptotically. I have also changed the Chinese transcription from Wade-Giles to *Pinyin*, and turned the endnotes into footnotes. The characters are provided at the first occasion when a name or title appear, or, when appropriate, in the bibliography. As the document can be searched, the index could be dispensed with, together with the references to the original edition. This digital edition should therefore be regarded as Version 3.0.

Leiderdorp, August 2013

INTRODUCTION

The present book is structured around the proposition, a well-known and ancient one, that Neo-Confucianism in Japan began with Fujiwara Seika, that Hayashi Razan was Seika's most important disciple, and that Razan was hired by the *bakufu* as its Confucian ideologist. I am well aware that the status of this proposition, at least amongst specialist in the field, is rather low, and that in recent years several scholars have queried or disproved parts of it.¹ However, the proposition offers an interesting and, in my opinion, valid angle of approach for the study of the first beginnings of Neo-Confucianism in Japan, and of its proponents Seika and Razan.

The main interest of the proposition is that it offers — or pretends to offer — a solution for three problems that must be settled before one can embark on further studies of the intellectual history of the Tokugawa period. These problems concern the time of the introduction of Neo-Confucianism, the nature of the Neo-Confucianism that was introduced, and the way in which it functioned in its social and political context.

According to the proposition Neo-Confucianism began with Fujiwara Seika. As it is commonly understood, this means the Neo-Confucianism was introduced in the last decade of the sixteenth or the first of the seventeenth century. Both during the Edo period and later many scholar have tried to explain “why this should be so.” Their explanations fall into two main categories, one of which is the availability of new sources

¹ For details, cf. Ch. I, n. 1. Here I will confine myself to one quotation, from an article by Ishida Ichirō (“Tokugawa hōken shakai to Shushi-gakuha no shisō,” 1962), that gives the proposition more or less in full: In the beginning of the Tokugawa period Confucianism, or, more specifically, the schools of Zhu Xi and Wang Yangming, tried to take over the role of a theology (*shingaku*) in the formation and preservation of the new feudal society, instead of creeds like Buddhism, “Tentō,” or Christianity. However, it seems that the school of Wang Yangming could not faithfully discharge the role that the new feudal order required of it. ... It is a historical fact, deserving our attention, that, on the other hand, ever since the beginning of the *bakufu*, the school of Zhu Xi worked loyally in support of the policies of the *bakufu* and the fiefs.

Tokugawa Ieyasu first invited Fujiwara Seika. Seika had originally been a monk of the Five Monasteries, but after he had come into contact with Keian's Japanese explanation of the commentaries of Zhu Xi he had immersed himself in the study of Zhu Xi's teachings. Eventually he had returned to the lay-state, and he exerted himself to liberate Zhu Xi-ism from Buddhism. Subsequently Ieyasu appointed Seika's disciple Hayashi Razan, and put him in charge of civil affairs (*bunji wo tsukasadorashimeta*) (pp. 72–73).

We may not overlook, that in their essence the teachings of Zhu Xi-ism agreed with the structure and spirit of the feudal system of the Edo period and supported it. By its very nature, a feudal system demands intellectual uniformity. But this certainly does not mean that it is a matter of indifference, which “thought” becomes the standard of unification. The fact that one teaching, over such a long period of time, became interwoven so deeply with all areas of life, cannot have been the result of a fortuitous union; it must have been due to mutual sympathy and response (*ibid.*, p. 75).

(i.e. “books from China”), and the other, the establishment of the Tokugawa realm of peace.

The first explanation we find mentioned several times in Edo sources, and has recently been greatly developed by Abe Yoshio.² In his theory Abe emphasizes the sudden availability of Korean (not Chinese) books, and argues that the rise of Neo-Confucian studies was linked causally to the introduction of Korean Neo-Confucian works into Japan as a result of the invasions of Korea that took place in the 1590's. Abe's theory is discussed in Chapter II.B of this study; for the reasons stated there, I cannot consider his theory as proven or even as plausible, though it might be allowed to live on in an attenuated form, i.e. that a number of Korean Neo-Confucian works were brought to Japan in these years, that Seika and Razan had read these works, and that they had some knowledge of Korean Neo-Confucian debate during the Yi Dynasty.

The other explanation, which considers the rise of Neo-Confucian studies in relation to the establishment of the Tokugawa *bakufu*, has always enjoyed great popularity. In the older Edo sources (introduced in the second part of Chapter I) it generally took the form of the assertion that the peace brought by the Tokugawa had been responsible for a flourishing of the literary arts, and therefore of Neo-Confucian studies. In consideration of the fact that one of the Neo-Confucian patriarchs, Hayashi Razan, had been employed by the *bakufu*, it was further developed into the assertion that the *bakufu* had taken a positive interest in Neo-Confucianism and used it to establish its rule of peace. This development of the original assertion in its turn led to the idea, postulated by some modern scholars (e.g. Ishida Ichirō and Maruyama Masao), that a “compatibility” existed between Neo-Confucianism and the social and political structure of Tokugawa Japan.

Such a “compatibility,” however, did not exist. The feudal society that developed in Japan was quite different from that of China, both the contemporary China and that of Zhou or Song times. The other argument, namely that Neo-Confucianism was “used” because it favours the preservation of the *status quo*, is also not valid. Neo-Confucianism is primarily concerned with the ends and means of individual self-cultivation, and its most important political demand is that administrative offices be filled with those who have succeeded in cultivating themselves. Depending on the circumstances, this can

² See especially his *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen* (1965).

become a highly explosive doctrine.

Such essentially egalitarian demands stood not the slightest chance of being met in feudal Japan, where every office tended to become hereditary, and where no amount of education or self-cultivation would ever help one to cross the social barriers laid down by birth and family affiliation.

The only way, therefore, for Neo-Confucian thinkers to fulfil at least part of their objective was to educate those who were born to fill the offices of power. In this they succeeded to some extent by introducing Neo-Confucianism as part of the basic curriculum for the higher classes: the ability to write Chinese poems was a prized accomplishment, and everyone who wanted to learn how to write them, first had to read the Confucian Classics. The only problem with this “scheme” was, that the nearer one got to the top of the hierarchy, to the *daimyō* and the *shōgun*, the less important such important intellectual accomplishments became. Such persons could not be educated, but only lectured to, at give times, at ceremonial occasions, and when their underlings for some reason thought it necessary.

This pattern of frustration, this necessary marginality of Neo-Confucian studies, the reader will find described in Chapter IV, where Razan’s career with the *bakufu* is described.

Not only did the supposed “compatibility” not exist, the *bakufu* as such took no positive interest in Neo-Confucian studies, either. Perusal of the chapter “*kangaku no igi*” in Bitō Masahide’s *Nihon hōken shisōshi kenkyū* will make this clear. What remains, therefore, is the assertion that the establishment of peace brought about the flourishing of the literary arts, and that Neo-Confucianism was part and parcel of these literary arts. Here, I think, lies the true explanation. As I argue at the end of Chapter II, social and economic circumstances that came about in the Azuchi-Momoyama period created a “market” for intellectuals, and gave them an, always precarious, basis of existence outside the old court schools or the Buddhist church. Interesting side-lights on this intellectual milieu, as it existed in the first years of the seventeenth century, are offered by the glimpses we get through Razan’s and Seika’s letters, or through writings like Matsunaga Teitoku’s *Taionki* (cf. Chapter II.B).

This development was new. However, it remained a development; it was not a fundamental revolution. The prized polite arts (the ability to express oneself through the medium of Japanese and Chinese poetry; the tea-ceremony) remained the same. The

Confucian Classics, the basis of Neo-Confucian education, had also been the basis of education during the Middle Ages. Razan or Seika lecturing to *daimyō* or *shōgun* are not much different from the Kiyohara or the Zen priests who travelled through the country to lecture on the identical classics to, admittedly rather different, *daimyō* and *shōgun*. The question obtrudes itself, whether the supposedly new Neo-Confucianism was not, also as regards its contents, a continuation of the medieval Confucian studies.

These matters are discussed, and the relevant materials and theories reviewed, in Chapter II.A. The conclusion is that most of the essential Neo-Confucian works and commentaries were already known, that the study of Confucianism with the aid of these Neo-Confucian commentaries had reached a high level of sophistication, especially within the Kiyohara family, and that the form of Seika's and Razan's written works very much resembles that of the writings, the so-called *shōmono*, of the Kiyohara. Taken in conjunction with the fact that both Seika and Razan had contacts with the Kiyohara, and that works of Kiyohara origin or inspiration were still being compiled and printed until the second half of the seventeenth century, these are interesting findings. They prove that a great deal of continuity existed (at least in this field) from the Middle Ages to the modern period, and that an influx of Chinese or Korean books was not in any way a necessary precondition for the rise of Neo-Confucian studies. The materials and the interest were there already. The findings also suggest that the proponents of Neo-Confucianism had to contend for several decades with other schools, which could claim to be continuing an older tradition.

The evident interest Razan evinced in Shintō studies points the same direction. The Kiyohara were intermarried with the Yoshida, the family that hereditarily headed the Yoshida shrine in Kyoto. Attempts at "unifying" Shintō and Confucianism, and at understanding the one in terms of the other already had a long standing in these circles. In many respects Razan continued this tradition. (I must add, however, that Seika seems to have been less keenly interested in Shintō studies.)

In other, words, the differences between the Middle Ages and the Tokugawa period seem to be the result of evolutionary, rather than of revolutionary developments. Why, then, was the claim made that Neo-Confucianism began with Seika?

This problem is discussed in Chapters II and III, from different angles. In chapter I, the main points under discussion are Seika's conversion to Confucianism and the nature of his relations with his disciples. Both matters hinge, in turn, on the

interpretation of biographical writings. The first problem is that Seika seems to have made the claim that he originated Neo-Confucianism independently, only once. This was in a written communication to a Korean prisoner-of-war, Kang Hang, dating from 1598 or 1599. The claim is reiterated several times in writings of Hang that he composed in order to praise Seika, and it is given a prominent place in Seika's necrology, the *Seika-sensei gyōjō*, which Razan wrote in 1620, the year after Seika's death. The claim contains two elements: (1) Up till Seika's days all Japanese Confucian studies had been based on the old Han commentaries and Tang sub-commentaries; (2) Seika had realised the truth of the Neo-Confucian teachings of the Song philosophers, and he had done so through reading "the books," not through the instruction of any living person.

The problem is how to understand this claim. Did Seika make it in relation to his celebrated project of making a complete edition of the Confucian Classics according to the Neo-Confucian interpretations? Then his claim is understandable. Text editions of the Classics according to the new commentaries hardly existed in Japan, and the Kiyohara, who as the old *myōgyō-ke* had a tradition to uphold, had never attempted to make one. Seika's project marked a new departure, though it was not quite as unprecedented as he made out and others, e.g. the Zen priest Bunshi from Satsuma were engaged in similar projects. The other element of his claim, namely that "from his youth he never had a teacher," is also understandable, though again not literally true. Seika, of course, had had many teachers, but even if he had wanted to do so, there did not exist an identifiable, established tradition from which he could have claimed descent.

Whatever Seika's motives were, Razan decided to take Seika's claim and Kang Hang's panegyrics literally. And he relates them, not to Seika's project of editing the Classics according to the new commentaries, but to Seika's conversion from Buddhism to Confucianism, which took place several years before Seika met Kang Hang. A few added touches, many of them taken over from Kang Hang's writings, were sufficient to turn Seika into someone rather resembling the Neo-Confucian patriarchs of the Song. And Razan was not the only one to do so. We find the same tendency in writings related to other disciples of Seika.

From their perspective they were right to do so. Traditions were important. The "transmission of the Way" was an important concept within Neo-Confucianism. It presupposed a handing-down of the truth from master to disciple, and the only recognised gap in this tradition was the interval from Mencius to Zhou Dunyi, who had

rediscovered the tradition in the “books that had been left. “ Since neither Seika nor Razan could claim to have received the truths from a recognised Chinese master, they had to use the same dodge again. Moreover, traditions were rife in Japan. There existed secret traditions for *waka*, for the interpretation of the *Genji monogatari*, for music, for the Classics, for the *Nihon shoki*. To be called “someone without a tradition” labelled one as an unreliable upstart.

I do not know whether this was a problem to Seika. If it was, he had no way of circumventing it. He could only grin and bear it. But his disciples could get around the difficulty, if Seika were raised to a sufficiently exalted status. So they, and especially his official biographer, Razan, proceeded to exalt him, calling as their witness Kang Hang and stressing the comparison with the Masters of the Song.

In the first Chapter I have shown how this was done, and indicated what, in the opinion of the biographers of Seika's disciples Razan and Matsunaga Sekigo, apparently constituted proof of such a master-disciple relationship.

The presumption is that such a relationship implied that the disciple continued the master's doctrine. The only disciple of Seika who has left philosophical writings of any length and depth is Hayashi Razan. Therefore, if one wants to check the validity of this presumption in the case at hand, one has to make a comparison of the “thought,” the “doctrines” of Seika and Razan. This is what I have attempted to do in Chapter III. My, not very surprising, conclusion is that appreciable differences exist between the two. From his doctrines one would never have guessed that Razan was a disciple of Seika.

If we now return to the original proposition, we see that in all respects it has to be attenuated, rephrased, or discarded. Neo-Confucianism did not start suddenly in 1600. It was the result of a much more gradual development of existing interests and traditions. Its rise was part of a general revitalisation of intellectual life. Hayashi Razan was not Seika's disciple in the ordinary sense, i.e. that he had studied at Seika's school, had been imbued with his doctrines, and had continued to preach these. The relationship sprung from the mutual needs the two had for each other: Razan was looking for someone to head his cause, and Seika for someone who could share his many-sided intellectual interests. Naturally, in view of the difference in ages, Seika became the *sensei*. But precisely in matters of Confucian doctrine they never saw eye to eye. The idea that Seika was the first patriarch of Japanese Neo-Confucianism was

launched by Razan, elaborated by his sons, and adopted by the biographer of Matsunaga Sekigo.

Lastly, the *bakufu* was not interested in Neo-Confucianism nor did it hire Razan as its Neo-Confucian ideologist. The tasks Razan fulfilled with the *bakufu* were many and varied, but hardly any of them can be considered as Confucian. Others criticised him because of this, and he himself admitted it.

From these results a number of methodological and programmatic consequences follow:

1. The *shōmono*, i.e. the medieval exegetical writings on the Confucian Classics, should also be studied for their doctrinal contents.
2. From the beginning Neo-Confucian studies in Japan were carried out in conjunction with studies of Shintō. One cannot consider the one without the other.
3. In the study of Neo-Confucianism due attention must be given to the fact the Neo-Confucianism and its representatives were, socially speaking, marginal. In fact, a better case could be made for the importance of Buddhism in shaping Edo society or the *bakufu*'s policies than for the importance of Confucianism.
4. If one's aim is to establish that the *bakufu* "used" Neo-Confucianism to legitimise its rule and to shape its policies, one will have to prove this through its edicts, laws and regulations, as well as through the recorded judicial decisions of the *bakufu* authorities.
5. Neo-Confucianism should be considered as a part of the wider field of "Chinese studies," *Kangaku*; most of its proponents were appreciated, employed, and paid on account of their knowledge of Chinese, rather than because of their Neo-Confucian convictions.³
6. The arbitrary distinction between a "medieval" period, characterised by the ascendancy of Buddhism, and a "modern" Confucian Edo period must be done away with. It is rather the continuative aspects that should be given attention in research.

³ This is one of the points that are made by Kate Wildman Nakai in her interesting article "The naturalization of Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan: the problem of Sinocentrism" (1980). One of the other points she makes, namely that the Tokugawa Confucians found it difficult to function with their foreign creed in contemporary Japanese society, is of relevance to our point 3.

In the title of this book it is promised that its subject will be the adoption and adaptation of Neo-Confucianism. From the foregoing discussion it will have become clear that adoption by the bakufu is not what I have in mind. A systematic adoption by the bakufu never took place. At the most one can speak of a continued protection of the Hayashi and their school, which was intensified periodically, e.g. during the reign of Tsunayoshi or under the regime of Matsudaira Sadanobu, when the *bakufu* took the unprecedented (and never repeated) step of trying to organise Neo-Confucian studies. On the other hand, Neo-Confucianism was adopted by the intellectuals. In the Edo period it comes increasingly to the fore, but already during the Middle Ages it had found many students. It had penetrated into intellectual debate, very strongly in connection with Shintō and, to a lesser extent, with Buddhism. It had become the major source of inspiration for the interpretation of the Classics, which were the basic curriculum for all higher education. Thus it became part of the intellectual background of the Muromachi period, and permeated into e.g. the "house instructions" (*kakun*) of the warrior class.

What we see in the Edo Period is, on the one hand, a growing specialisation and, on the other, a further diffusion of Neo-Confucian studies. Specialisation, as it occurred particularly in the *Kogaku-ha*, tended to dissolve Confucian studies more and more into the wider field of *Kangaku*, Chinese philology. But at the same time knowledge of Neo-Confucianism diffused through all layers of the population, and became an important part of the moral education of society at large: an insistent stressing of Loyalty and Duty, defined in terms of the Five Human Relations and of the Four Classes into which society was deemed divided.

Adaptations of course occurred at all stages. Explanations of Neo-Confucianism with help of Shintō or Buddhist concepts altered the way in which the Japanese understood it. The stress on the *xinfa* aspect of Neo-Confucianism rather than on its *dixue* aspect,⁴ may be due partly to the Buddhist background of its first practitioners, partly to the different political context. One was used, in Japan, to ascetical systems of self-cultivation that centred on "the heart," and those who were in positions of political power felt less need than their Chinese counterparts to propitiate an influential Neo-Confucian opinion by pretending to be interested in its sermons.

Many adaptations also took place in the course of the Edo Period, e.g. in the

⁴ For a practical example of the usefulness of these two concepts as analytical tools for the study of Neo-Confucianism, and for a study of the interrelations between these two aspects of Neo-Confucianism in China, see W.Th. de Bary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-heart* (1981).

Sekimon Shingaku. But perhaps the most important adaptation was that in Japan the ethical teachings of Neo-Confucianism ultimately were reduced to *chūkō*, with Filial Piety (*kō*) definitely second to loyalty (*chū*),⁵ and to what was known as the *Taigi meibun ron*. Though this *Taigi meibun ron* was not much more than the doctrine that everyone should fulfil his allotted task in society (allotted, that is, by birth), eventually it proved to be a mighty weapon for ousting the *shōgun*, when it was discovered that he no longer fulfilled his task.

A few more words may be said about this book and some of the intellectual debts I incurred in writing it. Like everybody else I began my studies by reading Maruyama Masao's *Nihon seiji shisōshi kenkyū*, and from the beginning I was disenchanted with the off-hand way in which he treats the first stages of the development of Neo-Confucianism in the Edo period. I also had my reservations about the context in which he placed his researches: the development of a "modern" political philosophy out of a "medieval" one. Consequently I was very much struck with Bitō's criticism of his work.

Germinal to this book were, more than anything else, the chapter of *Nihon hōken shisōshi kenkyū* mentioned earlier, and Imanaka Kanji's *Kinsei Nihon seiji shisō no seiritsu*. This last book introduced me to the study of medieval *shōmono* and opened my eyes to the many continuities between the medieval traditions and those of the early Edo period. Abe Ryūichi I have found to be a very reliable and useful guide in these fields.

Originally this thesis was planned in four chapters: "The Sources of Neo-Confucianism (Neo-Confucianism considered as a continuation of medieval traditions)"; "The Political thought of Hayashi Razan"; "Hayashi Razan and the *Bakufu*"; "Confucianism and the Needs of the *Bakufu*." When I started writing, I found that next to a factual study of the way in which Neo-Confucianism arose the various theories concerning this event had an interest of their own and merited separate treatment. Growing acquaintance with the relevant studies and materials, however, brought me to the conviction that I would have to postpone the completion of my thesis indefinitely (though not interminably), if I would try to write the last chapter now. So an unplanned

⁵ A thorough and careful study of this development is I.J. McMullen's article "Rulers or Fathers? A Casuistic Problem in Early Modern Japanese Thought" (1987).

first chapter has crowded out the planned final one. The writing of the other chapters proceeded more or less according to plan.

The book, let me be the first to admit is, contains more material than is strictly necessary. The treatment of Kang Hang and his relations with Seika is perhaps too detailed. I have, however, decided to retain all of it; I could not prevail upon myself to leave the field to Abe Yoshio's fond suppositions. It was unnecessary to enumerate all of the Korean embassies that came to Japan during the days of Seika and Razan, but, since I would have to mention a few of them, I thought that I might as well make the list complete, for later reference. The descriptions of the philosophy of Seika and Razan may seem excessively long. However, full treatment seemed preferable to a summary accompanied by lots of threatening references in the notes. Perhaps it was not necessary to translate so many letters of Seika and Razan at such great length in the final chapter. I have retained them because of the intrinsic charm they have in the original, and in order to add some flesh to the bones of the argument.

Since the rules of my *Alma Mater* forbid me to thank my teachers at the University of Leiden, I hope that all *sensei*, friends, and colleagues who taught, helped, and inspired me, will understand that I refrain from thanking them here, even when they are not attached to this seat of learning.

Here I will only mention the *Monbushō*, whose support enabled me to study in Japan from 1971 till 1974, and the *Kokusai Kōryū Kikin*, which paid for my second sojourn in 1978. Other institutions to which I owe thanks are the University of Kyoto, which twice allowed me to study within its gates as *kenshūin* and to use its many libraries, as well as the Research Institute for Humanistic Studies of Kyōto University, the Naikaku Bunko, and the Diet Library for the use of their books, reading rooms, and the willingness with which they allowed copies to be made of their books and manuscripts.

Finally, I would like to thank the National Museum of Ethnology in Leiden for the use of its facilities and equipment, and Mrs. Paymans' computer services bureau I.B.A.M. for its generosity and the ingenuity with which it solved the problems incident to editing and printing this text on a computer.

Leiden, November 1982

PREFATORY NOTES

I have transcribed Japanese according to the Hepburn transcription, Chinese according to Pinyin, and Korean according to the McCune-Reischauer transcription. In the few cases where the computer font did not have the characters I needed, I have either indicated the parts of which the character is composed, or referred to the number of the character in Morohashi, *Dai Kan-Wa jiten*. In one case, the character was not listed even in Morohashi. In that case, I have put an X. The curious reader is kindly invited to look it up in the original text. All instances of this nature are marked with { }.

KARAHITO NO
MONO NO KOTAWARI
TOKU NO HAKANASA

Motoori Norinaga

CHAPTER I:

THEORIES AND CONTENTIONS CONCERNING THE RISE OF NEO-CONFUCIANISM IN THE BEGINNING OF THE EDO PERIOD

The reason why Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657) continues to be remembered, in fact his main claim to fame, is that being the disciple of the first self-professed Japanese Confucian, Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩 (1561-1619), he entered into the service of the *bakufu* and started the *vogue* Confucianism was to enjoy during most of the Tokugawa period as the official ideology.

This proposition has proved very tenacious and pervasive. One reason for this will be that certain modern methodological concepts have come to be attached to it, e.g. that of the universality of stages of historical development, or the interpretation of all “thought” (*shisō*) as “ideology.” The first makes one inclined to assume *a priori* that a change of “period” implies correlated changes in all fields of human endeavour (and that similar stages occur in all similar historiographical entities); the second, to conceive of “thought” as something that directly emanates from socio-economic and socio-political changes. It is therefore useful to reflect on the way in which this proposition that, as is witnessed by various recent works on the Confucianism of the Tokugawa period, still heavily influences the historians approach, has arisen.¹

¹ Outside of the circle of specialists in the intellectual history of the Tokugawa period the proposition is still generally accepted, and even amongst specialists (*vide* our quotations from Ishida Ichirō’s article, *supra*, Introduction, n. 1), its influence is still strong. Yet most of the “underpinnings” of the proposition have in fact been removed: see, e.g., Wajima Yoshio’s article “Kinsei ni okeru Sō-gaku juyō no ichimondai” (1974), in which he argues that Tokugawa Ieyasu did not hire Razan primarily as a Confucian scholar, or Kanaya Osamu’s “Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku shisō” (1975), where the writer concludes that appreciable differences exist between the philosophical attitudes of Seika and Razan. In this connection we may also cite Hori Isao, who says that the relation between Seika and Razan differed from the ordinary relation between teacher and disciple (1964; *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 65-66).

To a greater or lesser extent these findings are incorporated into recent studies, but nobody has as yet tried to combine them into a new general theory. This gives an elusive air of contradiction to the accounts of the development of Neo-Confucianism that are given in general surveys of intellectual history like Minamoto Ryōen, *Tokugawa shisō shōshi* (1973), Kinugasa Yasuki, *Kinsei Jugaku shisōshi no kenkyū* (1976), or Furuta Hikaru & Koyasu Nobukuni, eds, *Nihon shisōshi tokuhon* (1979). The writers generally admit that the conceptions Seika and Razan had of Neo-Confucianism were different, and that Razan was not employed by Ieyasu as a Confucian scholar. On the other hand they all begin their account of Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism with Seika, all place Razan second in the line of succession, and all consider the orthodox kind of Neo-Confucianism that was advocated by Razan as an ideology admirably suited to the needs of the *bakufu* (see Minamoto, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-18; Furuta & Koyasu, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-87; Kinugasa, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-63, esp. on p. 63, the paradoxical phrase: “Razan’s Zhu Xi-ism was a system of idealistic rationalism and thus was able to show emblematically what form the feudal power structure of the Edo period *should* take on, but it seems quite possible to suppose that for the same reason it will hardly have

The proposition is a compound of several claims. The first one, made by Seika and by others on his behalf, is that without the benefit of a tradition handed down to him by a teacher, only by reading the Classics, he had discovered Confucianism. The second claim is, that Razan was Seika's most important disciple. The third, that Razan was employed by the *bakufu* in his capacity of a Confucian scholar.

In this chapter we will concern ourselves with the first two of these claims.

A. The discovery of Confucianism

1. Fujiwara Seika and Kang Hang

The *locus classicus* for Seika's claim is a communication to the Korean prisoner of war Kang Hang 姜沆 (1567-1618)² dating from the end of 1598 or the beginning of 1599. We will translate it in full:

Our lord Akamatsu [Hiromichi] 赤松廣通 (1562-1600)³ wants me to transmit

been of practical use in shaping the practical policies of the *bakufu*."

² Kang Hang was born in Yönggwang (Chölla Namdo); his clan seat was Chinju (Kyöngsang Namdo). In 1588 he took the degree of *chinsa*, and five years later he passed the higher literary examinations (*munkwa*), finishing in the third class. He was employed first in the Office of Editorial Review (*Kyosögwang*) as a Reference Consultant (*paksa*) (Sr. 7th rank), then as a Librarian (*chönjök*) in the National Academy (*Sönggyungwan*) (Sr. 6th rank), and lastly as Assistant Section Chief (*chwarang*) of the Boards of Works and of Punishments (Sr. 6th rank). While on home leave, in 1597, he tried to organize volunteer forces against the Japanese invaders, but he was captured by the Japanese and taken to Japan. He returned three years later, in 1600. Back in Korea he was twice appointed to a provincial post as Education Officer (*kyosu*) (Jr. 6th rank), but he refused both offers, and during the remainder of his life he dedicated himself to literary researches and teaching. He died in 1618, fifty-two years old. A rather idealizing treatment of the relation between Seika and Kang Hang is given in Kim Ha-tae, "The Transmission of Neo-Confucianism to Japan by Kang Hang, a Prisoner of War." See also Matsuda Kō, "Fujiwara Seika to Kyō Suiin no kankei"; Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 62-92; Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, pp. 39-74.

³ Little is known about Akamatsu Hiromichi; he is not even listed in vol. I of the recently published *Kokushi daijiten*. The most thoroughgoing research regarding his life has been done by Abe Yoshio who presents his findings, conclusions and a selection of the relevant materials in Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 125-148. From his account the following outline emerges: Hiromichi — also known by the names of Akamatsu Hirohide, Saemura Yasaburō Hirohide or Saemura Sahei — was born in 1562 as the son of the lord of the castle of Tatsuno (Harima). When Hideyoshi invaded Harima in 1577 Hiromichi surrendered his castle, retaining only minor landholdings in western Harima. He fought in various campaigns of Hideyoshi, and eventually, in 1585, he received a fief of 22,000 *koku* at Takeda (Tajima). In the same period — whether this was before or after he received his fief is unclear — Hiromichi also married a sister of Ukita Hideie, which might have well have provided him with strong connections within the central power structure. Hiromichi seems to have taken part in the first Korean expedition of 1592-93, but no details are known. Although in 1600 he had joined the side of Ishida Mitsunari, he was not immediately dispossessed after Sekigahara. With the aim to improve his fortunes he took part in the siege of Tottori-jō, which was beleaguered by followers of Ieyasu. The castle fell, but some of the attending circumstances displeased Ieyasu. Hiromichi was held responsible and ordered to commit suicide. He died on the twenty-eighth, tenth month of Keichō 5 (15-12-1600).

to you the following: the various houses that in Japan lecture on Confucianism, from olden times up till now have only transmitted the learning of the Confucians of the Han period and do not yet know the [philosophy of] *li* (J. *ri*; principle) of the philosophers of the Song. For four hundred years they have not been able to remedy the faults of their inveterate tradition. Quite the contrary: they say that the Confucians of the Han are right and those of the Song are wrong. In truth, one can only smile pityingly. I think [it is the same as with] the dogs of Yue who bark at the snow, not because the snow is not clean, but because they have never seen it, or the dogs of Shu who bark at the sun, not because it is not clear, but simply because they do not know it and think it strange.⁴

From my youth onwards I have never had a teacher. I read books on my own, and said to myself: the Confucians of the Han and Tang never rose above memorizing and reciting words and phrases. They hardly did more than giving explanatory notes on pronunciation and adding remarks in the upper margin [in order to highlight certain] facts. They certainly did not have an inkling of the utter truth of the Holy Learning. During the Tang dynasty the only one to rise [above this level] was Han Yu 韓愈. But he too was not without shortcomings. If

When Hiromichi first became acquainted with Seika cannot be established definitely. The only evidence is a letter, dated on the tenth day of the eleventh month (no year is given), which was sent by Seika's uncle Fukōin Jusen Seishuku 普廣院壽泉清叔 (dates unknown) to Hiromichi. The letter was sent from Echigo. In it Jusen says that he regrets not having seen Hiromichi since he went down and expresses his satisfaction with the growing friendship between Hiromichi and Seika (*DNS* XII.31, pp. 619-620). This letter can be dated (to some extent) with the help of another letter of Jusen, dated Bunroku 3/6/26 (12-8-1594), in which Jusen says that, when he went to Echigo in Tenshō 16 (1588), he had appointed Seika to succeed him as abbot of the Fukōin in the event of his death. However, in the tenth month of Bunroku 1 (1592) he had returned safely to Kyoto. Since, moreover, Seika's behaviour towards him was disrespectful, he had severed relations with him. In the second month of Bunroku 2, when Seika was about to leave for Nagoya (Kyūshū), he had refused to meet him. After his return Seika had visited him once again (on the twenty-first day, fifth month, apparently of Bunroku 3), this time at the Fukōin, so he had not been able to avoid meeting him. But that had been the last time they had heard from each other, and now he wanted it to be clear once and for all that, whatever happened, Seika was not to succeed him (see text in Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 142; Abe's source is Fujiwara Yoshimichi, *Suiyo shōroku*, pp. 17-20).

In view of the dates mentioned in this second letter, Jusen's letter to Hiromichi must have been written between the eleventh month of Tenshō 16 (1588) and the eleventh month of Tenshō 19 (1591). The inference seems to be that Jusen knew Hiromichi before he went to Echigo, had introduced Seika to him, and was glad that they got along together well. This interpretation has a certain logical cogency. Hiromichi evidently was a person with intellectual interests, and Jusen was famed for his learning (see, e.g., Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 79). It is therefore likely that he and Jusen came to know each other once Hiromichi's fortune had been made, i.e. after his enfeoffment at Takeda (1585). It is also likely that Jusen introduced his nephew and appointed successor Seika to Hiromichi, were it only to have him act as his deputy also in his capacity as Hiromichi's intellectual mentor. This seems a likelier hypothesis than the supposition that Seika and Hiromichi met as early as 1577 when Seika was still living in the Keiunji in Tatsuno and Hiromichi, who had just lost his castle, was living in obscurity close by. It also seems more probable than the version Razan gives in Seika's *Gyōjō*, namely that *after* he had lived for some years in Kyoto Seika returned to Harima and met Hiromichi there. Neither of them had any reason to return there in the late 1580's.

There also exists a series of twenty-seven letters (texts in *DNS* XII.31, pp. 620-633) written by Seika to Hiromichi; some of these are in Seika's handwriting and none of them is fully dated. Internal evidence suggests that they were all written in the course of the 1590's. Since none of them has a bearing on the matter under discussion, we will not concern ourselves with them here.

⁴ The moral of this old Chinese proverb is that dogs (and men) are inclined to distrust things they do not know, even when these things are not actually harmful. Yue and Shu were two countries in ancient China, located resp. in the present provinces of Chekiang and Szechwan. Yue was notoriously hot, and Shu, notoriously foggy.

it were not for the Song Confucians, how could we ever have resumed the broken strands of the Learning of the Holy Ones?

However, since in Japan the whole country is like this, one man cannot turn back the raging waves that have already toppled, or send back the declining sun when it is already coming down. I felt full of pent up anger, and only held the zither and did not play the flute (i.e. I kept my opinions to myself. WJB)

For this reason our lord Akamatsu has now newly made a copy of the text of the Four Books and the Five Classics, and he has requested me to add Japanese reading marks to the side of the characters according to the interpretation of the Confucians of the Song, for the ease of posterity. Whoever in Japan shall want to champion the interpretation of the Song Confucians shall take these volumes as his basic source.

Alas! Though I have no friend like Ziqi 子期 [who] understands my every mood, [I shall wait, like] Ziyun 子雲 [for someone in] a later generation who will appreciate me.⁵

You must tell these facts, show them to be true, and write a postface at the end of these works. This has been our lord Akamatsu's long-cherished desire, and would please me very much. Please think about it!⁶

Although the status of the text is not clear (in the *Seika bunshū* it is put into the section "Prefaces," headed "Translation," and considered as a written conversation between Seika and Hang, while in the *Seika-sensei bunshū* it is put into the section "Letters" and headed "Asking Kang Hang") and it is uncharacteristically verbose, there is no valid reason to doubt its authenticity. Against the communication's authenticity one could object its verbosity (e.g. the amplification of the hackneyed proverb of the dogs of Shu and Yue), the ambiguity of its status and the differences in wording between the versions of the *Seika bunshū* and the *Seika-sensei bunshū*.⁷ To cite the most important one: If we accept the version of the *Seika bunshū*, the phrase "Whoever in Japan shall want to ..." should be changed into "Whoever in Japan shall want to translate the explanations [of the Classics] by the Confucians of the Song, ..." Also we find most of the

⁵ For Ziqi, see the anecdote reported in *Liezi*, "Tangmen": "Bo Ya 伯牙 was very good at playing the lute. Chong Ziqi was very good at listening. When Bo Ya played the lute and his mind was on climbing high mountains, Chong 鐘 Ziqi said: 'How well [you play]! Lofty indeed, like the Taishan!' When his mind was on running water, Chong Ziqi said: 'How well [you play]! Vast [it sounds], like the great rivers.' Whatever Bo Ya was thinking of, Chong Ziqi got it without fail." Ziyun is the style of the Han philosopher Yang Xiong 楊雄 (53 B.C. — A.D. 18). When criticized that one of his works, the *Taixuan jing* 太玄經, was not in tune with the times, he said that he would wait for someone in a later generation who would understand him (see the add. notes in NST XXVIII, p. 368)

⁶ Ōta, I, pp. 135-136; DNS XII.31, pp. 637-638; NST XXVIII, p. 95-96.

⁷ The *Seika bunshū* and the *Seika-sensei bunshū* are two independent compilations of Seika's literary works, though the contents, of course, to a great extent overlap. The *Seika bunshū* was compiled by Razan and Kan Tokuan in 5 *kan*; its preface is of Kan'ei 4 (1627). Together with the *Zoku Seika bunshū*, compiled by Tokuan in 3 *kan*, preface also of Kan'ei 4, it was printed sometime between Kan'ei 6 and 21 (see Ōta I, Intr., pp. 75-77). The *Seika-sensei bunshū* was compiled by Seika's great grandson Fujiwara Tametsune in

statements of this communication quoted, sometimes even *verbatim*, or amplified in other pieces of writing Hang composed for Seika. From this it might be concluded that the communication was concocted later, on the basis of these writings of Hang. I prefer, however, to argue the other way around and say that these close resemblances are the natural result of the obligation Hang had to adhere closely to Seika's presentation of the facts. After all, these writings were ordered by Seika, and Hang would be safest when he elaborated only on what he had been told. The other points could be explained away, if we assume that Seika originally told these things to Hang in a written conversation and that, later on, Seika himself or one of his editors rephrased the notes of this conversation without changing the gist of it.

Echoes of this communication we find in several pieces that Kang Hang composed in honour of Seika: in the *Seisai-ki*⁸ 惺齋記 he remarks in passing that Seika had not received "the tradition from a teacher," and in the *Shishōka-ki*⁹ 是尚窩記 he suggests Seika's uniqueness and loneliness by emphasizing the fact that Seika, not being able to find friends in the Japan of his own days, "befriended the men of old" and lived in the world of the Classics. However, neither in Seika's two other letters to Hang¹⁰ nor, for that matter, in any of his other letters, a reference is to be found to this parthenogenesis of Neo-Confucianism, while the account Kang Hang gives in the *Kan-yangnok* 看羊錄 is markedly different.¹¹

It seems therefore necessary to investigate this text more thoroughly, and compare it with the few other texts that were written by Seika and Hang between 1598 and 1600. The relevant texts are:

- 1) The record of a conversation between Seika and Hang.¹²
- 2) The communication from Seika to Hang (translated above).
- 3) The *Gokei-batsu* 五經跋.¹³
- 4) The Preface to the *Bunshō tattokuroku (kōryō)* 文章達德錄・綱領.¹⁴

18 *kan*, and printed in or after Kyōhō 2 (1717; see Ōta I, Intr., pp. 73-75).

⁸ Ōta I, pp. 16-17; *DNS* XII.31, pp. 635-637; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 365-366.

⁹ Ōta I, pp. 14-15; *DNS* XII.31, pp. 634-635.

¹⁰ The first letter, headed "Chōsen Kyō Kō ni ken-su" in the *Seika-sensei bunshū* and "Chōsen Kyō Kō ni yosu" in the *Seika bunshū*, can be found in Ōta I, p. 135; *DNS* XII.31, p. 637. The second letter, headed "Kyō Kō ni kotau," can be found in Ōta I, p. 136; *DNS* XII.31, p. 638.

¹¹ The relevant quotation is given underneath, p. 31.

¹² Ōta II, pp. 369-370; *DNS* XII.31, pp. 639-641. The original source, given in *DNS*, loc. cit., is the *Reizei monjo*.

¹³ Ōta I, pp. 298-300; *DNS* XII.31, pp. 571-572.

- 5) The *Seisai-ki*.
- 6) The first letter from Seika to Hang.
- 7) The *Shishōka-ki*.
- 8) The second letter from Seika to Hang.

The secondary material is virtually limited to Kang Hang's *Kanyangnok* and the *Seika-sensei gyōjō* 行状 by Hayashi Razan.

Before we try to prove that the order in which we have listed the primary texts is correct, it might be useful to establish a chronology of Kang Hang's and Fujiwara Seika's activities between 1597 and 1600. First, however, some introductory remarks about the secondary sources, i.e. the *Kanyangnok* and the *Gyōjō*, are necessary.

The *Kanyangnok*¹⁵ consists of several letters, reports and diaries written at various times and places in Japan and Korea, and can be divided into five parts. The first part consists of a covering letter and of a description of the state of affairs in Japan. In the letter Hang relates the circumstances of his capture and of his imprisonment in Japan. It is addressed to the king, and dated Wanli 27/4/10 (4-5-1599).¹⁶ The description of Japan was written in two instalments. The first instalment Hang wrote in 1598 in Iyo; he entrusted it to one Kim Sōkpok 金石福, who finally brought it to Korea in the fall of 1601.¹⁷ The second instalment was written in Fushimi in 1599. Hang relates how, with danger to his own life, he once went to a house in Sakai where a number of Chinese officers were staying who had been taken to Japan by Konishi Yukinaga 小西行長

¹⁴ Ōta II, pp. 1-3; *DNS* XII.31, pp. 571-572. This preface is called *Bunshō tattokuroku jo* 序 in the *Seika bunshū* and *Bunshō tattokuroku kōryō jo* in the *Bunshō tattokuroku kōryō*.

¹⁵ The original edition of the *Kanyangnok* is the one contained in Kang Hang's collected literary works, the *Suūnjip* 睡隱集 (Suūn was Hang's literary name), printed in 1658 by Hang's disciple Yun Songō 尹舜舉 (see Songō postface at the end of the *Kanyangnok*). Various modern editions and translations exist. The references here are to the Chinese edition in *Kaikō sōsai* I, pp. 363-439, to the Korean translation in *Kanyangnok* (this edition also supplies the Chinese text), and to the two Japanese translations in *Kanyōroku* and in *Tōyō Bunko*. Of these editions *Kanyangnok* and *Tōyō Bunko* are annotated.

¹⁶ *Kaikō sōsai*, pp. 363-367; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 174-178; *Kanyōroku*, pp. 1-7; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 11-24. In *Sillok*, 121.9b-11b (vol. XXIII, pp. 598-599), a letter from Hang is quoted that is recognizably the same letter. The date in the *Sillok* is Sōnjo 32/4/15 (9-5-1599). At this place the *Sillok* merely quotes the letter; no indication is given as to who brought it or what was done with it. Nor is it made clear why the letter has been entered under this date. Presumably the reason was that it was received on this date, but five days seem a little short to convey a letter from Sakai to Seoul (see *infra*, n. 18). (N.B. The date of the letter and the above date in the *Sillok* have been converted according to the Chinese calendar, i.e. according to P. Hoang, *Concordance des chronologies néonémiques chinoise et européenne*, rather than according to P.Y. Tsuchihashi, *Japanese chronological tables from 601 to 1872*. Because the Chinese inserted the intercalary month of this year after the fourth, and the Japanese after the third month, the dates for these few months diverge considerably.)

¹⁷ *Kaikō sōsai*, pp. 367-380; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 178-194; *Kanyōroku*, pp. 7-28; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 25-70.

(?1557-1600) as hostages after the cease-fire of 1598: it seems probable that on this occasion he remitted the documents to the Chinese, asking them to take them back to Korea.¹⁸ Later on Hang entrusted a third copy of the documents, probably identical to the one he had given to the Chinese, to a certain Sin Chŏngnam 辛挺南 who, however, never reached Korea.¹⁹

The second part is entitled “What I heard and saw amongst the bandits” (*Chŏkchung mungyŏllok* 賊中聞見錄). It consists of a list of the names of Japanese public offices with their Chinese equivalents, a description of the eight circuits (*sic*) and sixty-six provinces of Japan, and a section about the commanders who took part in the invasions of 1592 and 1597. Hang must have prepared this report in Japan, between the fifth month of 1599 and the fourth month of 1600, for he presented it on the day of his

¹⁸ The *Sŏmnan sajŏk* contains a vivid description of this visit (see *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 437; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 247-248; *Kanyōroku* pp. 122-123; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 282-284; see also, *ibid.*, resp. p. 383; p. 198; p. 33; pp. 81-82). The story fits in with the remark that one of the Chinese, He Yingchao 河應潮, made when he reported back in Korea, namely that they had only with difficulty prevailed upon the Japanese to spare Hang's life (see *Sillok* 115.15a: XXIII, p. 648).

According to the colophon at the end of the first part of the *Kanyangnok* (*Kaikō sōsai*, p. 384-385; *Kanyangnok*, p. 200; *Kanyōroku*, p. 35; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 86) Hang entrusted the letter and the report to Wang Jiangong 王建功; the king, upon the receipt of these documents, was so impressed with them that he sent them on to the Department of Border Defence (*Pibyŏnsa*). Neither assertion is confirmed elsewhere. In the *Sillok* letter and report are mentioned twice, once under Sŏnjo 32/4/15 (see *supra*, n. 16), and once under Sŏnjo 32/7/19 (8-9-1599; *Sillok* 115.14b-15a: XXIII, pp. 647-648). In this second entry, too, nothing is said of royal approval. On the contrary, something was amiss with the documents: the contents were readily acknowledged as stemming from Hang, but the writing was not his; it seemed rather to be that of a Chinese. The Royal Secretariat was asked to investigate, and He Yingchao, the Chinese who had brought the documents back with him from Japan, explained that he had had to copy them, because the officer who had received the originals from Hang had wanted to keep these and bring them himself. This seemed illogical to the official of the Royal Secretariat. Moreover, the fact that the documents had been copied meant that parts of them could have been added or left out by the Chinese. However, in view of the attitude of the Chinese, who were clamouring for rewards, the Royal Secretariat felt that it would be best to discontinue the investigation: the truth of the matter would now be difficult to establish (*Sillok* 115.15a).

The *dramatis personae* occur elsewhere in the *Sillok*. He Yingchao is mentioned under Sŏnjo 32/7/14 (3-9-1599; *Sillok* 125.11a-b: XXIII, p. 646) as one of the six messengers sent back to Korea by the Chinese officers who still remained in Japan as hostages. On their way back to Korea they had picked up a number of Korean prisoners of war who had been waiting on Tsushima for final permission to return home. According to the diary of one of these, Chŏng Hŭidŭk 鄭希得, their ships arrived in Korea on the twenty-ninth day of the sixth month (19-8-1599; see Naitō Shunpo, “Jinshin teiyū eki ni okeru hiryo Chōsenjin no sakkan mondai ni tsuite,” p. 75). Wang Jiangong is mentioned under Sŏnjo 33/4/11 and 26 (resp. 23-5 and 7-6-1600; *Sillok* 124.5a-b: XXIV, p. 55, and 124.22b: XXIV, p. 64). In the first entry a report is quoted from the naval commander in Pusan, to the effect that two ships carrying a number of Chinese, amongst whom Wang Jiangong, and Koreans had arrived from Japan on the fifth day of the fourth month (17-5-1600), and the second entry contains a record of the questioning of Wang by the Korean authorities in Seoul. No mention is made of any letter Wang would be carrying for a Korean prisoner still in Japan. For the background to this whole paragraph see Nakamura Hidetaka, *Nihon to Chōsen*, pp. 198-201.

¹⁹ See the colophon at the end of the first part (*Kaikō sōsai*, pp. 384-385; *Kanyangnok*, p. 200; *Kanyōroku*, p. 35; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 86).

arrival back in Korea.²⁰

The third part is an exhortation addressed to his fellow prisoners of war; it was written in Tsushima) when he passed there on his way to Korea.²¹

The fourth part consists of a report of the latest rumours that Hang had picked up as he was leaving Kyoto and on Tsushima on the way, regarding the probability of new Japanese attacks on Korea, and some additional general information. The report is addressed to the Royal Secretariat (*Sŭngjŏngwŏn*) and written after his return to Korea, between the fifth and the eighth month of 1600.²²

The fifth part, entitled “How I passed through chaos” (*Sŏmnan sajŏk* 涉難事迹), is a chronological account, interspersed with poems, in which Hang recapitulates the story of his capture, captivity and release. It must also have been written or, at least, edited after his return to Korea.²³

According to the *Sŏmnan sajŏk* Hang was captured in 1597, ninth month, twenty-third day (2-11-1597), and reached Japan, i.e. Ōzu-jō in Iyo, by the middle of the tenth month.²⁴ On the twenty-fifth day of the fifth month of the following year (28-6-1598) he tries to escape, but he is caught again and sometime during the sixth month moved to the capital region:

In the sixth month [Tōdō] Sado[-no-kami Takatora] 藤堂高虎 (1566-1630) withdrew his soldiers from Kosŏng [in Korea] and returned to the capital of Japan. He sent some of his men to escort us and we went to the western capital of Japan, Ōsaka.²⁵

A few days later he goes from Ōsaka to Fushimi and here he stays until the fourth month of 1600. On the second day of this month (14-5-1600) he leaves Fushimi,²⁶ arriving in Pusan on the nineteenth day of the following month (29-6-1600).²⁷

As regards Hang’s meetings with Seika, in the first part of the *Kanyangnok* Seika’s name does not appear. In the covering letter Hang only mentions that he reached

²⁰ Ibid., resp. pp. 385-417; pp. 255-295; pp. 36-92; pp. 89-187. The date of the presentation is given at the end of this part.

²¹ Ibid., resp. pp. 417-419; pp. 301-304; pp. 92-96; pp. 189-206.

²² Ibid., resp. pp. 419-426; pp. 212-222; pp. 96-107; pp. 207-234. The date is given at the beginning of this part.

²³ Ibid., resp. pp. 426-438; pp. 226-250; pp. 107-125; pp. 235-289.

²⁴ Ibid., resp. pp. 428-431; pp. 228-233; pp. 109-114; pp. 238-251.

²⁵ Ibid., resp. pp. 432-435; pp. 236-239; pp. 116-119; pp. 259-267. Translated part on resp. p. 434; p. 239; p. 119; p. 264.

²⁶ Ibid., resp. p. 438; p. 249; p. 124; pp. 289.

²⁷ Ibid., resp. p. 419; p. 212; p. 96; p. 207.

Fushimi in the middle of the ninth month of 1598. (N.B. This date is at variance with the one Hang suggests in the *Sōmnan sajōk*.)

The Japanese robbers moved your servants on the eighth of the eighth month (8-9-1598) and on the eleventh of the ninth month we arrived in the castle of Ōsaka. The head of the robbers, Hideyoshi, had already died on the seventeenth of the seventh month (*sic!* Hideyoshi died on the eighteenth of the eighth month: 18-9-1598. WJB) ... We stayed there for several days, then they moved us again to Fushimi."²⁸

Hang also mentions that, after he had arrived in Fushimi, he did some copying for a Japanese monk. No name is given.²⁹

In the part of the report that he wrote in Iyo he mentions meeting the monk Ian³⁰ 意庵 and another unnamed monk, who has met Kim Sōngil 金誠一 (1538-1593) and his embassy³¹ is quoted.³² In the second part of the *Kanyangnok*, in which Hang enumerates the provinces of Japan and the generals in charge of the invasions of Korea, in the notes to the paragraph dealing with Chikuzen *chūnagon* Kingo (= Kobayakawa Hideaki 小早川秀秋・君吾, 1577-1602), Seika is mentioned for the first time, by his Buddhist appellation of Shun *shuso* 薺首座.³³

A few pages further on, still in the second part, Hang tells how he sought the company of Japanese monks, and again he mentions Ian and Seika. He describes these meetings as follows:

Amongst them (sc. the Japanese monks. WJB) there were a few who were lettered and had some understanding of the way things are. There were the physicians Ian and Rian 理庵 who several times visited me in my chains. And there was the monk of the Myōju-in, *shuso* Shun, a descendant of the Kyōgoku *chūnagon* [Fujiwara] Sadaie (1162-1241)³⁴ and the teacher of Akamatsu Sahyōe

²⁸ Ibid., resp. p. 365; p. 176; p. 4; p. 19.

²⁹ Ibid., resp. p. 365; p. 177; p. 5; pp. 19-20.

³⁰ Ibid., resp. p. 369; p. 181; pp. 10-11; p. 30. Ian is here described as follows: "Ian was born in the capital. Like his grandfather and his father he went to study in China (*sic*). He has some understanding of arithmetic, astronomy and geography, and he once made a *tugui* 土圭 (a kind of gnomon; see Morohashi III: 4867-110. WJB) in order to measure the shadow it cast in the sun." This Ian is in all probability the physician Yoshida Sōjun 吉田宗洵 (1558-1610), a friend of Seika (see *Seika-sensei gyōjō*, NST XXVIII, p. 191; *Kokon ian jo* 古今醫案序, *ibid.*, pp. 82-85; Ōta I, *Intr.*, p. 20). Though not impossible, it is hardly likely that Ian went to Iyo or met Hang there. This passage probably is an interpolation.

³¹ Kim Sōngil was the vice-envoy of the Korean embassy of 1590.

³² *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 375; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 187-188; *Kanyōroku*, p. 20; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 55. Since Seika certainly met Kim Sōngil and other members of the embassy, it seems likely that this unnamed monk was in fact Seika, and that this passage, as the one about Ian (see *supra*, n. 30), is an interpolation.

³³ Ibid., resp. p. 405; p. 277; p. 69; p. 143. *Shuso* is the appellation of the chief trainee in a Zen monastery.

³⁴ This is of course the famous poet Fujiwara Sadaie (Teika). Seika was a descendant in the eighth

左兵衛 Hiromichi, the *daimyō* of Tajima. He is very intelligent and understands the ancient texts. There is no book he has not read. His character, too, is headstrong. There is no one amongst the Japanese of whom he approves. ... Only with the [*daimyō* of] Wakasa, *shōshō* [Kinoshita] Katsutoshi 木下勝俊 (1569-1649)³⁵ and with Sahyōe Hiromichi he is on intimate terms.³⁶

Hang then relates how Seika eventually introduced him to Akamatsu Hiromichi, who asked him, together with his brothers and other Korean prisoners, to write for him a fair copy of the main text of the Six Classics. All this was kept a secret from Tōdō Takatora, for Hiromichi's relations with him were rather strained. The meetings and the work were probably discontinued after the ninth day of the second month (23-3-1600), when Takatora was summoned to Kyoto by Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1542-1616). On Takatora's arrival Hang and his fellow prisoners presented a petition to him in which they asked leave to move about freely outside the residence. Thanks to the intercession of a monk, Keian 慶庵,³⁷ Takatora consented. Hang immediately contacted his compatriots and by putting their money together they were able to buy a ship. Then they went to see Seika and Hiromichi. The latter provided them with a safe conduct from Terasawa Shima-no-kami Hirotaka 寺澤廣高 (1563-1639), the former with a pilot to lead them to Tsushima.³⁸

generation of his grandson Tamesuke, and belonged to the branch known as the Shimo-Reizei. See his genealogy in Ōta I, Intr., pp. 6-7. For an account of the separation of Sadaie's descendants in to the Nijō, Kyōgoku, and Reizei branches see Brower, Robert H., "The Reizei family documents," pp. 447-450.

³⁵ Kinoshita Katsutoshi, better known by his literary pseudonym Chōshōshi 長嘯子, was the eldest of the five sons of Hideyoshi's brother-in-law Kinoshita (Sugihara) Iesada 家定 (1543-1608), the youngest of whom was Kobayakawa Hideaki. A younger sister was married with Ieyasu's fifth son, Tokugawa Nobuyoshi 信義 (1583-1603). From his youth Katsutoshi served under Hideyoshi. He was first enfeoffed at Tatsuno (Harima) and later (1594) transferred to Obama in Wakasa (80.000 *koku*). After the battle of Sekigahara his fief was taken away from him and he retired to Kyoto where he lived to a ripe old age, devoting his leisure to poetry, literature, book collecting, and the tea ceremony. He is an important *waka* poet in his own right.

³⁶ *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 415; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 292-293; *Kanyōroku*, p. 89; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 181.

³⁷ Abe Yoshio, "Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku to Chōsen," p. 86, identifies this Keian with a famous surgeon of this name, who was later (Genna 4; 1618) incarcerated for being a Christian.

³⁸ *Kaikō sōsai*, pp. 415-416; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 293-294; *Kanyōroku*, pp. 90-91; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 181-186. Terasawa Hirotaka was the *daimyō* of Karatsu (Hizen), the port of departure for Korea. Moreover, he was Nagasaki *daikan* from 1592 till 1603. Hang here creates the impression that this release was a personal favour of Hiromichi and Seika. Earlier in the *Sōmnan sajōk*, however, he has told that the Chinese hostages, when he went to visit them in Sakai, had promised him that they would ask Ieyasu to have Takatora send him back (op. cit., resp. p. 437; pp. 247-248; pp. 122-123; p. 283). Ieyasu was interested in returning prisoners, because he wanted to create an atmosphere conducive to the normalization of the relations with Korea and China. See e.g. the entry under Sonjō 34/4/25 (20-5-1601); *Sillok* 136.23b: XXIV, p. 238), where it is suggested that the Japanese had released Hang precisely for this reason. Takatora was one of Ieyasu's staunchest followers, while Hiromichi belonged to a different faction. Seika knew Ieyasu, but he does not seem to have approached him in this matter. It is therefore likelier that Ieyasu was at the back of it all, than that Hang's release was engineered by Hiromichi and Seika.

In the fourth and fifth parts Seika appears again: he warns Hang that another invasion of Korea is due in the following year³⁹ and comments on an alternative inscription Hang has provided for Hideyoshi's mausoleum.⁴⁰ The same story follows as above, though with different accents: Seika's hiring Hang to do clerical work has enabled the latter to earn some money for the home voyage⁴¹; Seika is asked by Hang to "facilitate the crossing" and, though it this is not mentioned here, he evidently complied.⁴²

The other secondary source, the *Seika-sensei gyōjō*,⁴³ was written by Hayashi Razan in 1620, the year after Seika's death. As all *xingzhuang* (J. *gyōjō*) it is not an ideal source: the *xingzhuang*, a kind of necrology, is a literary genre with requirements of its own, and historical accuracy is only one of these. As a source the preference should always go to the annalistic biography or *nianpu* 年譜 (J. *nenpu*). Unfortunately, no *nianpu* of Seika has survived, though, to judge by his biography in the *Reizei kaden* 冷泉家傳,⁴⁴ there once existed one.

The paragraph in the *Gyōjō* dealing with Kang Hang is a short one. We will translate it in full:

The assistant section chief of the Board of Punishments, the Korean Kang Hang, came and stayed at the house of Akamatsu. Hang met the Master (= Seika) and was delighted that in Japan there was such a man. They conversed with each other for days on end. Hang said: "Did we in Korea for the last three hundred years have somebody like him? Then I have not heard of him. Although to my misfortune I find myself in Japan, I have met this man. Is that not very fortunate?" Hang called the place where the Master dwelt *Kōhanka* 廣胖窩, and the Master [thereupon] called himself Seika. He derived [this name] from [Xie] Shangcai's 謝上蔡 so-called *Xingxingfa* 惺々法.⁴⁵ The Confucians and Erudites of our

³⁹ *Kaikō sōsai*, pp. 419-420; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 212-213; *Kanyōroku*, pp. 96-97; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 207-208. A similar warning was given by Rian. Both Rian and Seika mention as their source Kobayakawa Hideaki. The warning is reported under Sonjō 33/6/9 (18-7-1600); *Sillok* 126.4a-b:XXIV, p. 76) and was discussed briefly at a great court meeting on defence policy, held on Sōnjo 33/6/15 (24-7-1600; *Sillok* 126.7b: XXIV, p. 78). The consensus of the meeting was that Hang's story was unreliable.

⁴⁰ *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 437; *Kanyangnok*, p. 247; *Kanyōroku*, p. 122; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 281.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, resp. p. 437; p. 248; p. 123; p. 284.

⁴² *Ibid.*, resp. p. 438; pp. 249-250; p. 124; p. 289.

⁴³ The *Seika-sensei gyōjō* is to be found in Ōta I, pp. 6-13; *Bunshū* 40 (II, pp. 18-24); *DNS* XII.31, pp. 472-479; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 188-198. All references hereafter are to the text in *NST* XXVIII.

⁴⁴ See *DNS* XII.31, pp. 480-481, esp. p. 481, with its "in the column 條 (*tiao*; J. *jō*) of the year ... " (N.B. The incidents mentioned here do not always tally with those related by Razan in the *Gyōjō*.) A remark by Nawa Kassho points in the same direction: see Ōta I, p. 302, last line but one.

⁴⁵ *Kōhanka* may be translated "Grotto of Expansiveness and Ease." It is a reference to the sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue*; the passage in question reads (Legge's translation): "Riches adorn a house, and virtue adorns a

country of old have only read the commentaries and sub-commentaries of the Han and Tang, and punctuated the Classics and Traditions, adding Japanese readings. But when it came to the works of the Cheng (i.e. Cheng Hao 程顥・明道, 1032-1085, and his brother Cheng Yi 頤・伊川, 1033-1107. WJB) and Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130-1200), they did not know one tenth. Therefore the people who knew of the Learning of *Xing* 性 (J. *sei, shō*; human nature) and *Li* 理 (J. *ri*; principle) were few. Because of this the Master urged Akamatsu to have Kang Hang and some ten others write a fair copy of the Four Books and the Five Classics, the Master himself adding reading marks and readings according to the interpretation of the Cheng brother and Zhu Xi.⁴⁶

As a *xingzhuang* the piece is up to standard: Hang (the reason for his happening to be in Japan is played down, as it is neither auspicious nor relevant) is only mentioned in so far as he is a) praising Seika, b) instrumental in choosing a new literary name, and c) collaborating in a subordinate capacity in one of the two major works Seika is engaged in at the time. As such he is paired off with Yoshida Soan 吉田素庵 (1571-1632) who helps Seika with his other project, the *Bunshō tattokuroku*.⁴⁷

As for Seika's activities immediately preceding 1598 the *Gyōjō* only mentions that in the beginning of the Keichō era (1596-1614) he stayed with Kinoshita Katsutoshi, together with whom he engaged in literary activities and "selected phrases from Laozi 老子 and Zhuangzi 莊子."⁴⁸ No trip to Iyo is mentioned or even hinted at. Moreover, according to the *Gyōjō* Seika and Hang first met through Akamatsu Hiromichi. This

person. The mind is expanded, and the body at ease. Therefore, the superior man must make his thoughts sincere." The *hao* 號 "Seika" takes its cue from the *Xingxingfa* ("The Method of Keeping the Heart Awake") of the Song philosopher Xie Liangzuo 良佐 (Shangcai; 1050-1103), a disciple of the Cheng brothers. In one of his letters to Razan, Seika wrote about these names: "The two characters *guang* and *pan* were given to me as a name by Kang Hang. I did not call myself so. The old [names with] "tree" [in them] are special *hao* of my younger days, and their meaning differed from my present [*hao*]. [My new ideas] I have expressed with [my *hao*] Seika and with no other." (Ōta I, p. 146) When Razan implies that "thereupon" Seika chose the name "Seika," he is mistaken. Seika had already used it to sign the *Kokon ian jo*, which he wrote in 1596 (see Ōta I, p. 108; NST XXVIII, p. 85).

⁴⁶ NST XXVIII, pp. 190-191.

⁴⁷ Yoshida Soan is the same as Suminokura Haruyuki 角倉玄之. Yoshida was his original family name (*honsei*), and Soan was one of his literary pseudonyms. He was the eldest son of the famous and wealthy Kyoto merchant Suminokura Ryōi 了以 (1554-1614) and a nephew of the physician Yoshida Sōjun (Ian). Soan, however, made his reputation rather by his patronage of the arts and letters. He was the one who had the so-called "Saga-bon" printed (in moveable type); he was a disciple of Seika, a friend of Razan, and one of the pivotal figures on the literary and cultural scene of Kyoto in the first decades of the seventeenth century. For his biography see Hayashiya Tatsusaburō, *Suminokura Soan*. According to Soan's *Gyōjō*, quoted in Hayashiya, op. cit., p. 239, Soan first met Seika as early as 1588. According to a preface by Hori Kyōan that figures in one of the editions, the *Bunshō tattokuroku kōryō* (6 *kan*) was the extract of a much larger compilation of over 100 *kan*, made by Soan under Seika's direction. This work is now lost. The extant *Kōryō* is a compilation of quotations from Chinese works, all pertaining to the theory of literature. For further details see Ōta II, *Kaidai*, pp. 1-5; text in Ōta II, pp. 45-365.

⁴⁸ NST XXVIII, p. 190.

would squarely put their first meeting after Hang's arrival in Fushimi.

On the basis of the evidence we have presented so far, we may conclude that Seika and Hang can have associated only between the sixth or seventh month of 1598 and the fourth month of 1600. The next question must be, whether these dates can be made more specific with the help of what might be called "first-hand evidence." This first-hand evidence is of two kinds: first we have the letters Seika wrote to Hang, the records of their conversations, and Hang's writings; second, we have the colophons of the manuscript copies of a number of Chinese works that Hang and his collaborators made for Hiromichi. We will consider each of these in turn.

When we compare the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku* with the *Seisai-ki* and the *Shishōka-ki*, we find that the first part of the preface, i.e. the quotation from Song Jinglian⁴⁹ 宗景濂 and Hang's praise of Seika as a descendant of Fujiwara Sadaie, is quoted — in the usual scissors-and-paste fashion — near the end of the *Shishōka-ki*,⁵⁰ while the following seven lines of the preface, extolling Seika's scholarly and personal qualities, are repeated right at the beginning of the *Seisai-ki*.⁵¹ Moreover, in the second letter Seika thanks Hang for having written the *[Shishō]ka-ki*.⁵² The preface is dated Wanli 27/3/1 (26-3-1599); the other two pieces only bear the inscription "Wanli 27, written by the Korean etc. Kang Hang."

It seems a justifiable conclusion to put the preface first and, assuming that Hang freely made use of it when writing the other two pieces, the *Seisai-ki* and the *Shishōka-ki* second and third. Since the phrase "That I have arrived in Japan was three years ago; that I have met Seika in the capital and have had conversations with him has been several months" of the preface is repeated literally in the *Seisai-ki*,⁵³ they must have been written closely upon each other. We prefer therefore to put the *Seisai-ki* before the *Shishōka-ki*. The letter, of course, comes fourth.

The records of a conversation between Seika and Hang, the communication and the *Gokei-batsu*, too, form a natural sequence. In the conversation Seika, referring to an

⁴⁹ Song Lian 濂 (1310-1381; style: Jinglian) was an eminent scholar-official and literary figure. For his biography see L. Carrington Goodrich, ed., *Dictionary of Ming Biography* II, pp. 1225-1231.

⁵⁰ *DNS* XII.31, p. 569; pp. 634-635.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 569-570; pp. 635-636.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 637.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 569; p. 635.

anecdote about Tao Hongjing 陶弘景,⁵⁴ advises Hang to earn his own money⁵⁵ and after some more talk invites him to inscribe a screen for Akamatsu Hiromichi, who evidently was present at the occasion.⁵⁶ The communication, in which Seika tells Hang why Hiromichi had ordered a new edition of the Classics to be made, and asks him to write a postface, might very well be the record of, or a memo based on, a similar, subsequent conversation, while the *Gokei-batsu* is the natural outcome of Hiromichi's express wishes. Since the *Batsu* is dated on the fifteenth day of the second month (11-3-1599), this sequence is prior to the sequence opening with the preface to the *Bunshō tattokuroku*.

What remains is Seika's first letter to Hang. In this letter Seika makes a reference to the *zansho* 殘暑: "The lingering warmth [of summer] gradually lessens; it is like [a bolt from] a mighty bow at the end of its flight, not [strong enough even to] pierce a piece of thin silk."⁵⁷ This places the letter in the seventh month of 1599. Seika goes on to remark that it had been some time since he last visited Fushimi: "For a long time now I have not come to this place; perhaps, I think, for the same reasons as the four Master Shao enumerated for not going out, or for the same seven things Xi Zhongsan 嵇中散 said he could not bear."⁵⁸

Whether it should precede or follow the *Shishōka-ki* and the other letter, in which Seika thanks Hang for it, is difficult to say. We have placed it before the *Shihshōka-ki*. Otherwise, since Seika apparently was absent during the summer months, it should have been written during the third month, together with the *Seisai-ki*. This would be crowding things a little too much.⁵⁹

⁵⁴ For Tao Hongjing (451-536) see Giles, H.A., *A Chinese biographical dictionary*, no.1896. In the *Nan Shi* 南史 the anecdote Seika refers to is told as follows: "Later on [Liang Wudi] from time to time invited him (= Tao Hongjing) to enter into his service, but he did not go. What he did was draw two oxen: one ox roamed freely through the grass along the water; the other wore a golden headstall, and a man held it by the rope and urged it onwards with a stick. Emperor Wu laughed and said: 'This man can make anything! If one would want to teach a turtle with a trailing tail (i.e. a recluse. WJB), how would it be possible to do so?'" (*Nan Shi* 南史 76)

⁵⁵ *DNS* XII.31, p. 639.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 640-641.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 635.

⁵⁸ Master Shao is the Song philosopher Shao Yong 邵雍 (1011-1077). He once said that he did not go out when there was "a strong wind, or a heavy rain, or great cold or heat." Xi Zhongsan is Xi Kang 嵇康 (223-262), one of the Seven Sages of the Bamboo Grove. The seven things he could not bear, and because of which he considered himself unfit for public service, he enumerates at length in his letter to Shan Zhou 山濤・巨源 (*Yu Shan Juyuan juejiao shu*, in *Xi Zhongshan ji* 2).

⁵⁹ One more argument might be adduced in favour of our conclusion, namely that the statement of the editor of the *Seika-sensei bunshū* that he has arranged all pieces chronologically (see *Hanrei* in Ōta I, pp.

The colophons are described by Abe Yoshio.⁶⁰ According to his description, on a total of sixteen different works, there are six different shorter and longer colophons. The dates given in the colophons lie between the middle of the third month of 1599 and the fifteenth day, first month of 1600 (29-2-1600). The earliest one is the colophon of a set of the Four Books and the Five Classics: the same colophon is repeated at the end of every work, in virtually the same wording and in the identical handwriting, probably Hang's.⁶¹ The volumes are very small (14.5 x 11.3 cm). Only the main text is supplied, without commentaries, Japanese readings, or reading marks. According to the colophon,

After I had finished copying the Four Books and Five Classics, for a long time Akamatsu Hiromichi day and night immersed himself in these and pondered their meaning. However, because the volumes and sets were too big and heavy to put them into his sleeves easily when occupied with official business, he again asked me to write yet another set in very small characters. ... (dated) *qingming* of the Year of the Boar (= middle of the third month, 1599. WJB).⁶²

In other words, the copying of this second set of the Four Books and the Five Classics was begun sometime after the first set in larger volumes had been finished; it was completed by the beginning of the third month. This implies that the first set must have been written during the last months of the previous year, 1598.

The seven other works are Neo-Confucian primers. They are all of the same small size as the Four Books and Five Classics. Most of them are in Hang's handwriting, and five also have colophons by Hang.⁶³ The most remarkable thing is that, with the exception of the date, the colophon of the *Jinsi bielü* 近思別錄 is identical with the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku*: it is dated on the fourth day of the eleventh month, instead of on the first day of the third month. It is written, however, in a hand different

20-21).

⁶⁰ Abe Yoshio, "Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku to Chōsen," *CG* XII, pp. 61-76; see Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 72-76.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 62; pp. 64-65.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁶³ These works are *Quli quanjing* 曲禮全經 (1 vol.), different hand from the Four Books and Five Classics; colophon dated sixteenth day, seventh month (5-9-1599); *Xiaoxue* 小學 (1 vol.), same hand as the *Quli*; colophon dated first month of winter (November-December 1599); *Jinsilu* 近思錄 (1 vol.), same hand, but for a few pages, as the Four Books and the Five Classics; no colophon; *Jinsi xulu* 續錄 (1 vol.), same hand as the *Quli*; no colophon; *Jinsi bielü* 別錄 (1 vol.), text in the same hand as the Four Books and Five Classics; colophon in the same hand as the *Quli*; colophon dated *dongzhi* (J. *tōji*), i.e. the day of the winter solstice of 1599 (ca Keichō 4/11/4); *Tongshu* 通書 (1 vol.), same hand as the Four Books and Five Classics; colophon dated beginning of spring, Year of the Rat, i.e. second half of February, 1600. *Zhengmeng* 正蒙 (2 vols), same hand, but for a few pages, as the Four Books and Five Classics; colophon dated on the fifteenth day of the first month (29-2-1600).

from Hang's, and since the preface was intended for Seika and the *Jinsi bielu* for Hiromichi, Hang may well have given one of his collaborators permission to copy it. After all, he had plagiarized it himself on two occasions.

In other words, the internal evidence confirms what we already knew, but is not of much use in narrowing down the period of Seika's and Hang's acquaintance: all primary materials, dated and undated, arguably have originated between the end of 1598 or the beginning of 1599 and the beginning of 1600. Only one piece of evidence, Hang's preface to Ian's *Rekidai meii denryaku* 歴代名醫傳略,⁶⁴ suggests, but only suggests, that the first meeting with Seika and Hiromichi took place not earlier than the very last days of the twelfth month of 1598: this preface is dated the twelfth month of the Year of the Dog (1598); in it Hang only mentions Ian and his disciple Rian, not Seika, and says that this book by Ian was the first piece of writing he had seen since he had come to Japan.

Some minor problems and discrepancies remain. Who, we would like to know, introduced Hang to Seika? It seems likely that Ian or his nephew Yoshida Soan did this, and very unlikely that it was Hiromichi, as Razan states. Why does Hang suggest that he started copying for Hiromichi and Seika sometime in the middle of 1599, instead of the end of 1598?⁶⁵ It seems rather late, and contradicts the evidence of the *Gokei-batsu* and the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku*. The most striking thing, however, is the paucity of the usual vestiges of a literary acquaintanceship: Seika's collected works contain only two poems addressed to Hang,⁶⁶ while Hang's *Suñjip* 睡隱集, if we disregard the *Kanyangnok*, contains not one poem or piece of prose writing addressed to Seika, not even the *Seisai-ki* or the *Shishōka-ki*. The only reference to him occurs in a context that is hardly flattering: to judge by the *Suñjip* the only thing Hang took with him from

⁶⁴ Text in Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 74-76.

⁶⁵ In the second part of the *Kanyangnok* Hang says that Seika "eventually" spoke about him to Hiromichi, who thereupon asked him to make copies of the Six Classics (*Kaikō sōsai*, p. 416; *Kanyangnok*, pp. 293-294; *Kanyōroku*, p. 90; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 183-184), and in the *Sōmnan sajōk* he places the beginning of his scribal activities after his visit to the Chinese hostages: "Since in Japan it is thus that, when one has money one can even make the devils do one's bidding, I finally let myself be hired by the monk *shuso* Shun to do his copying and earn some money" (*Kaikō sōsai*, p. 437; *Kanyangnok*, p. 248; *Kanyōroku*, p. 123; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 284. N.B. Pak forgot to translate the phrase about the devils!). Is then the unnamed monk for whom he did some copying, mentioned in the first part of the *Kanyangnok*, somebody else than Seika?

⁶⁶ Ōta I, p. 72. The poems are titled "On a painting of chrysanthemums, in answer to Kang Hang." The circumstances under which they were written are described in the *Kanyangnok* (*Kaikō sōsai*, p. 438; *Kanyangnok*, p. 248-249; *Kanyōroku*, p. 124; *Tōyō Bunko*, pp. 285-286).

Japan was a good joke.⁶⁷ As the things that he wrote and left in Japan show a rather exceptional degree of “autoplagerism,” the impression is created that Hang wrote these pieces on command, wanted to give himself the minimum of trouble and, though this contradicts what he says about Seika in the *Kanyangnok*, did not hold their recipient in high esteem.

In Japan, however, these writings were duly admired and collected: the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku* found a place in the *Seika bunshū*, in the same chapter as the poems etc. that were written by the members of the Korean embassy of 1590 and presented to Seika; the *Gokei-batsu* was inserted into the *Zoku Seika bunshū*, and the *Seisai-ki* and the *Shishōka-ki* were prefixed to the *Seika-sensei bunshū*. This suggests that these writings were very important within the Japanese context: important, because they were felt to be independent eyewitness accounts of Seika’s personality and way of living before he had established himself as a teacher of Confucianism and yet stressed the same things that were to become hackneyed commonplaces in Seika’s later biographies. The circumstance that these accounts were written by a Korean will only have strengthened their impact, for Koreans were generally regarded as being more knowledgeable in matters of Confucianism than the Japanese themselves.

The picture of Seika’s position within the Confucian tradition in Japan that emerges from the material introduced above can be summarized as follows:

- UNTIL SEIKA APPEARED THE NEO-CONFUCIANISM OF THE PHILOSOPHERS OF THE SUNG WAS NOT KNOWN. This is said in so many words in the communication, and also in the *Gokei-batsu*:

Japan is a country in the sea, very far removed from China. Its nobles (*shih-tai-fu*) have so far never made their houses famous with their explanations of the Classics. How could they ever have made a practical use of their powers in investigating principle and in making their hearts right? If with luck somebody did become known for his Confucian scholarship, it did not amount to more than the commentaries of He Yan 何晏 (d. 249) and Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (127-200). They say that the explanations of the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi are of no use, and only a few of them do not with [these writings] stop up bottles. After more than a thousand years had passed by, at last they have gotten this one man:

⁶⁷ Quoted in Matsuda Kō, “Fujiwara Seika to Kyō Suiin,” pp. 251-252.

Seisai Renpu 斂夫.⁶⁸ He is poor and keeps himself to himself; he does not seek fame, but only enjoys himself with his books. In his studies he has progressed far, and he has done so on his own. He makes the preservation [of the heart] and self-scrutiny to be his one basic principle.⁶⁹ The Classics he has thought through and analysed clearly. He alone considers the commentaries of the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi to be correct, but in the whole country nobody knows him. Only Lord Akamatsu associates with him on intimate terms. ... The people of Japan did not know that the Sages of the Song exist. Only Renpu has brought them to the fore. ... I congratulate Renpu on the fact that he on his own has found the Classics that have been left.⁷⁰

The same *clichés*, which stem from the biographies of the Song patriarchs of Neo-Confucian, we find again in the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku*:

As far as his learning is concerned he is not closely confined within one tradition. He has not received the transmission from a teacher. He has based himself on the Classics left over from a thousand years ago, and has resumed the strands that were broken before a thousand years. He has progressed far, and on his own. Widely he has sought, and he continues [the learning of] far [and ancient times].⁷¹ From what was represented by the knotted strings, what was borne by the dragon horse and carried by the divine tortoise or stored in the walls of Confucius' [house], up to [the writings of] Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 (1017-1073), the Cheng, Zhang Zai 張載(1020-1077) and Zhu Xi, Zhu Xi (*sic*) and Lu Xiangshan 陸象山 (1139-1193), Xu Heng 許衡 (1209-1281) and Wu Zheng 吳澄 (1249-1333), Xue Xuan 薛瑄 (1392-1464), Hu Juren 胡居仁 (1434-1484), Chen Xianzhang 陳獻章 (1428-1500) and Wang Yangming 王陽明 (1472-1529),⁷² etc., all the books about the [Philosophy of] *Xing* and *Li* — he has studied them thoroughly and widely; he has thought them through and analyzed them clearly. In everything he makes it the basis of his learning to extend the Heavenly Principles and to fetter the unruly heart. ... Japanese scholars everywhere in the country only knew that there existed a learning [that consisted of] memorizing and reciting words and phrases; they did not yet know

⁶⁸ "Renpu" is Seika's Style (*zi*).

⁶⁹ See *Mengzi* IV B 14 and Zhu Xi's commentary to this passage.

⁷⁰ *DNS* XII.31, pp. 554-555.

⁷¹ See Han Yu, *Jinxue jie* 進學解 (*Guwen guanzhi* 古文遺止 8).

⁷² The "knotted" strings" were a mnemonic device, in use in ancient China before writing had been invented (see Morohashi VIII: 27398-115). The "dragon horses" rose out of the Yellow River in the days of Fu Xi 伏羲, with the Eight Trigrams on its back (see Morohashi XII: 48818-516), and the "divine turtle" was found by Yu 禹 after he had succeeded in controlling the floods. The signs on its carapace inspired Yu to make the "nine divisions" see 九疇 (*jiuchou*) of the "Great Plan (see *Shujing* 書經 5, 4 ("Hongfan" 洪範); Morohashi VI: 17245-182). The "walls of Confucius' house" refer to the discovery of the ancient character texts of several of the Classics when Confucius' old house in Lu was torn down. These texts formed one of the major sources of the Old Text School, which originated at the end of the Former Han Dynasty (see Morohashi II: 3233-441). For Zhou Dunyi, Cheng Hao, Cheng Yi, Zhang Zai, Zhu Xi and Lu Xiangshan (Jiuyuan) the reader is referred to Franke, Herbert, ed., *Sung Biographies*; for Xue Xuan, Hu Quren, Chen Xianzhang and Wang Yangming, to Goodrich, *Dictionary of Ming Biography*; for Xu Heng and Wu Zheng see de Bary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart*, *passim*.

that the learning of the Holy Ones and Sages existed: a learning of Human Nature and Principle, of preserving [one's heart] and of scrutinizing oneself, of knowledge and action being one. ... he was born in a faraway country, cut off by the sea, and he aroused this one region from its blindness and deafness.⁷³

In the *Kanyangnok*, however, Hang gives a different description of the situation. Having spoken of the hostility that exists between the various Buddhist sects, he continues:

As for the study of the Holy Classics, they either follow the commentaries of Kong Anguo 孔安國 (2nd c. B.C.) and Zheng Xuan, or they follow the explanations of Zhu Xi. Thus divided into sects, [students] move from [one] to [the other], and every [teacher] sets up his own faction.⁷⁴

For the evaluation of this first point the reader is referred to Chapters II and III.

- SEIKA WAS LONELY AND UNKNOWN. He was so willingly, for he did not approve of the policies and personalities of the more important politicians and he did not want to become a member of their *entourage*. The only *daimyō* he befriended were Akamatsu Hiromichi and Kinoshita Katsutoshi.

Statements to this effect can be found in the *Gokei-batsu*⁷⁵ and in the preface of the *Bunshō tattokuroku*:

Because the laws of the king were not heeded and unruly bandits did as they pleased, from his youth onwards Renpu lived in seclusion and privately found his pleasure in the Way.⁷⁶

As far as his character is concerned, he hides his talents and does not seek to become famous. People may have heard of him and never have seen him, or they may have seen him and yet not know him [for what he really is]. When he sees good, he is amazed; in hating evil he seems like mad. If it were not in conformity with the Way, he would not wish even to be a king or a minister or a great dignitary. [As Yan Hui 顏回] he is satisfied with a bamboo dish [of rice] and a gourd [to drink from], and [he lives in] a mean, narrow lane.⁷⁷ But he lives there

⁷³ DNS XII.31, p. 570.

⁷⁴ *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 424; *Kanyangnok*, p. 218; *Kanyōroku*, p. 103; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 223.

⁷⁵ See the translation on p. 17: "He is poor and keeps himself to himself," etc.

⁷⁶ DNS XII.31, p. 569.

⁷⁷ Yan Hui was one of Confucius' disciples. For this passage see *Lunyu* VI, 11. Legge translates: "The Master said, "Admirable indeed was the virtue of Hui! With a single bamboo dish of rice, a single gourd dish of drink, and living in a mean narrow lane, while others could not have endured the distress, he did not allow his joy to be affected by it. Admirable indeed was the virtue of Hui!"

magnanimously. If it is something righteousness does not allow,⁷⁸ he does not care even for a thousand foursomes of horses or ten thousand measures [of grain]^{79,80}

The ancients who wrote books did not see practised what they had written in their own days, but they all had it practised later on. Now Renpu does not exert himself to have [what he believes in] practised by his contemporaries, but he tries to have it practised in later days. But should this mean that Renpu is generous only to [the people living in] later times, and mean to [the people of] the present? Or only that it is something that cannot be practised now?⁸¹

The theme also occurs in the *Seisai-ki*,⁸² the *Shishōka-ki*,⁸³ and even in the *Kanyangnok*:

Again he (= Seika) said: “The leaders of Japan are all robbers. Only Hiromichi really has a human heart. In Japan normally one does not follow mourning rituals. Hiromichi is the only one who kept his three years of mourning.”⁸⁴

A more effective way of blackening the Japanese in the eyes of a Confucian Korean would have been hard to find.

It is also in the *Kanyangnok*, and in this context, that Hang reports the story of Ieyasu’s attempts to enlist Seika’s services:

The *naidaijin* Tokugawa Ieyasu heard of his wisdom and talents; he built him a house in the capital of Japan and gave him two thousand *koku* of rice yearly. Shun *shuso*, however, rejected the house and did not live there; he refused the grain and did not accept it.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ See DNS XII.31, p. 639, where Hang, in his conversation with Seika, uses the same expression about himself, only substituting *gu* 顧 (J. *kaerimiru*) for *ke* 可 (J. *-beshi*).

⁷⁹ I.e. enormous riches, like that of duke Jing 景 of Qi 齊, who had one thousand foursomes of horses (Lunyu XVI, 12), or like Chen Tai 陳戴, who had estates with a revenue of ten thousand *zhong* 鍾 of grain (Mengzi III B 10). See also Mengzi VI A 10.

⁸⁰ DNS XII.31, pp. 569-570.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 571.

⁸² Ibid., p. 635: “As far as his character is concerned he lives concealed and teaches; he does not seek to become famous, ...,” etc. Ibid., p. 637: “Since the people of this later generation (i.e. the contemporary Japanese. WJB) who know Renpu are few, I could not perforce not speak about him, although I come from far away. Therefore I write this piece, awaiting the Ziyun of a later generation.”

⁸³ Ibid., p. 634: “Now, in every village and country, the empire has its gentlemen, and yet Mencius did not consider it sufficient to befriend only them[, but he says that one should also befriend the men of old]. How much more [urgent should this be], if there are no gentlemen [anywhere] in the empire, in any village and country [as is the case with Seika in Japan]?”

⁸⁴ *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 416; *Kanyangnok*, p. 293; *Kanyōroku*, p. 90; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 183.

⁸⁵ Ibid., resp. p. 415; p. 293; p. 89, p. 181.

I do not think, however, that these statements can be accepted at face value. As the *Gyōjō*, the *Kanyangnok* and Seika's own collected works show, Seika knew quite a few people, i.e. the important *daimyō* Tokugawa Ieyasu, Kobayakawa Hideaki and Kinoshita Katsutoshi. Amongst the members of the *entourage* of these *daimyō*, the monks, clerks, physicians, literati, etc., he was also well known. So the seclusion and obscurity in which he lived were not as great as Hang intimates. In other words, Hang gives an idealized description of a situation he perhaps only partly understood.

The key is set by the line in the preface to the *Bunshō tattokuroku*: "He lived in seclusion and privately found his pleasure in the Way." It is the *cliché* of the happy sage, of Yan Hui, that Hang has in mind. In the set pieces he wrote, the *Gokei-batsu*, the Preface, the Inscriptions (*ji*; *J. ki*), he works it for all it is worth. It is interesting, however, to see that in the *Kanyangnok* he uses a different explanation: all Japanese are scoundrels, but my friend Seika hates them.

Both these explanations of Hang, however, miss the main point, and the misunderstanding will be due in part to Hang's Korean background. In Korea to go out and serve or to retire and teach was to a certain extent a matter of choice.⁸⁶ But somebody in Seika's position did not have the options a Korean *yangban* 兩班 had. Seika was an orphan, penniless, and a monk, and this practically excluded him from any of the court dignities his birth entitled him to. On the other hand, his high descent prevented him from entering outright into the service of a *daimyō* or any other member of the military class. At the very least a polite pretence of guest friendship would have to be kept up. As a secondary factor one must, of course, mention that for Seika political power lacked the fascination that could have induced him to involve himself more deeply with politics. The fastidiousness Hang mentions is certainly part of the explanation, but not to the exclusion of the social context.

The stress that, in face of the evidence, is put on Seika's secluded life etc., is in my opinion due to hagiographical *clichés* and can be considered as part of the Seika legend.

- SEIKA WAS INTERESTED IN KOREAN CONFUCIAN RITUAL, CLOTHING, ETC.; he was the first to resume the *sekiten* 釋典 (Ch. *shidian*) and *sekisai* 釋菜 (Ch.

⁸⁶ This was especially so in the Yi dynasty when the struggles between the various *yangban* factions made many people prefer the quiet of the country and of private tutoring over the dangers of a political career. See Vos, F., *Die Religionen Koreas*, pp. 165-166; 168-170.

shicai), the ritual offerings in the Confucius temple.

In the *Kanyangnok* Kang Hang mentions that both Seika and Hiromichi were interested in the *shidian* and *shicai* rituals:

Furthermore [Seika] asked your servant (= Hang) about the order of the examinations in our country, and about the rules of the *shidian* ritual in spring and autumn, the lectures to Your Majesty on the Classics, and the court audiences. I answered him that I was only a rustic person and that it was hardly worth the trouble to ask me. I only told him the bare outlines of the examinations, the *shidian* etc.⁸⁷

Furthermore [Akamatsu Hiromichi] had obtained the *Rules for the shicai at the district school* 郡學釋菜儀目 (*Kunhak sōkch'ae ūimok*) and the *Five Kinds of Rites* 國朝五禮儀 ([*Kukcho*] *oryeŭi*). In his own fief in Tajima he supervised the building of a Confucius temple. Moreover, he had ritual clothing and caps made after the pattern of our country, and when he had time to spare he led his retainers and practised the ritual.⁸⁸

In his obituary of Hiromichi, Seika, too, mentions the same facts, and like Hang he properly gives him the credit for the undertaking:

After the Way of the Five Classics and the Four Books had been transmitted [to Hiromichi] by the Korean erudite Kang Hang, who had been Assistant Section Chief of the Board of Punishments, he tried to hold the ritual of the *shidian* which had long been interrupted, and something like examinations. In this country, too, in former times had these not been performed enthusiastically? For in the writings of the Minister of the Right, Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845-903), much is said about it. The erudite (= Hang) said: "That in [this time of] warring states he has such ambitions, that [must be because] he remembered the example of duke Wen of Teng 藤文公.⁸⁹ The only thing he lacks in his time is the talent of a Mencius [to help him]. This is very galling." Thus he had felt. At the end of his many writings he wrote this down, and then he returned to his own country.⁹⁰

Razan, however, just as fittingly stresses Seika's part in these activities:

Again he (= Seika) urged [Hiromichi] to erect a separate building in which to enshrine the tablets of the Holy Ones, [in fact,] to make a kind of Dachengdian 大

⁸⁷ *Kaikō sōsai*, p. 415; *Kanyangnok*, p. 293; *Kanyōroku*, p. 90; *Tōyō Bunko*, p. 183.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, resp. p. 416; p. 294; pp. 90-91; p. 184. The *Kukcho oryeŭi* is described in Fang, Chaoying, *The Asami Library: A Descriptive Catalogue*, p. 12.

⁸⁹ For duke Wen of Teng see *Mengzi* III A 1-3.

⁹⁰ Ōta I, pp. 236-237.

成殿.⁹¹ By way of trial he had Teijun 貞順 (= Yoshida Soan) and his other disciples learn the *shidian* ritual. This ritual had been interrupted for a long time, but Seika hoped that from these small beginnings it would eventually come to be practised on a large scale.⁹²

Seika was also interested in the *shenyi* 深衣 (J. *shin'e*) the Confucian ritual garment. Razan, who seems to be very much intrigued by it, mentions it in the first letter he wrote to Seika, in 1604,⁹³ and talks about it at their first meeting.⁹⁴ And in one of his letters to Razan of the same year Seika indicates the differences between his own version of the *shenyi*, “that follows the pattern of our national dress,” and the Ming Chinese original.⁹⁵

These are the three headings under which the image of Seika as it emerges from these writings of Hang can be summarized. It is perhaps unfair as yet to call it a legend, but it certainly became one later on, when these same points were stated over and again, with ever growing conviction, and Seika was fitted into the genealogical tables of Japanese Confucianism.

2. The Seika Legend

The first stage of the development of the legend is, of course, the *Seika-sensei gyōjō*.⁹⁶ In the main Hayashi Razan's descriptions are consistent with those of Kang Hang, but there are a few differences of emphasis and presentation. There is, e.g., a difference in the way in which, in his communication to Hang, Seika laments the absolute lack of knowledge of the new philosophy of the Song, and the way Razan presents the facts, admitting the at least one tenth was known. The phrase “They say that the Han Confucians are right and those of the Song wrong,” does not reappear in the *Gyōjō*. Razan evidently is not quoting from the communication, even though it is included in

⁹¹ *Dachengdian* or “Hall of a Complete Concert” is the generic name of the main hall of a Confucius temple. See Morohashi III: 5831-1290; *Mengzi* V B 1.

⁹² *NST* XXVIII, p. 191. See Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 30.

⁹³ *Bunshū* 2 (I, pp. 12-15).

⁹⁴ *NST* XXVIII, pp. 202-203.

⁹⁵ Ōta I, p. 140; *ZZGR* XIII, p. 113. See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 81-83.

⁹⁶ Chronologically the funerary poems etc., collected in the *Seika bunshū* (see Ōta I, pp. 301-312), come first, but since these utterances are highly poetic and must be interpreted as instances of a special genre

the *Seika bunshū*, which he edited.

Earlier, immediately after he has given up his plans to go to China, we already find Seika thinking: “The Holy One, too, did not have a regular master.⁹⁷ For me, too, it will be sufficient to look for one in the Classics.”⁹⁸ Here again the communication had been more positive: while according to the *Gyōjō* Seika, referring to Confucius, hints that he himself, too, never has had one exclusive teacher, the communication claims that “from his youth onwards he never had a teacher.”

The sources are consistent, however, in that they both emphasize the theme that everything started with Seika. This theme of Seika as a kind of *caput scientiae* is pervasive. In connection with the *Bunshō tattokuroku* it appears again, as we see from the relevant passages in the *Gyōjō* and in Hang’s Preface:

Again, because the people of these days do not know the rules and standards of writing literature, he (= Seika) collected discussions about poetry and criticisms of literature by famous writers of ancient and modern times, and he composed the [*Bunshō*] *tattokuroku kōryō* in a considerable number of chapters.⁹⁹

Nowadays, moreover, the scholars do not know the rules and standards for writing literature. Therefore, [Seika] collected discussions by Sages of earlier times, inserted his own opinions, divided [the material] and arranged it into categories, and [in this way] made the [*Bunshō*] *tattokuroku kōryō*.¹⁰⁰

Here we find Seika at the basis of all good writing, as his edition of the Classics placed him at the basis of all decent Confucian studies. It will hardly be necessary to point out that both sources show a regrettable lack of appreciation of all Chinese writing carried out by Seika’s immediate predecessors and contemporaries.

In his summing up at the end of the *Gyōjō* Razan describes Seika in the following terms:

The Master studied in his youth and did not relent when he reached adult age. He acquainted himself with Buddhism and Taoism and he read widely in all schools. He also perused the *Nihon shoki*, the *Man’yōshū*¹⁰¹ and the poetry and prose of the previous reigns. In the course of his reading he “rejected all the heterodox

they will not be dealt with here.

⁹⁷ See *Lunyu* XIX, 22, and Legge’s translation.

⁹⁸ *NST* XXVIII, p. 190.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

¹⁰⁰ *DNS* XII.31, p. 570.

¹⁰¹ See Takano Tatsuyuki, “Ide yo, Reizei-ke denpon *Manyōshū*.”

doctrines and his thinking was now pure and unadulterated.”¹⁰²

He acutely observed the meaning [of the Classics] and analyzed [their] principles. [He did this easily,] like splitting bamboo: he never had to exert his strength. He once said: “Whether I read it or somebody else, how could the meaning of the text be different? In that case, however, the commentaries and sub-commentaries by the various Confucians can be read by anybody who knows his characters. The things one [should] value, however, one has to find outside of the words.”

Everyone who knew the Master praised him as an illustrious Confucian[, responsible for] the restoration [of Confucianism]; those who did not know him unreasonably considered him as somebody without teacher or tradition.¹⁰³ The Way, however, is one. A man may enlarge the Way¹⁰⁴; he cannot stray from it for one moment.¹⁰⁵ There are those who see a Sage and so know the Way¹⁰⁶; there are those who endeavour to cultivate their virtue by means of others.¹⁰⁷ [Sometimes] somebody is aroused [on hearing of the Sages] after a hundred generations [have passed by],¹⁰⁸ or [proclaims] the identical Way although he is a thousand miles distant.¹⁰⁹ Therefore the people use it daily without knowing it. More than a thousand years after, in ancient times, Confucius had died, Zhou Dunyi on his own resumed the tradition that nobody had handed down [to him]. Was this not [due to the working of] the Way? Is [the appearance of] the Master not a similar case? Is it not [one of those] occasions of good fortune to our country, [when] “all under heaven begins to be adorned and brightened,”¹¹⁰ and the Five Planets gather in the sign Kui 奎 [as an omen of peace]?¹¹¹ Is this not truly magnificent? How could one, because of the ephemeral words of one individual, doubt something that has been the unanimous opinion of the whole world during a myriad generations? I, [Dō]shun (= Razan), have only given an outline of what I have seen and heard [myself]. But how much more [could be told] of those things that I have not seen or heard? After the Master had died every last piece of his writings was dispersed and those who could lay hands on one treasured it. [Still] the few drafts and manuscripts that have been left will create a stir throughout the world.¹¹²

¹⁰² Quotation for *Jinsilu* 14, 25 (the biography of Zhang Zai). See Chan, *Reflections on Things at Hand*, pp. 306-307.

¹⁰³ Note the importance of a teacher and a tradition to authenticate one's status as a Confucian scholar. That in fact this was felt to be of extreme importance is, of course, the basic assumption on which the argument of this chapter rests. See the introduction to this book.

¹⁰⁴ *Lunyu* XV, 29. See Legge's translation.

¹⁰⁵ *Zhongyong*, first *zhang*. See Legge's translation.

¹⁰⁶ *Mengzi* VII B 38, and Legge's translation.

¹⁰⁷ *Mengzi* IV B 22, and Legge's translation.

¹⁰⁸ *Mengzi* VII B 15, and Legge's translation.

¹⁰⁹ *Mengzi* IV B 1. Legge's translates: “Mencius said, ... ‘Those regions (i.e. the regions where resp. Shun 舜 and King Wen 文王 lived. WJB) were distant from one another more than a thousand *li* 里, and the age of the one sage was posterior to that of the other more than a thousand years. ... But when we examine those sages, both the earlier and the later, their principles are found to be the same.’”

¹¹⁰ See *Yijing* 易經, Fourth Appendix, sect. 1, ch. 4, 17; Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 414; Honda Wataru. *Eki*, pp. 19-20.

¹¹¹ *Kui* is the fifteenth of the twenty-eight zodiacal constellations. It was in charge of civil, as opposed to military fortune. See also the headnote to this passage in *NST* XXVIII, p. 197.

¹¹² *NST* XXVIII, pp. 196-197.

But Seika was not only the father of the Renaissance of Confucian studies, he was also a rather peculiar person, as the last part of Razan's description shows:

Next to his left eyebrow the Master had a mole more than three inches long and his eyes had double pupils [like Shun]. Although ordinarily he cut his hair and did not wear a cap, he sometimes let the hair on the crown of his head grow and did not mind that it grew long. People thought this very strange, but they were afraid of his severity and did not dare to ask the reason [for this behaviour]. By nature he loved wine, but sometimes he did not even wet his lips for ten days, and sometimes he drank much and then he was drunk, but not disorderly. He never liked social calls and large gatherings, but when he met somebody and was glad, he sat and talked with him the whole day. When somebody came to visit him he taught and enlightened him according to his kind, like a bell when it is struck: sometimes it sounds small and sometimes loud.¹¹³

The Master did not leave his house and the Way rose higher and higher in his days. The Master spoke well: will the Way be practised more and more in later generations?¹¹⁴

The first two points which constitute the Seika legend are clearly represented: Seika is a *chūkō no meiju* 中興の名儒, an "illustrious Confucian responsible for the Restoration of Confucianism"; he also was a man of a retiring disposition. Moreover, as we have already seen, the *Gyōjō* takes due notice of his interest in the *shidian* and *shicai* ceremonies, and the *shenyi* figures conspicuously, not only in the letters Razan and Seika exchanged, but also at Ieyasu's court in Kyoto, where for some time after the Battle of Sekigahara (*sic*) Seika regularly appeared wearing it.¹¹⁵

Razan wrote the *Gyōjō* in the year following Seika's death. It was included in the *Seika bunshū*. The prefaces and postfaces of the *Seika bunshū* are all dated in 1627, and it is here that we may expect to find the next instances of the legend.

Hori Kyōan 堀杏庵 (1585-1642), one of Seika's more important disciples, writes in his preface to the *Bunshū seihen* that

Alone Master Fujiwara Renpu arose and made it his duty to restore Confucian learning 斯文 (*siwen*). He gathered the learning that [for long] had not been

¹¹³ Quotation from *Liji* 禮記 18 ("Xueji" 學記), 9. See head-note in NST XXVIII, p. 198.

¹¹⁴ NST XXVIII, pp. 197-198.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 191-192. Ieyasu never was in Kyoto in 1600. According to *Shiryō sōran* XIII, pp. 264-286, he did not enter the capital after the Battle of Sekigahara, but remained in Ōtsu for some time. From there he went straight to Ōsaka. Hidetada 秀忠 stayed in Fushimi, but only briefly, from the twenty-third till the twenty-ninth day of the ninth month.

transmitted from the Classics that had remained. He cut away the brambles of heterodox opinions and opened up the right way that reeds had overgrown, so that the scholars knew which way to go. Because of this the people of these days know to place the Six Classics first and literary pursuits second. They start from the *Daxue*, the *Zhongyong*, the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi*; they transmit these works within their families and recite them in their houses; they realize [the truth of these works] in their minds and recognize them as right in their hearts, and eventually they submit to the interpretation of the Cheng [brothers], Zhang Zai, and Zhu Xi. But the Master did not seek to become famous, he did not consort with the men of power and prominence. He lived obscurely at the foot of the Hokuniku Mountain 北肉山, closed his door, and nursed his illnesses. Therefore, even amongst his disciples, only a few received the true transmission [of his teachings].¹¹⁶

In his postface to the same work, Razan's younger brother, Hayashi Nobuzumi (Eiki) 林信澄・永喜 (1585-1638), writes:

The Master deplored this (i.e. the oblivion into which Confucian studies had fallen. WJB) and made clear [the philosophy of] Human Nature and Principle, and the Four Books and Six Classics he all explained according to the interpretation of the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi. He discarded Buddhism and Taoism, and the Three Principles and the Five Human Relations he taught according to the Way of the Holy Ones and Sages.¹¹⁷

Seika's retired life, however, is treated differently by him. Right at the beginning of his postface he explains that it depends on the circumstances whether and how one can act in accordance with the Way, and in his peroration he joins issue with the editor of the *Zokuhen* of the *Seika bunshū* and yet another of Seika's disciples, Kan (Kamata) Tokuan (Gendō) 菅・鎌田得庵・玄洞 (1581-1628), precisely on this point:

Gendō had once been a disciple of the Master, and therefore, in his mind, he deplored the fact that unfortunately the Master had not had his opportunity and had not been able to carry out the Way.¹¹⁸ For this reason he transmitted his (= Seika's) writings to the world, in order to make him a teacher for a myriad generations. But has this been the case only with the Master? Even Confucius and Mencius missed their times. But then, whether the Way is acted on [in the world] or not is dependent on the times. Is this perhaps what is meant? "Yao 堯 is praised as corresponding to Heaven, and yet he did not submit the loftiness of [Xu You 許由, who lived on] the north bank of the Ying 潁." "King Wu 武王 [s

¹¹⁶ Ōta I, p. 256; *DNS* XII.31, p. 557.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, resp., p. 258; p. 559.

¹¹⁸ Where Tokuan said this, Eiki does not indicate. No such thing is said in the only accessible instance of Tokuan's writings, his preface to the *Seika bunshū zokuhen*.

music] was perfectly beautiful[, but not perfectly good],” and ultimately he made [the sons of the lord of the country] Guzhu 古注 fulfill their pledge.¹¹⁹ From [these examples] we see that not to act also can be acting. In the case of the Master, was it not only that he knew his times [and therefore did not act]? Would it [then still] be necessary to talk about his acting or not acting?¹²⁰

Kan Tokuan himself, in his preface to the *Bunshū zokuhen*, again illustrates the first two points of the legend to perfection:

The Master ... from his youth onward loved to read books and his hand and mouth never stopped [reciting] literature. He was nobody's disciple, but he had the brightness of the Five Elements.¹²¹ He was like Jiren 季仁, addicted to the three wishes.¹²² Moreover, he acquired a proud nature like Li Ying 李膺¹²³: he kept himself aloof and refused to associate with other people. He admired Tao Yuanming's 陶淵明 intentions [as expressed in his poem] “Guiqu[-lai ci]” 歸去來辭 (“Le chant de retour”); he never accepted bureaucratic appointments or salaries. He contented himself with his untrammelled leisure. In his last years he “was at rest”¹²⁴ in his cottage in Ichihara. Amidst the hills and gullies he did as he pleased, and he sang [the ode] “Kaopan” 考槃¹²⁵ along the streams in the valleys. He intoned poems about the seven places [of scenic beauty] and put

¹¹⁹ The phrase as such occurs in *Hou Han Shu* 後漢書 83, but it refers to two sections of the *Lunyu*, resp. VIII, 19, and III, 25; see Legge's translations. For Xu You see *infra*, Ch. III, n. 45. Yi the Elder 伯夷 and Qi the Younger 叔齊 were the sons of the lord of Guzhu, the country ruled by the descendants of Shennong 神農. When King Wu overthrew Zhou 紂, they starved themselves to death, rather than renege their loyalty to their lord.

¹²⁰ Ōta I, p. 259; *DNS* XII.31, p. 559.

¹²¹ The expression “the brightness of the Five Elements” probably is intended as a synonym of expressions like “the finest” 精 (*jing*; J. *sei*) or “best” 秀 (*xiu*; J. *shū*) *qi* 氣. Thus the expression means that Seika had the disposition of a Sage, for Sages are characterized by the fact that the *qi* of which they are made is very fine and clear. Another possible interpretation is that *wuxing* 五行 is synonymous with *wuchang* 五常, the Five Constant Virtues. For examples of this usage see Morohashi I: 257-78, and the *Gogyō genkai* 五行諺解 by Kan Tokuan's disciple Kumagai Reisai 熊谷荔齋 (dates unknown), which has nothing to do with the five elements but is an explanation of these Constant Virtues. The phrase then should mean that Seika in his behaviour displayed these virtues in their brightest form. In view of the context, our first interpretation seems the likeliest. The second interpretation, however, might be preferable on the ground that “brightness” 明 is an epithet that is seldom, if ever, used in collocation with *qi*, but very often, e.g. in the phrase “to illustrate one's illustrious virtue” of the *Daxue*, in collocation with the inborn virtues, = the Five Constant Virtues, = *li*.

¹²² Jiren is Zhao Shishu 趙師恕 (Song). For his biography see *Song Yuan xuean* 63. His “three wishes” were “to know all good men in the world, to read all good books in the world, and to see all beautiful landscapes in the world” (see Morohashi I: 12-390).

¹²³ The text gives Yuanli 元禮, which is the Style of Li Ying. For his biography see *Hou Han Shu* 97. The three qualifications of proud nature etc. are all taken over from this biography.

¹²⁴ See *Shijing* 詩經 138. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, p. 89, translates: “Under a cross-beam door(-lintel) (i.e. in a simple hut — B.K.), one can be at rest; by the ample flow from the spring one can cure hunger.”

¹²⁵ “Kaopan” is ode 56 of the *Shijing*. According to Karlgren, *Book of Odes*, pp. 37-38, *kaopan* means “to achieve one's joy, at a love meeting.” The usual interpretations, however, were, less lasciviously, “to build a hermitage and amuse oneself, doing precisely as one likes,” or “to hit the *pan*” (supposedly a kind of music instrument). See Morohashi IX: 28843-128.

them into *waka*.¹²⁶ He cherished his peace, was content with his own virtue and enjoyed his private pleasures. This was what one calls “living in retirement to study one’s aims and practising righteousness in order to carry out one’s principles. In the Master I have seen [such a man].”¹²⁷ ... When “the unvarying principles had been allowed to go to ruin”¹²⁸ and there was nobody outstanding, he secretly propped up [their decay]. “Teaching and transforming” had become flagging and slack, but he restored the manners and customs that had deteriorated. If the [present] flourishing state of our Way has not been brought about by the exertions of the Master, how then?¹²⁹

The next instance is the preface to the *Seika-sensei bunshū*. This preface is written by Emperor Go-Kōmyō 後光明 (1633-1643-1654). It is dated Keian 4/9/12 (26-10-1651).

In recent times there was one Master Seika, the Hokuniku-sanjin 北肉山人. ... In his acquiring of learning he [made use of] his wide knowledge and strong memory. Therefore his understanding of principle was subtle and clear ... If something was not according to his Way, nothing, not even high coaches and foursomes of horses, could make him pay heed¹³⁰: he threw it away like worn-out sandals.¹³¹ If something was according to his Way, even if it were only a dish of rice or a platter of soup,¹³² it would yet “be sufficient to nourish his spirit and nurse his years.”¹³³

Righteous scholars and men of benevolence, who admired his virtue and adored his deportment, who went in and out of his gate and travelled to and fro over his way — they could not be counted. Aye, was he not [greeted with joy, like] the sound of footsteps in a lonely valley¹³⁴ or the appearance of sun and moon after darkness? Although [others could not reach] his finesse and subtlety, even as one cannot scale heaven with a ladder,¹³⁵ nevertheless several people have to some extent acquired one or other of the Master’s members (i.e. his virtues. WJB).¹³⁶

Daily [his teachings] brought something new and every month they flourished more.¹³⁷ From those days onward the people have honoured and

¹²⁶ See e.g. the Japanese poem sequence “The scenery in Ichihara: Seven poems,” in Ōta I, pp. 215-216.

¹²⁷ *Lunyu* XVI, 11. See Legge’s translation. The section closes with the phrase “I have heard these words, but I have not seen such men.” Tokuan had been luckier, in this respect, than Confucius.

¹²⁸ *Shujing* 5, 4 (“*Hongfan*”); see Legge’s translation in *Shu Ching, Book of History*, p. 126.

¹²⁹ Ōta I, p. 293; *DNS* XII.31, p. 561.

¹³⁰ See *Mengzi* V A, 7.

¹³¹ See *Mengzi* VII A, 35.

¹³² See *Mengzi* VII A, 34; VII B, 11.

¹³³ Quotation from Han Yu; see Morohashi XII: 43455-23.

¹³⁴ See Morohashi VIII: 25415-131.

¹³⁵ See *Lunyu* XIX, 15. Legge translates: “Zigong 子貢 said ... , ‘Our Master (= Confucius) cannot be attained to, just in the same way as the heavens cannot be gone up to by the steps of a stair.’”

¹³⁶ See *Mengzi* II A, 2 (20). Legge translates: “Formerly, I once heard this: Zixia 子夏, Ziyou 子遊 and Zizhang 子張 had each one member of the Sage (= Confucius).” For the explanation and interpretation of this phrase see Morohashi I: 1-1421.

¹³⁷ The same phrase is used by Zhu Xi in his preface to the *Zhongyong*, where it is applied to the growth of the heterodox schools.

believed the Holy Ones and Sages and Humanity and Righteousness have been preached. The blessings and benefits of his virtue, with which he covered the empire and coming generations, were far-reaching and complete.

In those times orators arose like clouds and impostors gathered like stars, but expostulations about virtue one seldom heard. The Master was the only one who pitied the misery the people had fallen into, and who was distressed by the [extent to which the] Way was obscured by the dust of the world. Several times he visited *daimyō* and preached to them. To those above he discoursed on Yao and Shun and to those below he spoke of the Duke of Chou 周公 and Confucius, but glib-tongued, smartly speaking men all claimed that this was abstruse and far removed from actual concerns. Therefore he was not used in the world. So Seika withdrew and lived in his cottage in Ichihara. He lived in retirement and spoke as he liked.¹³⁸

Again, we find the first two points admirably stated, even at the cost of an obvious inconsistency between the second (and third) and the last paragraph of the quotation, the same inconsistency that could be observed in the quotation from Hori Kyōan's preface to the *Seika bunshū* (cf. *supra*, pp.26-27).

It is possible, of course, to continue this list, but I think that the point I wanted to make has been sufficiently established. The treatment of Seika in later sources (e.g. the *Sentetsu sōdan* 先哲叢談) and in studies of the Meiji period like those of Inoue Tetsujirō does not differ materially from the interpretation offered in the oldest sources introduced above.

Perhaps, at this point, we had better analyze these statements and try to determine against what background they should be interpreted. In order to do this the first question we will have to answer is: what was at that time the generally accepted conception of the growth of the Confucian tradition in Japan?

To start with the conclusions, the general idea was that formerly Confucianism had existed, even flourished, in Japan, that it had (almost) disappeared during the Middle Ages and had experienced its Renaissance at the beginning of the Edo period, when through the good offices of Seika it became impregnated with Neo-Confucianism.

In his *Gakumon genryū* 學問源流, the first history of Japanese Confucianism, Nawa Rodō 那波魯堂 (1727-1789) writes:

The customs of the Engi (901-922) and Tenryaku (947-956) eras gradually

¹³⁸ Ōta I, p. 1; ZZGR, p. 43.

declined and little by little the number of people in the world who knew of the learning of the Classics grew less. When we come to the Kenmu (1334-1335/1337) and Genkō (1331-1333) eras there are people like Nitta Yoshisada 新田義貞 (1301-1338), Ashikaga Takauji 足利尊氏 (1305-1338-1358) and Kusunoki Masashige 楠木正成 (1245-1336), and sometime before them there were the Wada 和田 and the Hōjō 北條. Wars were rife in the empire and together with learning the court aristocracy declined. The exclusive interest was in the arts of war.¹³⁹

It is a constant principle of Heaven, [however], that when disorder has reached its limit, [things] tend to order [again]. In this case Master Fujiwara Seika appeared. He is the founding-teacher of the learning of the Classics. ... In the thirteenth year of the Yung-lo period (1403-1424) Emperor Cheng-tsu 成祖 of the Ming dynasty ordered his Confucian servants to collect the *Sishu daquan* 四書大全, *Wujing daquan* 五經大全, and *Xingli daquan* 性理大全. In Japan this was the time of the 101st emperor, Emperor Shōkō 稱光 (1401-1412-1428), the year Ōei 22 (1415), when [Ashikaga] Yoshimochi 義持 (1386-1394-1423-1428) was *shōgun*. But only after some 140 or 150 years had passed these books came east. That is to say, in Seika's days. ... Basing himself on the Four Books and the Five Classics and on the *Xingli daquan*, and largely availing himself of the learning of the scholars of the Song, he established his teachings. When the country entered upon its period of peace, his learning extended itself greatly and everybody learned from him. That the Learning of the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi became known, started with the Master.¹⁴⁰

Rodō seems to be less than sanguine in his estimate of the level of excellence attained by the Confucians even in the Engi and Tenryaku eras¹⁴¹ and to have no doubts at all about the uniqueness of Seika. If, however, we go back in time to the *Nihon kokon jinbutsushi* 日本古今人物史, a collection in 7 *kan*, published in 1669, of biographies compiled by Utsunomiya Ton'an (Yūteki) 宇都宮遯庵・由的 (1633-1709 or 1707),¹⁴² we find more details about the earliest period. In the preamble to the fifth *kan*, the *Jurin-den* 儒林傳 ("Biographies of Confucians"), he writes:

In olden times Confucianism was practised in our country by the Four Houses [of hereditary scholars of the Daigaku-ryō 大學寮, specialized respectively] in History (*kiden-dō* 紀傳道), the Classics (*myōgyō-dō* 明經道), Law (*myōhō-dō* 明

¹³⁹ *Gakumon genryū*, pp. 2b-3a. A modern edition of the *Genryū* is published in *Nihon bunko* VI.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 4b-5a.

¹⁴¹ See *ibid.*, pp. 1a-1b.

¹⁴² Utsunomiya Ton'an was a *samurai* from Iwami. He studied in Kyoto under Matsunaga Sekigo until 1646, when he was ordered home. Because in the *Jinbutsushi* he infringed on the name taboo, he was censured by the *bakufu* and sequestered in his own house in Iwami. When he was set free in 1675, he returned to Kyoto. Here he taught and won great repute by his editions of Chinese classics. In his last years he was again ordered to return to Iwami, where he died.

法道) and Arithmetic (*sandō* 算道).¹⁴³ Suga[wara] and Awa[ta] 粟田 even became one of the Three Ministers.¹⁴⁴ They were the ones with the most excellent talents and virtues. Kiyohara no Yoshishige 良枝 (1253-1331) gave his oral explanations of the Six Classics, and was allowed to “enter the hall.”¹⁴⁵ Apart from these, in every generation there were quite some people who knew the Classics or arithmetic. They figure prominently in the historical works. One might speak of a real flourishing [of learning]. Their children and grandchildren succeeded them and continued their work, but they did not reach by far [the quality of] former days. In the modern age Master Seika acquired the untransmitted learning from the Classics that had remained and greatly restored Confucian literature. Up till now most of the people who talk about learning take the Master as their model.¹⁴⁶

Another Nawa, Seika’s disciple Nawa Kassho 那波活所 (1595-1648), in his preface to his edition of the Collected Works of Bai Juyi 白居易, also gives a rather circumstantial account:

The Minister of the Right, Sugawara no Michizane, was a most eminent [figure] in our national literature. The guests from Parhae 渤海 saw his poems and said they were like [those of] Letian 樂天.¹⁴⁷ He himself wrote this down and

¹⁴³ In imitation of the Chinese example a court university (Daigaku or Daigaku-ryō) was instituted in the Taihō Code of 702. Originally its teaching personnel included a *Daigaku-no-kami* 大學守 (director), one *Monjō-hakase* 文章博士 (Erudite of Literature), one *Myōgyō-hakase* (Erudite of Confucianism) with one assistant, one *Myōbō-hakase* (Erudite of Law) with one assistant, one *San-hakase* (Erudite of Arithmetic), one *On-hakase* 音 (Erudite of Reading) and one *Sho-hakase* 書 (Erudite of Calligraphy). In the middle of the ninth century the *Kiden-dō* or Way of History usurped the place of the *Monjō-dō* from which it had originated, and the two names came to be used interchangeably. In the course of the Heian Period the *San-dō* and the *Myōbō-dō* declined into insignificance, and the positions in the other two *dō* became the preserve of four clans, the Four Houses to which Ton’an refers. These houses were the Sugawara 菅原 and the Ōe 大江, who dominated the positions within the *Kiden-dō* and also generally filled the elective office of *Daigaku-no-kami*, and the Kiyohara 清原 and Nakahara 中原, who monopolized the functions within the *Myōgyō-dō*. In the *Kiden-dō* Chinese history and literature were taught on the basis of the *Shiji* 史記, the *Han Shu*, the *Hou Han Shu* and the *Wenxuan* 文選; the *Myōgyō-hakase* taught the Confucian Classics. See Schmidt, E., *Die Ersten Hoch- und Privatschulen Japans*.

¹⁴⁴ Sugawara is of course Sugawara no Michizane; for Michizane see Wenck, Günther, “Sugawara no Michizane; Mythos und historische Gestalt.” The most likely Awata seems to be Awata no Mahito 眞人 (?-719), a great scholar and active politician, who led one embassy to China. Mahito, however, does not seem to have had any connection with the Daigaku-ryō, nor do the functions match: Michizane eventually reached the position of *udaijin* 右大臣, but Mahito never rose above that of *chūnagon* 中納言.

¹⁴⁵ The expression “to climb/enter the hall” 昇殿 (*shōden*) refers to the privilege of entering the Seiryōden 清涼殿, the emperor’s living quarters within the palace. Those who had this privilege were known as *tenjōbito* 殿上人; they were generally of the fifth court rank and higher. Yoshishige’s immediate ancestors for several generations had not risen above the fifth rank (high enough, though, to qualify as *tenjōbito*), but Yoshishige reached lower senior fourth rank. See the *Kiyohara keizu* 系図 in *GR* IV, p. 300; *ZGR* VII, p. 412; p. 425. For details concerning the several genealogical tables of the Kiyohara collected in the *GR* and *ZGR*, see *Gunsho kaidai* I, pp. 13-14.

¹⁴⁶ *Nihon kokon jinbutsushi* 5.1a.

¹⁴⁷ Letian is the Style of the Chinese poet Bai Juyi (772-846). Parhae (J. Bokkai) is the name of a sinicized state in Manchuria, Mongolia and Siberia; it considered itself as the continuation of Koguryō and existed

considered it an honour. But how could the Minister of the Right alone have been like this? Formerly the system of the state was flourishing, so literature was flourishing, too. Therefore, in the world people [of talent] were not few and learning certainly was pure. ... Alas! The system of the state deteriorated together with literature. [Literature] changed and entered into the Woods of Zen. The taste of the Zen monks ran to aridness and vegetarianism; they did not know the taste of high office and of the state in its full glory.¹⁴⁸ For this reason this collection [of poems by Bai Juyi] was not studied. Later on, however, the literature of the Zen monks, too, deteriorated. ... Fortunately there was our Master Fujiwara Seika, who in virtue as well as in literature was a great man [whose like does not appear] in a hundred generations. Hayashi *teigaku* 提學 (= Razan)¹⁴⁹ succeeded him and gave rise to a great flourishing of Confucian studies.¹⁵⁰

In other words, one was willing to acknowledge that Confucianism had existed in Japan, even flourished, during the height of the Heian Period. Seika himself acknowledges this when he writes to Razan:

How can you say that the wearing of the *shenyi* is something that has started only with me? Our country lies beyond the Eastern Sea, in the land of the sun: the place where the sun shines brilliantly on the mists of the early morning, where the great breakers and cascading waves well up. When its *qi*, which is clear and pure, coalesces, it forms talented men. Therefore when in former days the revolution of *qi* reached its zenith, both as cultural products and as men of talent were concerned, we could hold the balance with China. All the Confucians who were in the Daigaku-ryō had polished their behaviour; they were diligent and did not tire; they were upright and not remiss in their duties. The rites of the *shidian* and the system of examinations figure prominently in the writings of the Minister of the Right Sugawara no Michizane. If in those days the Confucians would not have worn Confucian clothes, practised Confucian behaviour and given expositions of the Confucian ritual, what reason should they have had to usurp the title of Confucians?¹⁵¹

All writers insist, however, that with Seika something new began.¹⁵² What Seika

from 712 till 927, when it was overrun by the Khitan. It sent many embassies to Japan.

¹⁴⁸ For the expression “zhengya” 正衙 (J. *seiga*), here translated as “the state in its glory,” see Morohashi VI: 16255-39.

¹⁴⁹ Among Seika’s disciples Razan was known by this nickname. Its meaning is “intendant of Education,” “school supervisor.”

¹⁵⁰ *Kassho ikō* 遺稿 8.11a-11b. See *ibid.* 9.4b-5a, where the same sentiments are voiced and where Kokan Shiren 虎関師鍊 is mentioned as the one exception to the general tendency to aridness of the medieval monks.

¹⁵¹ *NST* XXVIII, p. 97; Ōta I, p. 138. See headnotes to this passage in *NST*, loc. cit.

¹⁵² There are some exceptions. The *Dai-Nihon shi* 大日本史 mentions a hopeful flowering of Neo-Confucian studies at the court of Go-Daigo 後醍醐 in its biography of the monk Gen’e 玄惠 (op. cit. 217; quoted in Ōe, *Shisho*, p. 27), and Ijichi Sueyasu (Sen’in) 伊地知季安・潜隠 (1781-1867), in his *Kangaku*

did is variously described as a restoration of the former flourishing state of Confucian studies (Confucian studies being conceived of by some as part of the whole of Chinese, i.e. literary, studies, *Kangaku*: Nawa Kassho, Utsunomiya Ton'an),¹⁵³ or as the introduction of Neo-Confucianism, i.e. the introduction of the New Commentaries (*xinzhū* 新註) and the concomitant ethical and metaphysical concepts: Nawa Rodō. Seika is even compared to the Neo-Confucian patriarchs Zhou Dunyi (by Hayashi Razan, in the *Gyōjō*), to the Cheng brothers, to Zhang Zai and even to Zhu Xi himself (by Hori Kyōan). Of the sources that stress the second point, Hori Kyōan's preface and the *Gakumon genryū* also mention the cultural heights reached in the Heian Period. The others either do not provide any background at all, or, like the communication, Kang Hang in his set pieces or Razan in the *Gyōjō*, only mention that up till Seika's times Neo-Confucianism had not, or hardly, been known.¹⁵⁴

The scenario that these writers had in mind when they stressed Seika's role in the introduction of Neo-Confucianism undoubtedly is the rediscovery of the Confucian tradition in the Song. Not only the comparisons with Zhou Dunyi and the other patriarchs point this way. In some places even the phrasing is reminiscent of Chinese eulogies of Cheng Mingdao 程明道 ("The Master was born 1400 years later; he

kigen 漢學紀源, gives the palm to the monk Keian 桂菴. For a discussion of these claims see Chapters II and III.

¹⁵³ To these can be added Hori Kyōan, who pulls out all the stops in his preface to the *Seika bunshū*: in our country, "the spiritual region of the divine emperors, the place where the tranquil and pure coalesce," civilization, i.e. the Way of Filial and Brotherly Piety, was established by Emperor Jinmu 神武. Things were even improved when the writings of the "Three Kings and Five Emperors" (see Morohashi I: 12-399) were imported and civilization reached a first height under the Emperors Nintoku 仁徳 (257-313-399) and Ingyō 允恭 (ca 376-412-453). The introduction, however, of Buddhism (Kyōan uses the phrase "Kuratsukuri no Kyōgyaku" 鞍作之兇逆; Kuratsukuri is another name of Soga no Iruka 蘇我入鹿 [died 645]. WJB) created great disturbances and well-nigh obscured the transmission of the Way. Thereupon, however, Naka-no-ōe 中大兄 (the later Emperor Tenji 天智, 626-668-671), together with the *muraji* [Nakatomi no] Kamako 中臣鎌子, i.e. the later Fujiwara no Kamatari 藤原鎌足, 614-669, the ancestor of the Fujiwara. WJB), "personally studied the teachings of the Duke of Zhou and Confucius under Master Minabuchi 南淵 (dates unknown. WJB)." His exertions led to a second period of cultural flourishing that lasted for several centuries and ended in the Kenmu period, after it had already been undermined by the growing craze for poetry. "Though the Holy Classics still existed, those who knew them were few. If the so-called scholars did not belong to the Zen-sect, they declared for Taoism. ... The Three Human Relations were lost and men no longer knew the Learning of the Holy Ones and Sages. The Five Rites were not expounded. That at home one did not see the manners of modesty and restraint was for more than five hundred years" (Ōta I, pp. 255-256).

¹⁵⁴ This is tersely stated by Razan's brother Eiki in his postface to the *Seika bunshū*: "Well now, in our country the Confucian arts have been practised in the world for a long time. There were many who expounded the Six Classics. Some, however, remained stuck in the minor arts of [dividing texts into] sections and of [establishing] readings; they did not yet get through to the true Learning of the Holy Ones and Sages. Others borrowed from the false teachings of the heterodox [schools and the] Buddhists and treated these as one and the same as Confucianism; they were Confucians in name, but Mohists in their

acquired the learning not transmitted from the Classics that had remained”¹⁵⁵ and Zhou Dunyi (“Only the Master restored it after a thousand years; all alone he obtained the deep and subtle meaning from sections that had survived and writings that were partly destroyed.”¹⁵⁶ “This means that Master Zhou continued the strands of Confucius and Mencius that had [for a long time] not been transmitted.”¹⁵⁷). It is the concept of the “transmission of Learning,” the “transmission of the Way” (*chuandao* 傳道), which is characteristic of Neo-Confucianism.¹⁵⁸

Not surprisingly Kang Hang, who set the tone for the other panegyrists, elaborates these parallels to the full. Even if he had known of them, he would hardly have been inclined to extol the beauties of any pristine Japanese tradition. It is strange, however, that the communication (supposedly written by Seika) does not acknowledge them either, while Seika in his letter to Razan, and Kyōan and Kassho in their various prefaces praise them to the skies.

To posit that Seika, on his own, discovered Neo-Confucianism is, of course, a way to authenticate in the approved Neo-Confucian manner the endeavours of Seika’s followers, albeit only in their own eyes. On the other hand, the renewed vitality of Confucianism could also be linked up with one of the more glorious periods of Japan’s own past, and thus be presented as part of the rebirth of civil government and peace. To represent it in this way meant not only that one had a solace for hurt chauvinist feelings and ammunition against critics of a growing craze for things Chinese, it also opened the door for a most promising socio-historical theory. Kassho hints at it when he writes that “formerly the system of the state was flourishing, so literature was flourishing, too.” According to such a theory, it should be expected that literature, and for literature one can easily substitute *siwen*, Confucianism, should again flower now that Ieyasu had reunified and pacified the country.

This theory was in fact elaborated. It was standard in the later Shōhei-kō 昌平黻 and related circles. Examples can be found in the *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川實紀,¹⁵⁹ and in

actions” (Ōta I, p. 258).

¹⁵⁵ See the biography of Cheng Hao: *Song shih* 427; *Yichuan-xiansheng wenji* 7.

¹⁵⁶ Huang Zongxi, *Song Yuan xuean* 12.27a. For the words that we have translated with “deep and subtle meaning,” see Morohashi IV: 10203-101/104.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 12.28a.

¹⁵⁸ See Shimada, *Shushigaku to Yōmeigaku*, ch. 1, passim.

¹⁵⁹ E.g. *Tōshōgū go-jikki*, *Furoku* 22 (TJ I, p. 339). This chapter begins with the famous comparison of Ieyasu to Emperor Gaozu 高祖 of the Han.

its purest form it appears in the preface to the *Sentetsu sōdan* by Satō Issai 佐藤一齋 (1772-1859):

Heaven brought forth our Great Lord Eminent Ancestor (*resso taikun* 烈祖大君, = Ieyasu). It gave him valour and wisdom and extraordinary virtue, and endowed him with equal talents both for literary and military pursuits. He swept away the licentious mists of darkness and showed the shining sun. He castigated the barbarian oppressors and made the unicorns and phoenixes (i.e. Holy Ones and Sages. WJB) come forth. He had already invited Master Seika and treated him according to the rites. Again he selected Master Razan as his advisor. From these days on reverence for civil pursuits again became the custom.¹⁶⁰

The only thing nobody had any use for was the medieval Confucian scholarship. It is mentioned by some of the writers: by Kang Hang, who is no doubt reproducing what he has heard from Seika and other informants, by Razan, and by his brother Eiki. Although all of these references are rather denigrating, evidently these writers could not yet ignore the fact that it (had) existed. Razan, in fact, goes least far in denigrating the Middle Ages. In the passage of the *Gyōjō* quoted above he is truthfully, albeit rather succinctly, reporting facts: the Neo-Confucian commentaries were known, but not very well known or understood; a text edition of the Classics squarely based on the New Commentaries did not exist. In the introduction to his *Rongo Wa-ji kai* 論語和字解 he is more explicit. Here he perfunctorily refers to the pristine Japanese tradition, but then he goes on to mention (and he is the only one to do so) the Confucian studies of the medieval Kiyohara that his contemporaries so sadly neglected:

Because in the olden days in our country [every one], from the emperor and high dignitaries down to the Erudites of the Four Ways, knew how to read, they will have understood the meaning [of the Classics]. In more recent times, however, manners and customs deteriorated, and because people were illiterate they could not read books. The only things they sometimes looked at were books with added *kana* readings. ... In the house of the Kiyohara they were already reading the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* according to the edition of Zhu Xi, but for the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi* they said that the commentaries by He Yan and Zhao Qi 趙派岐 (ca 110-ca 205) were better. A serious mistake. When one reads the various *shōmono* 抄物 of that house, the way they use Zhu Xi's commentaries when they

¹⁶⁰ *Sentetsu sōdan*, Issai's preface (*Nihon Tetsugaku Zensho* XX, p. 9). See also Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信 (1758-1820), who remarks: "Because the god (= Ieyasu) had already understood this (i.e. the importance of supporting Zhu Xi-ism. WJB) even before the world, which was in turmoil, had settled down, he employed a man called Dōshun 道春 (= Razan) and in this way set up a sign for the learning of all [coming] generations to follow" (*Kagetsu sōshi* 花月草紙, p. 60).

themselves do not approve of the explanation given by the Old Commentaries and incorporate them into the learning of their house, is deceitful. And about passages they have not noticed or cannot read they do nothing at all! How [can] Zhu Xi [possibly] have written good commentaries on the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*, and bad ones on the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi*, so that the Kiyohara [can] pick and choose? How could someone like Zhu Xi first have been wise and later on suddenly have become stupid? It is not that Zhu Xi was stupid; the people who could not read were stupid. And [as far as the question is concerned] which one of [the two,] He Yan or Zhu Xi, was good and which one was bad, cannot one know this by reading their commentaries?¹⁶¹

B. The Line of Succession

That Seika was the first to have revived Confucianism and/or introduced Neo-Confucianism was generally accepted. It was accepted, as we have seen, not necessarily because it was the truth, but nevertheless for good reasons. The object was pragmatic: to establish Seika's position as — in the words of Nawa Rodō — the “founding-teacher.” Once this had been done, the next focus of attention would, of course, be the line of succession. This brings us to the second part of the proposition and our next question: who were Seika's “rightful heirs”?

Seika had quite a few pupils, many of whom founded their own schools.¹⁶² The most famous ones, apart from Razan, of whose relationship with Seika we will come to speak presently, were Nawa Kassho, Hori Kyōan, Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五 (1592-1657) and Kan Tokuan.

Of Kan Tokuan's writings nothing seems to have survived but his preface to the *Seika bunshū zokuhen* and a medical work, the *Manbyō kaishun jokai* 萬病回春序解. Of the writings of the others, however, much is left, though not always as easily accessible as one could wish. With this reservation we will try to give an idea of the opinions they had on the correct line of succession.

Kan Tokuan

¹⁶¹ *Rongo Wa-ji kai* 4a-4b. (References are made to the MS copy in the possession of the Sonkeikaku Bunko.) For a discussion of these statements see the following chapter.

¹⁶² For the orthodox view of the alignment of, and the succession within the various schools, see Sugiura Masaomi, *Jugaku genryū*. Ōta I, Introduction, p. 19, gives a list of Seika's pupils and of other people he had relations with.

Kan Tokuan's biography has to be pieced together from two sources. One is the inscription for Tokuan's tombstone, dated fifth month of Kan'ei 8 (1631), which Razan wrote at the request of Tokuan's younger brother Chūan Ryōboku 仲菴了卜; the other is the preface Tokuan wrote for *Seika bunshū zokuhen*. From these sources, it appears that Tokuan was born in Harima in 1581 and moved to Kyoto in 1608. The same year he began to frequent Fujiwara Seika. He also got to know Razan, who was very busy at the time travelling to and fro between Kyoto, Sunpu, and Edo, but met with him whenever he was in Kyoto. He even lectured on *Tongjian gangmu* 通鑑綱目 once, at Tokuan's request. Tokuan seems to have run a private school. On the day of the Gion festival (Kan'ei 5/6/14, = 15-7-1628), he was stabbed to death by one of his pupils, Yasuda Anshō 安田安昌.¹⁶³

In his preface to the *Seika bunshū zokuhen* Tokuan himself says the following of his relations with Seika.:

Fortunately I was born in the same region as the Master (= Seika) and lived in the same times. I am twenty years younger than the Master. Being "a weak plant and no good,"¹⁶⁴ I had not been able to study literature exhaustively and in good order. When I was twenty-eight I moved to the capital. I followed the Master and received the Six Classics, the Five Books, the Three Histories, the *Wenxuan*, the "*Lisao*" 離騷, the *Tongjian* and the writings of Laozi, Zhuangzi, Han Yu, Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元, Li Taibai 李太白, and Du Fu 杜甫, and roughly asked their meaning.¹⁶⁵

During the twelve years [that I was his disciple] from time to time he invited me to be his guest and "took me by the ear" (i.e. taught me directly, personally. WJB).¹⁶⁶ My relations with the Master were such that, if I did not see him for one day, it seemed like three autumns! ... Shall I speak about the fact that I was born in the same region [as the Master], lived with him in the same time, received the [interpretation of] the books from him, [was his disciple for] a number of years, was on intimate terms with him, and was instructed by him personally? Even Boyu 伯魚 did not hear any different lessons from [his father,]

¹⁶³ "Kan Gendō himei" 碑銘 in *Bunshū* 43 (II: pp. 68-69); paraphrased part on p. 69. See also *NST* XXIX, p. 480, and *infra*, Ch. IV, pp. 252-254. See Razan's comments are late, and lukewarm at best, and something seems to have gone wrong with the printing of the text of the inscription between the last line of p. 68 and the first of p. 69. Tokuan appears elsewhere in Seika's and Razan's *Bunshū*, but these passages do not add relevant biographical details.

¹⁶⁴ For this expression see Morohashi IV: 9791-41.

¹⁶⁵ "The Five Books" is a phrase not attested elsewhere. The Three Histories are the *Shiji*, the *Han Shu* and the *Hou Han Shu*. The "*Lisao*" is a part of the *Chuci* 楚辭. In view of Razan's remark, *Tongjian* will be Zhu Xi's *Tongjian gangmu*, and not Sima Guang's *Zizhi tongjian* 資治通鑑.

¹⁶⁶ See *Shijing* 256, 10. Karlgren, *Book of Odes*, p. 218, translates: "When I do not lead you by the hand, I show you your work; when I do not, face to face, give you orders, I take you by the ear."

Confucius. “The superior man maintains a distant reserve towards his son.”¹⁶⁷ How much more [will he maintain a distant reserve towards] strangers? How much more, towards ordinary men? And yet, nowadays there are people, young fledglings still, reeking of their mothers’ milk, who — sly and villainous — “become more and more pernicious [with their deceptions] and ingeniously discuss [all sorts of sophistries].”¹⁶⁸ These people, who studied within his walls but did not seek the innermost chamber of the hall (i.e. the ultimate truths of his teachings. WJB), who lie to their friends and [try to] use their teacher for their private ends and who are not ashamed to sell themselves, — are they any better than Yin An 殷安 (*sic*) who crooked his fingers and imitated the Holy Ones and Sages (*sic*), thus leaving his name to be reviled by later generations?¹⁶⁹ It is in truth the extreme of insolence. It is always thus with small men. A gentleman can only laugh about it.

The Master was towards his disciples as a clear mirror is towards the myriad things, as a great bell is towards an inch-thick pole¹⁷⁰: good and bad, as they come and go, are reflected in it; greater and lesser strokes make it resound [correspondingly].¹⁷¹

Two things may be remembered from Tokuan's account of himself: first, that he emphatically considers himself to be a true disciple of Seika, though his first teacher had been Razan, and second, that, though he sharply distinguishes himself from those fake pupils who had not “entered the innermost chamber,” as a true disciple he was nothing much out of the ordinary.

Nawa Kassho

In Nawa Kassho's *Gyōjō* and *nenpu*¹⁷² the fact the he had studied with Seika is duly

¹⁶⁷ See *Lunyu* XVI, 13. Legge translates: “Chen Kang asked Boyu, saying, ‘Have you heard any lessons from your father different from what we have all heard?’ Boyu replied, ‘No. ...’ Chen Kang retired, and, quite delighted, said, ‘... I have also heard that the superior man maintains a distant reserve towards his son.’”

¹⁶⁸ See *Zhuangzi* 10, 4. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* I, p. 289, translates: “The versatility shown in artful deceptions becoming more and more pernicious, in ingenious discussions as to what is hard and what is white, and in attempts to disperse the dust and reconcile different views, is great, but the common people are perplexed by all the sophistry.”

¹⁶⁹ This passage has all the earmarks of a quotation or a reference, but I have not yet been able to establish what Tokuan is referring to.

¹⁷⁰ See *Bunshū* 2 (I, p. 13) where Razan uses the same metaphor to describe the relation of Zhu Xi (the bell) to Lu Xiangshan (the pole).

¹⁷¹ Ōta I, pp. 293-294.

¹⁷² See *Kassho ikō*. References are made to the MS copy in the possession of Kyoto Daigaku. Kassho's *Gyōjō* and *Nenpu* are written respectively by his disciple Okuda Shōan (Shaun) 奥田松庵・舒雲 (dates unknown) and by his son Mokuan (Moriyuki) 木庵・守之 (1614-1683). The *Gyōjō* is dated Keian 1 (1648), fifth month; the *Nenpu* is not dated. The preface of the *Kassho ikō*, written by one Itō Sōjo 伊藤宗恕 (1629-1708) is dated Kanbun 5, end of the twelfth month (1666). For more biographical details regarding Kassho see his “Jijo-fu” 自叙賦 (op. cit. 7.1b-3a).

emphasized. Kassho met Seika in the tenth month of 1612, when he was eighteen years of age, married and already independently established in Kyoto. In Genna 2 (1616), twenty-two years old, he shaved his head “to conform to the popular custom”, and in the last month of Genna 4 he apprenticed himself to a doctor Wake 和氣 in order to study medicine. In the ninth month of the next year (1619) Seika died.

Kassho served the *daimyō* of Kumamoto, Katō Tadahiro 加藤忠廣 (1597-1653) and from Kan’ei 11 (1634) onwards the *daimyō* of Ki, Tokugawa Yorinobu 頼宣 (1602-1671)¹⁷³; he had some kind of school in his residences in Kyoto and Wakayama, and was famous enough to be summoned by the *bakufu* to Edo in order to cooperate with others (under the direction of Hayashi Razan) in the compilation of the *Kan’ei shoka keizu den* 寛永諸家系圖傳:

In the spring of 1642 the *bakufu* ordered its Confucian servants to compile the *Shoka keizu* (“Genealogies of all houses”). The Master received the summons and went to Edo, but because of his eye trouble he firmly refused [to take part in the project]. So they let him go and he returned [to Kyoto].¹⁷⁴

As to his teachings, his biographer, once he has duly stressed the excellence of those of Seika, informs us that:

Our Master Yū¹⁷⁵ received his (= Seika’s) teachings and came to understand them more and more. Hereupon Seika’s teachings, too, became famous in the world.¹⁷⁶

The next sentence is curious and should be kept in mind for eventual comparison with claims made by, or on behalf of, Hayashi Razan:

As regards the Master’s Confucianism, [it consisted] in] exhausting the principles and preserving sincerity; time and again he explained Zhu Xi and Lu Xiangshan. He certainly had some brightness of “subtle emanation.”¹⁷⁷ As regards his

¹⁷³ See Shibata Jun, “Nawa Kassho to Tokugawa Yorinobu,” pp. 30-47.

¹⁷⁴ *Kassho ikō*, *Gyōjō* 2b-3a. For the compilation of the *Shoka keizu den* see *infra*, Ch. IV, pp. 287-288

¹⁷⁵ “Master Yū” is Kassho. In his last years he sometimes affected the surname Yū, after the name of his grandfather Yūkei 祐惠. See *Kassho ikō*, *Nenpu* 1a.

¹⁷⁶ See *Kassho ikō*, *Gyōjō* 3b.

¹⁷⁷ For “*fa wei*” 發微 see *Tongshu* 3. This section is quoted in *Jinsilu* 1, 2; Chan, *Reflections*, p. 8, translates these words as “subtle emanation.” (The context is: “And one whose subtle emanations cannot be seen and whose [goodness] is abundant and all pervasive without limit, is a man of spirit.”) See also Yuasa Yukihiro, *Kinshi-roku* I, pp. 14-16. The phrase means that Kassho had some saintly qualities. As such it

literary endeavours, he was surpassing and precise and exerted himself to get rid of Japanese peculiarities: he certainly had some merits in “reviving things that had fallen into disuse.”¹⁷⁸ As a teacher, he did not differentiate between bright and stupid [pupils], and he was capable of guiding them and making them understand. He certainly practised a way of teaching that brought enlightenment.¹⁷⁹

Hori Kyōan

Hori Kyōan’s career¹⁸⁰ is very similar to that of Kassho. Like Kassho he was trained as a physician. Like Kassho, after having served the *daimyō* of Hiroshima, he was retained by one of the *go-sanke*, in his case the *daimyō* of Owari, Tokugawa Yoshinao 義直 (1600-1650). He, too, cooperated in the compilation of the *Shoka keizu den*.

As to the problem at hand, the sources that we have at our disposal remain silent. The last line, however of his preface to the *Seika bunshū seihen* (*supra*, p. 27) may be kept in mind: “Therefore, amongst his disciples only a few received the true transmission [of his teaching].” In this opinion he was not alone.

Matsunaga Sekigo

According to his *Gyōjō*¹⁸¹ Sekigo was the descendant of the notorious Matsunaga Hisahide 久秀 (1510-1577) and the son of the *kyōka* 狂歌 poet Matsunaga Teitoku 貞徳 (1571-1653). His grandmother on his father’s side was a sister of Fujiwara Seika.¹⁸² Sekigo was born in 1592. When he was eight years old, or at least before he

forms a pair with the parallel phrase (see following note) that implies the same thing, but now as regards Kassho’s actions, not his nature.

¹⁷⁸ “To revive things that have fallen into disuse” (*qi fei* 起廢) is the phrase Sima Qian 司馬遷 uses to characterize Confucius (see Morohashi X: 37048-163).

¹⁷⁹ *Kassho ikō*, *Gyōjō* 4a.

¹⁸⁰ According to the *KSM* Hori Kyōan’s works, *Nenpu* etc., are kept at various public and private libraries; no modern printed editions exist. For reasons of time consultation of these works has not been possible.

¹⁸¹ *ZZGR* XIII. The *Gyōjō*, dated Tenna 3 (1683), is prefixed to the *Sekigo-dō Shōzan Kyōken-sensei zenshū* 尺五堂忝儉先生全集, the preface of which is dated Kanbun 9/6/2 (29-6-1669). Both the *Gyōjō* and the *Zenshū* were compiled by Sekigo’s disciple Takigawa Josui (Shōraku) 瀧川恕水・昌樂 (dates unknown).

¹⁸² The account of the *Gyōjō* is so garbled as to be completely unreliable: Hisahide committed suicide in 1577, when he was attacked by Oda Nobunaga 織田信長, and not in Tenshō 4 (1576), as the *Gyōjō* claims. Even if he would have had a third son, this son could not both have been three years old at the time when he was taken out of the beleaguered castle, and have become the grandfather of Sekigo who was born in

was eleven, Seika “gave the Master the *shenyi* and the bonnet that he used to wear himself. He (= Sekigo) was going to continue the tradition of the Way, and this was the proof thereof.”¹⁸³ When he was only thirteen years of age, he was already giving lectures to Toyotomi Hideyori 豊臣秀頼 (1593-1615) on the *Shujing* and when he had reached his thirtieth (*sic*) year

he asked Seika to transmit to him the deepest truth (*ōgi* 奥義) of the “*Hetu*” 河圖, “*Luoshu*” 洛書, “*Xiantian houtian*” 先天後天, “*Buwu jiutu*” 卜筮九圖, and “*Taiji tu*” 太極圖 of the *Zhouyi* 周易, of the “*Hongfan*” and the “*Jiuzhou*” of the *Shujing*, and of the *Chunqiu* 春秋. [Seika] had sworn to transmit these teachings only to one disciple and he did not disclose them to his other disciples.”¹⁸⁴

In Kan’ei 10 (1633), when at the age of forty-one he has enrolled in the Kenninji 建仁寺 and is studying Buddhism at his father’s request, he is sent for by the Ex-Emperor Go-Mizunoo 後水尾 (1596-1611-1624-1680). He offers the emperor a copy of an extract of the *sūtra*’s he has written and the emperor exclaims:

[He has read] the Thirteen Classics, the Twenty-one Histories, all kinds of foreign books and the whole of the *sūtra*’s! He is a great Confucian of wide learning, a genius the like of whom now or formerly has hardly ever been seen, unheard of in Japan!¹⁸⁵

Afterwards he expresses these same feelings more prosaically in an edict.

Not only the imperial house protected Sekigo, the *bakufu*, too, in the person of its representative in Kyoto showed its appreciation:

The Kyoto *shoshidai* Itakura Suō-no-kami [Shigemune] 板倉重宗 (1586-1656) said to the Master: “Outside of the eastern gate of the Nijō Castle, among the shops, there is a vacant plot of land. An old man told me that his plot originally was called the plot of the Daigaku-ryō. My father Iga-no-kami [Katsushige] 勝重 (1545-1624) had it cleared. Now I will give it to you. I wish that you would move there.” The Master went to have a look. The grounds were spacious and quiet. It was [inside] the market area, but there was no noise of carts and horses. There

1592. Again, the *Gyōjō* says that Sekigo’s grandfather Eishu 永種 (dates unknown) was married to a daughter of Kami(*sic*)-Reizei Tamesumi 為純. Tamesumi, however, was Seika’s father, not his brother. Teitoku himself, in his *Taion-ki* 戴恩記 (ZGR XIIIb, p. 615), says that his father was a cousin of Tamesumi.

¹⁸³ ZZGR XIII, p. 135.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 135.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 136.

were many trees and flowers. It was removed from the dust and bustle. In truth, it was a secluded dwelling in the middle of the city. In front it gave on the stream of the Horikawa and at the back there was a garden with bamboos. It was one hundred bows wide and nearly thirty poles long. In truth, it could hold quite a lot of students. Suō-no-kami personally measured its length and breadth. Then he ordered carpenters to put up the buildings. The Master moved to this house and called it himself the Kōshū-dō 講習堂.¹⁸⁶

Now

the rites of the *shicai* ceremony for a long time had not been practised in the capital. The Master continued what had been cut off, gathered his pupils, invited musicians, put down the offerings and held this ritual at his private school. Every year on the first day *ding* 丁 (J. *tei*) in the second month of spring and autumn the offerings were made without fail.¹⁸⁷

A few years later, in the first year of Keian (1648) Sekigo again received a plot of land, this time to the south of the imperial palace. Here, too, he built a lecture hall in order to “let the imperial princes and grandsons of the nobles hear of the Way.”¹⁸⁸ He was not interested, however, in a position of *jusha* 儒者 (Confucian teacher), even when Itakura Shigemune offered him one:

In the third year [of Keian, = 1650. WJB] ... the Kyoto *shoshidai* Suō-no-kami recommended him and wanted to give him a place as a Confucian official, but the Master did not want human dignities. He was at peace in the dignities Heaven had conferred on him¹⁸⁹ and in his virtue, so he never accepted. In commoner’s clothes he mixed with people who had high ranks and high offices. He never let himself be bound by the affairs of his family. In response to invitations from *daimyō* he travelled far. He [went] everywhere to look at famous mountains and great rivers. Parties under the flowers, poetry sessions in front of the moon. In spring he took a barrel with him and went to the temple precincts on the Higashi-yama. In fall, leaning on his goosefoot-stick, he visited the famous landscapes of the Western Ridge: the white cherries of Ōharano, the red maples of Takao ... These were the “responsibilities” [he had because he did] not hold an appointment.¹⁹⁰

When Sekigo died in 1657 the succession passed on to his son Sun’un (Shōeki) 寸雲・昌易 (1619-1680), who said of himself:

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 136.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 136

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 136.

¹⁸⁹ For the phrase “human dignities” and “dignities conferred by heaven” see *Mengzi* VI A, 16.

I privately compare myself to Shao Yaofu 邵堯夫 (= Shao Yong 雍) in his Grotto of Ease. I [dwell] hidden within the precincts of the Kōshū-dō on Horikawa, read the Six Classics, live by my teaching and writing, teach my pupils without growing weary of it, and transmit the tradition of the Way of Hokuniku-sanjin Fujiwara Seika.¹⁹¹

This *xingzhuang* 行狀 suffers from all the defects of the genre, but it also shows clearly what points in the opinion of the biographer went to prove Sekigo's status as a Confucian: the investiture and the initiation he received from Seika, the performance of the *shicai* ceremony, the official recognition he received from both emperor and *bakufu*. What is lacking is that Sekigo "went out and served." Admittedly he refused to do so of his own free will, but it is striking nevertheless, certainly if one compares him with Kassho, Kyōan and Razan.

Hayashi Razan

If Kassho and Sekigo were much younger than Seika, Razan's case is different. When Razan first met Seika, in 1604, he had already acquired a solid knowledge of Chinese and Japanese literature, history and related subjects, and he had become something of a partisan of Zhu Xi. In 1603 he already gave lectures on his own and taught the *Lunyu*.¹⁹² In his *Gyōjō* the story is told, how the disciples of Seika who evidently found it difficult to regard Razan as one of their own, came to call him *teigaku* 提學, i.e. intendant of

¹⁹⁰ ZZGR XIII, p. 137.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p. 139. This consciousness of continuing a tradition was not limited to Sun'un, but was shared by other members of Sekigo's school, as may be shown by some remarks that Takigawa Josui made to a visiting Korean about the origins of the *Yijing* tradition in Japan: "Kang Hang transmitted this (i.e. the tradition of the *Yijing*. WJB) to the ancestor of Confucianism in Japan, Fujiwara Seika, and thus the *Yijing* had already come east. Seika transmitted the "*Hetu*," the "*Luoshu*," the *Zhouyi*, the *Chunqiu*, the *Shijing* and the *Shujing* to my teacher Matsunaga Shōzō 昌三 (= Sekigo) and to Hayashi Razan. These two scholars were their teacher Seika's go-betweens (*sic*) and even surpassed their master. Though Seika had already died, did not literature [rest] in them? They in their turn transmitted [Seika's teachings], Sekigo to his sons Matsunaga Sun'un (Shōeki) and Shisai (Eizō) 思齋・永三 (1628-1710), to Kinoshita Jun'an 木下順庵 (1621-1698) and to me, Takigawa Shōraku. All the rest are warped and uncouth teachings based on local Japanese traditions, not worth the trouble of taking them up." This quotation is taken from Matsuda Kō, "Fujiwara Seika to Kyō Suiin no kankei," p. 354). Matsuda identifies his source rather summarily as a *Chōsenjin hitsudan* 朝鮮人筆談 of Tenna 2 (1682) and says that the conversation took place in Kyoto between Josui and a member of the Korean embassy of that year.

¹⁹² *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 4 (*Nenpu* under Keichō 8).

education, school inspector.¹⁹³

That Razan, too, experienced some difficulty in seeing himself in this light is apparent already in the letter he wrote in 1604 with the intention to make Seika's acquaintance. This letter (dated Keichō 9/3/1, = 31-3-1604) is addressed to their mutual friend Yoshida Soan, but intended for the Master's eyes. In it Razan speaks of the following topics: Seika's wearing of a *shenyi*, the irreconcilable differences between Buddhism and Confucianism and between Lu Xiangshan and orthodox Neo-Confucianism, and Seika's wrong-headed interpretation of the Three Principles of the *Daxue*.¹⁹⁴

What he says is, in fact: "You, Seika, are the first and foremost Japanese Confucian, as is witnessed by the fact that you wear a *shenyi*; being a Confucian you must as a matter of course hate Buddhism and fight it; as both you and I know that the best kind of Confucianism is the orthodoxy of Zhu Xi, I would like you to condemn the heterodox Confucianism of Lu Xiangshan c.s. and their silly definitions like that of the Three Principles."

When Seika answers, on the twelfth day of the same month,¹⁹⁵ he evidently is prepared to accept Razan's friendship, but wherever in his letter Razan had turned programmatic or inquisitorial Seika refuses the gambit: others before him have worn a *shenyi* in Japan; he is only afraid that he might dishonour his dress; Buddhism is wrong, of course, but if we would start pointing out the errors of the Buddhist, we might find out that we ourselves are not quite blameless, either; he has read the various works in which Lu Xiangshan is criticized, but he has never yet read a book by Lu Xiangshan himself or by one of his immediate disciples,¹⁹⁶ so he still reserves his opinion; anyhow, in view of the fact that both Zhu Xi and Lu Xiangshan "consider Yao and Shun as right and Jie 桀 and Zhou 紂 as wrong, both honour Confucius and Mencius and reject Buddhism and Taoism" etc.,¹⁹⁷ the differences that may exist between them are rather

¹⁹³ Ibid., *Furoku* 3, p. 37.

¹⁹⁴ *Bunshū* 2 (I, pp. 12-15.).

¹⁹⁵ *NST* XXVIII, pp. 96-100; *ZZGR* XIII, pp. 111-113; Ōta I, pp. 137-140.

¹⁹⁶ Razan had read the book, as is evidenced by the appearance of a *Xiangshan quanji* 象山全集 in his *Kikensho-moku* 既見書目 ("List of Books Already Read") of 1604 (see *Nenpu* under Keichō 9: *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 7). See also Razan's *batsu* 跋 of this work (dated Genna 8, 1622), in which he says that "at first these Collected Works were very rare and nobody had read them. When I was working on the copy of the *bifu* 秘府 (i.e. the copy in the possession of Ieyasu? WJB), however, I obtained permission to copy the whole work. After that, Seika borrowed my copy and copied that. Thereupon it became more and more known in the world" (*Bunshū* 53: II, p. 176).

¹⁹⁷ *NST* XXVIII, p. 99.

irrelevant; the interpretation of the Three Principles of the *Daxue* that he gives is quite normal, so any discussion can wait till they meet.

The spirit of Seika's reply shows itself clearly in the following lines:

Everyone who studies rectifies his heart and embodies [what is right] in his person. ... If one day suddenly he "finds himself possessed of a wide and far-reaching penetration,"¹⁹⁸ then [he knows whether things] are the same or different. It will not be knowledge from hearing or seeing; one must know by oneself, then one can stop. I once heard a story of someone who on the basis of things Zhou Dunyi, the Cheng [brothers], Zhang Zai and Zhu Xi had said criticized Han Yu. Master Xue Xuan argued as follows: "In the case of Zhou, the Cheng, Zhang and Zhu it is, in truth, possible [to criticize Han Yu], but in the case of somebody else this person will not be able to avoid the crime of not knowing his own limitations." How true this remark is! What I am afraid of is precisely this!¹⁹⁹

Razan, somewhat daunted, in his next letter (dated on the fourteenth of the same month) confines himself to the theme of the importance of friendship and of teachers:

If there is no one "who first apprehended principle,"²⁰⁰ who teaches us what we do not know and enables us to do what we cannot do [on our own], who then can breach our stupidity and ignorance? ... That the Master will breach my ignorance is certain. Ah! This is profitable for me. That I will not be able to help the Master [in the perfection of his] benevolence is certain. Ah! This is disadvantageous for the Master.²⁰¹

If ever, it is here that Razan is willing to consider himself as a disciple of Seika, to prostrate himself, if necessary. However, Seika does not reply to this letter.²⁰² Razan follows it up with another one (dated middle of the fourth month), in which he submits a host of questions to Seika, evidently with the intention of showing him that he, too, is an intellectual and an erudite and not to be trifled with. Finally, on the twenty-fourth day of the intercalary eighth month of this year (17-10-1604) Seika and Razan meet for the first time face to face. The minutes of this meeting were written down by Razan. Afterwards deprecatory remarks were added by Seika. These minutes, the *Seika mondō*

¹⁹⁸ See *Daxue*, fifth *zhuan*, and Legge's translation.

¹⁹⁹ *NST* XXVIII, p. 99.

²⁰⁰ See *Mengzi* V B, 1, and Legge's translation.

²⁰¹ *Bunshū* 2 (I, p. 16).

²⁰² See *Bunshū* 2 (I, p. 16), where the editor, Hayashi Gahō 鷺峰, remarks: "On the twelfth of this month the answering letter from Haruyuki (= Yoshida Soan) had arrived. Since in this letter [Soan] had spoken of friendship, the Master sent this letter (i.e. the second letter. WJB). Haruyuki did not answer it."

問答,²⁰³ again show that Razan took a rather independent position.

The differences as to method and object that existed between Seika and Razan appear clearly. Razan is interested in what could be termed philological matters: what does this mean, how can this usage be explained, how can these two theories be reconciled. Unquestioningly, however, he has accepted the orthodox Neo-Confucian doctrine and he wants to follow it in all respects. Seika on the other hand keeps himself aloof. He has a much broader understanding of Confucianism. He wants to comprehend, not to judge. And comprehension, for him, seems to be of a mystical rather than of an intellectual nature.

Again Seika fights shy of any open condemnation of anything. When Razan, from the Master's mouth, has taken down what seems to be a vigorous condemnation of Buddhism ("[The hearts of] our Confucians are like bright mirrors: when something comes along they react. [The hearts of] the Buddhists are like dark mirrors: they throw out things and cut them off. The original clarity that the mirror has of its own they want to darken. This is harming the principles."), Seika adds: "This is the standard theory of Confucians of old," and therefore not to be interpreted as a personal judgement.²⁰⁴ An attempt of Razan to blacken Lu Xiangshan by equating him with Xunzi 荀子 is neatly foiled,²⁰⁵ and Razan's inquisitiveness regarding the various explanations that have been given of "to extend one's knowledge and investigate things" is not honoured by Seika: you should not just read, you should try to comprehend. Then you will know that regardless of their seeming differences all Confucians are one.²⁰⁶

Modern authors²⁰⁷ tend to emphasize the differences that existed between Seika and Razan. Seika, they say, knew from the start that Razan had dangerous tendencies, and one of the first things that he told Razan was:

... "Why do you think you study? If you want to become famous and wealthy, [studying] will not be something you do in order to [improve] yourself.²⁰⁸ And if you want to sell yourself this way in the world, it would be much better not to study." I (= Razan) heard this and inscribed it in my heart.²⁰⁹

²⁰³ NST XXVIII, pp. 198-205; *Bunshū* 32 (I, pp. 346-350). See Ch. III, n. 26.

²⁰⁴ NST XXVIII, pp. 199-200.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 200.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 201.

²⁰⁷ Among many examples, see Minamoto Ryōen, "Fujiwara Seika to Hayashi Razan: Kinsei shotō no gakugei," *Bungei kenkyū* LXXXVII (1978), or Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 58-59.

²⁰⁸ See *Lunyu* XIV, 24.

²⁰⁹ NST XXVIII, p. 199.

But again Seika has dulled the edge of his remark:

Seika remarked: "This is an old and threadbare platitude, not worth [the trouble of] writing it down. I only came to [mention] it because you have [only just] begun to fix your ambitions [to study]." ²¹⁰

It seems to me that too much has been made of this supposed incompatibility of Seika and Razan. After all, they never severed their relations. On the contrary, Razan's entry into the service of Ieyasu was largely Seika's doing.²¹¹ The fact that Razan could write the *Gyōjō* and compile the *Seika bunshū* without raising a public outcry tends to prove that Razan was not the only one to regard himself as one of Seika's more important heirs.

The point has been much belaboured by modern Japanese historians, and the main reason is, that everybody loves Seika and nobody even likes Razan. Razan is equated with the *bakufu*, regarded as the one who delivered Confucianism into servitude, as the father of the *goyō gakumon* 御用學問, Confucianism-in-the-service-of-the-*bakufu*, and this did not tend to endear him to Meiji historians. Seika, on the other hand, never was a servant of the *bakufu*, he was not narrow-minded like Razan and did not try to curry favour with the powerful. It may be evident that the case against Razan is inspired by the likes and dislikes of later generations, living after the overthrow of the *bakufu*, and that consequently the historiographical value of this line of reasoning is doubtful.

Since we are here concerned with the way the succession of Seika supposedly passed to his disciples, the most relevant question we can ask is: how does Razan say that his relations with Seika developed, in what way does he slant his representation of the facts? As Seika's main biographer, major correspondent and first editor, Razan had a rare opportunity to make a selection of the facts that suited his aims.

If we read the *Seika-sensei gyōjō* while keeping in mind the points we raised in connection with the *Gyōjō* of Kassho and Sekigo, we find the following:

1) *Seika's anti-Buddhism is rather overstated.* Instances and examples of Seika's

²¹⁰ Ibid., p. 199.

²¹¹ See *infra*, Ch. IV, pp. 221-229.

anti-Buddhism can be found in his *Gyōjō*. The clearest statement is: “The Master thought: ‘For a long time now I have followed Buddhism, but I had doubts in my mind. But now that I have read the books by the Holy Ones and Sages I believe and have no doubts. The Way is truly [contained] in these [books]. How could there be [a Way] outside of the Human Relations? Buddhism has already cut off the [virtue of] benevolence, and again it destroys the [virtue of] righteousness. For this reason it is heterodox.”

The bickering at Ieyasu’s court with the monks Shōtai 承兌 (1548-1607) and Reisan 靈山 (dates unknown), too, is — the way Razan tells the story — partly prompted by Seika’s aversion to the avid careering of these monks: “There were the Buddhist priests Shōtai and Reisan. They were old acquaintances of the Master. They thought very highly of their own literary abilities. Formerly they had served Hideyoshi, but when he died they served Ieyasu.” The first discussion of the three that Razan wrote down has the same purport as the statement by Seika translated above. The other two contain rather sharp, personal attacks on these vain and grasping monks. Razan must have enjoyed writing them.²¹²

2) *His aversion of most Japanese daimyō (including Ieyasu) and his attachment to Akamatsu Hiromichi on which Kang Hang so much insisted, are played down.* Kang Hang, of course, had his own axes to grind. Nevertheless, it is true that Seika’s relations with the various *daimyō* follow a different pattern before and after the battle of Sekigahara. Before the battle Seika consorts with Toyotomi Hidetsugu 秀次, Kinoshita Katsutoshi, and Kobayakawa Hideaki, who were all members of the Toyotomi clan, and with Ieyasu, while his best friend and steadiest patron was Akamatsu Hiromichi. After Sekigahara (according to Razan) Seika put in a brief appearance in Fushimi and then concluded that he “did not want to go out (= to serve) again. In his heart he thought: ‘Yi and Qi did not serve the Zhou and yet they knew the grace of King Wu. The four white ones 四皓 did not serve the Han and still they knew the grace of Emperor Gaozu. How much more [would this be valid] for an ordinary subject like me?’ So finally he went into retirement and talked as he liked. People who visited him were few.” Although he kept up his friendship with Katsutoshi, who was himself living in retirement after Sekigahara, from

²¹² See Seika's *Gyōjō* (NST XXVIII, p. 188; p. 189; p. 191; pp. 191-192; pp. 196-197). See also the comment

now on Seika's closest ties seem to have been with Asano Yoshinaga 澱野幸長, the *daimyō* of Wakayama. Moreover, he seems to have become a celebrity in his own way, for fairly often Razan mentions that he is visited by important *bakufu* officials, e.g. Toda Ujitetsu 戸田氏鐵, to whom he explains the first book of the *Zizhi tongjian*, and by *daimyō* like Hosokawa Tadatoshi 細川忠利 (1586-1641), to whom he explains the *Daxue*. The nature of his relations with Ieyasu himself is not clear. If one is to judge by the fact the project proposed by a clique lead by one Gotō Tokunori (?) 後藤徳乗, Toda Ujitetsu, and Razan to establish an official *bakufu* school in Kyōto to be headed by Seika, never materialized, they cannot have been very good. Razan does not record any meeting between Seika and Ieyasu after 1600.

However this may be, the break in the pattern is evident. The reasons for this may be twofold: for one, Seika did not care for the ease with which people switched allegiances; for another, the forced suicide of Hiromichi must have rankled and may have given rise to some animosity directed against Ieyasu personally. Safely within the bounds of Confucian precepts and *samurai* ethos Razan stresses the first point. The circumstances of Hiromichi's death, however, he tries to gloss over as much as possible: "The next year (= 1600) Ishida Mitsunari 石田三成 lost and died. Thereupon Lord Akamatsu committed suicide. The Master was very sad." A rather bald statement, certainly if we compare it to Seika's lamentations in his *Akamatsu-shi o tomurau sanjū-shū* 赤松氏を弔ふ三十首.²¹³

3) *With the exception of Razan, none of Seika's disciples is more than barely mentioned.* The *Gyōjō* relates Seika's first meeting with Razan in rapturous detail:

Dōshun (= Razan) met the Master for the first time in the house of [Kako] Munetaka 賀古宗隆・正利 (dates unknown). They talked about Confucianism and exchanged comments on literature. In the *toko-no-ma* lay [a copy of] the *Lunyu daquan*. Razan opened it and asked questions about several sections. The Master explained them to him and said: "Regarding the passages you are inquiring about now, I too had the same doubts ten years ago." Again he said: "I do not just appreciate your cleverness, I only congratulate you with your ambitions. There are many clever people in this world, but few who have

of Razan's brother Eiki on Seika's anti-Buddhism quoted *supra* pp. 27-28.

²¹³ See *NST* XXVIII, pp. 189-196. For Yi and Qi see *supra*, n. 119. The four white ones (*si hao*) were four hermits who lived at the end of the Qin and the beginning of the Han; see Morohashi III: 4682-117. The "thirty poems in mourning for Akamatsu" are in Ōta I, pp. 234-240.

ambitions (i.e. to study Confucianism. WJB).” ... The Master said to Munetaka: “Nowadays people are [no better than] braying donkeys and barking dogs. Therefore, for a long time I have stopped writing. But now Dōshun has inspired me again.” From this time onwards they never stopped visiting each other.

Later on Razan received from Seika the *Yanping dawen* 延平答問, i.e. the record of the discussions between Zhu Xi and his teacher Li Yanping 李延平 (1088-1163):

One morning Razan, who regretted that Seika was leaving, saw him off. With his own hands the Master took the *Yanping dawen* and said: “This is the Method of [Regulating One’s] Heart (*xinfa*) as practised by Yanping; it is the gate to the teachings transmitted by Zhu Xi. That I show this to you now is not without intention.”

Not only Razan, but also his brother Eiki was much appreciated by Seika:

Dōshun’s younger brother Tōshūshi 東舟子 Eiki visited the Master for the first time. The Master said: “So your brother, too, has ambitions to study? This must certainly be called wonderful.”

As compared with the lavish treatment of the Hayashi, Seika’s other pupils are sadly neglected. The ones who are mentioned at least by name are:

- Yoshida Soan (he worked on the *Bunshō tattokuroku*; he made a trip up the Hozugawa together with Seika);
- Nawa Kassho (his new edition of Bai Juyi was read by Seika in instalments, as soon as the various chapters came from the press);
- one Hakuin 栢允 (he made a fair copy (*sic*) of the *Bunshō tattokuroku kōryō*; he accompanied Seika to Wakayama);
- one Shōgen (he copied the *Xiangshan wenji* 象山文集 that Razan had managed to lay hands on for Seika);
- one Shuibue Shunkō (Genko) 澁江春江・元古 (he accompanied Seika to Wakayama);
- Toda Tameharu 戸田為春 and Nagahara Shōun 永原松雲 (Seika explained to them the *Guwen zhenbao*);
- Hori Kyōan, Kan Tokuan and Yoshida Dōan 道庵 (another physician) (they “visited the Master from time to time” (*sic*) after Razan had left for Sunpu).

It may be noted that the young and promising Matsunaga Sekigo is conspicuously missing from the list.²¹⁴

When we turn to the *Nenpu* and *Gyōjō* of Razan himself, we find that their authors, respectively Hayashi Gahō 林鷺峰 (1619-1680) and Hayashi Tokkōsai 讀耕齋・守勝 (1624-1661), both sons of Razan, are equivocating on one important point: the nature of the relation between Seika and their father. Their dilemma is clear. They could describe Razan either as a disciple of Seika or as an independent founding teacher. For a pious son this last course would have had its attractions. On the other hand, if they did this, their father could be slighted as “someone without a tradition.” Moreover, it would have meant ignoring the ties Razan was commonly known to have had with Seika and leaving Seika to the other disciples. That a middle way could just barely be found is evidenced by an entry in the *Nenpu*:

At the time (i.e. in Razan’s youth. WJB) the Confucians of the Kiyohara in their explanations of the Four Books used Zhu Xi’s edition only for the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*, but for the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi* they still read the commentaries by He Yan and Zhao Qi and the sub-commentaries by Huang Kan 皇侃 (Liang) and Xing Bing 邢昺 (Song). They had not yet seen [Zhu Xi’s] Collected Commentaries. ... At this time, even though he was the ancestor of Confucianism, Seika Fujiwara Renpu avoided the world and did not meet people. The Master (= Razan) alone taught disciples and explained the works of the Song Confucians. The prosperity of the Learning of the Way in our country began with this.²¹⁵

Apart from this, the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō* raise the usual points:

1) *Seika is delighted with Razan.* Regarding the first meeting of Seika and Razan the *Nenpu* merely abridges the *Seika-sensei gyōjō*. Tokkōsai, in Razan’s *Gyōjō*, reports Seika as asking:

Learning has sadly deteriorated in this country and especially people who love letters are few. Let alone [if it comes to] reading the Classics. How have you come to this?

Under Keichō 10 the *Nenpu* quotes Seika’s following praising words:

Of late among the hereditary scholars and the Zen monks there were some who envied his (= Razan’s) attainments. The Master did not trouble with them. Seika said to his friends: “Rin Chū 林忠 (= Razan) does not alter his ambitions in order to [try and] avoid being disliked. That is good.

²¹⁴ NST XXVIII, pp. 191-195

²¹⁵ *Nenpu* under Keichō 5 (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 3-4).

The story of the *Yanping dawen* is again told in both the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō* and in substantially the same way as in the *Seika-sensei gyōjō*. The same applies to the anecdotes incident to Razan's *gō* 號 “Razan” and “Yūgao-chimata” 夕顔巷. The following quotation will illustrate in more detail what exactly Seika did appreciate so much in Razan:

Seika said to people: “Rin Chū is very intelligent and he is diligent by nature. He does not postpone till the evening what he can do in the morning or till the night what he can do in the evening, nor does procrastinate what he can do at night until the following morning. How could there not exist in these days [other] people with a retentive memory? But there is no one who is as assiduous and fast as he is. Nowadays someone who has seen a rhyme dictionary knows the level tones apart, but he cannot distinguish the other tones. Razan, however, does not even mix up the second, third and fourth tones. This is, indeed, a minor matter, but the detailedness of his memory may be inferred from this.”

Elsewhere, Seika praises Razan's thorough knowledge of Chinese particles.²¹⁶

2) *Razan is the most eminent amongst his disciples.* Nowhere in his *Nenpu* is any of Razan's supposed co-disciples mentioned by name. The story, however, about his nickname *teigaku* is told here and in the *Gyōjō* in detail. When Seika compares his other disciples to Razan, he says, according to Razan's *Gyōjō*:

With the people who study with me I can talk about *waka* or about Chinese poetry and prose, about [Chinese] history or about the history of our country. Each has his own predilections and interests. [Only] Rin Chū is at home in all of these fields. And the way he exerts himself in the investigation of things and his ambitions to learning my other disciples cannot even begin to equal.”

Of the other disciples Hori Kyōan at least seems to have concurred in this opinion. Again according to Tokkōsai:

When one day the *bakufu* official Abe Masayuki 阿部正之 (1584-1651) met Kyōan Seii 正意, he said: “I have heard that of the erudites of the present time Razan is the first and you are the second. ...” Seii answered: “Of Razan this is true. That someone with his literary [talents] is born in the Japan of our days and does

²¹⁶ See *Gyōjō* in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 3, pp. 37-38, 40; *Nenpu*, *ibid.*, p. 13, p. 18.

not have an opportunity to spread [his knowledge], is a great pity. Even if you would take ten or more of the likes of me, however, and would put us one on top of the other, how could we hope to look down on the Luo-mountain (= Razan) ?”²¹⁷

3) *Razan had received a shenyi*.²¹⁸ In short, Razan’s claim to the succession of Seika as evolved by the Hayashi rests on the following grounds:

- Razan takes the same vigorous anti-Buddhist stance as Seika himself did²¹⁹;
- he has received the *shenyi* from Seika (and some kind of initiation, when Seika handed him the *Yanping dawen*)²²⁰;
- he was Seika’s best, most prominent and most beloved disciple.

Strangely enough, no allusion is made to the existence of a direct link between Seika’s *shicai* and the *shicai* ceremonies that came to be held at the school of Razan in Ueno (Edo) from Kan’ei 10 (1633) onward.²²¹

If we compare these points with those we have found in the *xingzhuang* of Sekigo, we find a very close resemblance. Evidently, if in those days one laid claim to being a Confucian, one ought to have been a disciple of Seika, especially favoured by the Master with a *shenyi* and some kind of revelation of the innermost truths. Exclusiveness was a major concern. Traditionally one speaks of the Four Heavenly Kings of Seika’s school (*Seika-mon no shitennō* 四天王, meaning Razan, Sekigo, Kassho and Kyōan,²²² but in the *Gyōjō* of both Sekigo and Razan the writers significantly fail to use the term or give due prominence to the other three.

Both Razan and Sekigo were legitimized by their teacher, who in his turn was legitimate because he had been the first to discover the truth. The image of Seika, however, as projected by respectively Takigawa Shōraku, the writer of the *Sekigo-dō*

²¹⁷ See *Nenpu*, *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 13-14; *Gyōjō*, *Furoku* 3, p. 37, 40. For Hori Kyōan’s comments, see *ibid.*, p. 54.

²¹⁸ See *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 4; *Furoku* 3, p. 37.

²¹⁹ This point is not mentioned either by Gahō or Tokkōsai, but it is developed by Razan in his *Seika-sensei gyōjō* and mentioned by Eiki in his preface (see *supra*, n. 118).

²²⁰ It seems to us that this incident should be compared with the “ultimate truths” (*ōgi*) Sekigo received from Seika. See also Ch. IV, p. 229.

²²¹ See *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 2, p. 22; p. 30; *Furoku* 3, p. 43. Most of the material relevant to the *shicai* ceremony in Japan has been collected in *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 33. For the Shōhei-kō see esp. pp. 1418-1428. None of the Hayashi, with the exception of Razan, seem to have made any reference to Seika’s pioneering efforts in this field. This is especially noticeable in *Seidō saizō ki* 聖堂再造記 by Hayashi Nobuatsu 林信篤 (op. cit., pp. 1438-1440) and in Gahō’s “Sekisai shō” (*Gahō Rin-gakushi zenshū* 112.)

²²² See Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nihon Shushigakuha no kenkyū*, p. 40.

Kyōken-sensei gyōjō, and by Hayashi Razan and his sons is rather heavily influenced by their respective needs. In Sekigo's case the account of the double initiation and of Seika's rapt praise, the other disciples hovering in the background and watching the egg hatch,²²³ is perhaps needed to back up his claim against the Hayashi?

In Razan's case Seika's purported attitude towards the *bakufu* and his rejection of all heterodox learning are, I think, necessary to bring Seika's attitude in line with that of Razan. From the earliest days of his youth Razan was very vociferous in his denunciations of Buddhism,²²⁴ and he had entered into the service of the *bakufu*. As we have seen, his portrait of Seika stresses these same points: when Seika has recognized the truth he rejects all heterodox learning²²⁵; for a while he still retains his Buddhist garb, but after Sekigahara he dons his *shenyi* and spends his time scoring off the monks; he has met Ieyasu in Fushimi in 1600 (*sic*); he is friendly with a number of *bakufu* retainers and when he dies he was about to be put in charge of a Confucian school in Kyoto sponsored by the *bakufu*.

A comparison with the *Seika mondō*, the *Kanyangnok* etc. immediately shows the bias of this picture. To point out all its inconsistencies and half-truths will not be necessary. One of the more serious omissions is a just evaluation of the forced suicide of Seika's friend and patron Akamatsu Hiromichi. And the remarks about the school can only be called disingenuous: neither in Razan's own *Nenpu* and *Gyōjō* nor in any of the later works about the Shōhei-kō it is ever mentioned that this school was intended for Seika. On the contrary, Ieyasu's supposed interest in the project — *sc. making a school for Razan* — is always used to show that the school of the Hayashi had been founded in pursuance of the wishes of the founder of the Tokugawa *bakufu*.²²⁶

How Seika presently came to be considered as a special asset of the Hayashi is apparent in Gahō's preface to his father's *Bunshū*:

From the Middle Ages on wars were rife. This Way (*sidao*, = Confucianism. WJB) went into decline. In the Tenshō-Keichō periods (1573-1614) Hokuniku-sanjin Fujiwara Renpu with his extraordinary talents set his mind on the restoration [of

²²³ See *Sekigo-dō Kyōken-sensei gyōjō* (ZZGR XIII, p. 135).

²²⁴ See *Nenpu* under Keichō 2 (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 2-3): how Razan left the Kenninji when he was about to be forced into ordination, with some noble words on abstinence being contrary to filial piety. See also *Shishū* 41 (II, pp. 23-24), where Razan relates the same incident, in the preface to the elegies he wrote in memory of his mother.

²²⁵ NST XXVIII, p. 191. See *supra* n. 212.

²²⁶ See *Shōhei-shi* 昌平志 2, entry under Kan'ei 9 (*Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* VII, p. 14).

Confucianism]. It was in those days that my father, Master Razan, with his quick-wittedness excelled and with his erudition surpassed everybody. He had only met the Sanjin once, and already he was praised as “the one who had stirred him.”²²⁷ He was also called Intendant of Education [by his fellow disciples]. Thereupon they wrote and criticized poems and prose, they adorned and embellished them. Thereupon, moreover, the Learning of the Four Books and Six Classics especially took its flight and the ways of Zhou Dunyi, Zhang Zai, the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi were shown for the first time. Then the Sanjin died. The Master made This Way his personal responsibility, demonstrated it more and more, and lifted it into prominence.²²⁸

The usurpation of Seika by the Hayashi had begun.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

²²⁷ See *supra*, p. 51, the translation from the *Gyōjō* reporting Seika's praise of Razan to Munetaka. The phrase is a quotation from *Lunyu* III, 8. Legge translates it as “the one who can bring out my meaning,” but that translation is too contextual to fit here.

²²⁸ *Bunshū*, Gahō's preface (I, pp. 1-2).

CHAPTER II

THE SOURCES OF THE NEW CONFUCIANISM

In the first chapter we have shown the various opinions and contentions that arose in the beginning of the seventeenth century in regard to the origin of the new Confucianism. In the following two chapters we will try to piece together the story of what really happened. We will concern ourselves with the sources of Neo-Confucianism and discuss such questions as how clear the break with the Middle Ages really was, whether the traditional alignment of masters and disciples can be validated on the doctrinal level, etc.

The first problem that we have to deal with is a problem of sources: What texts were known? How were these texts and their interpretations transmitted? By whom? These are the main points on which we will concentrate in this chapter.

A. The Middle Ages

It has been shown over and over again, i.e. by Ashikaga Enjutsu¹ and Ōe Fumiki² and by Wajima Yoshio³ in their wake, that the texts which can be regarded as basic for the new Confucianism, sc. the Four Books and the other Chinese Classics with the Neo-Confucian commentaries, were known from the end of the Kamakura period (1336-1392) onwards. We need not concern us here with the still hotly debated issue of who was the first to have introduced which texts in Japan. It is clear that since the middle of the fourteenth century these works were known, taught and studied in Japan. And it should be noted that the scholarly tradition based on these medieval studies continued until well into the seventeenth century.

¹ Ashikaga Enjutsu, *Kamakura Muromachi jidai no jukyō*, 1932; hereafter cited as "Ashikaga, *Jukyō*."

² Ōe Fumiki, *Honpō Shisho kuntan narabi ni chūkai no shiteki kenkyū*, 1944; hereafter cited as "Ōe, *Shisho*."

1. *Shōmono* 抄物

The form in which these Neo-Confucian texts and studies were transmitted during the Middle Ages is that of the so-called *shōmono*. A *shōmono* is a (manuscript) copy of a Chinese (or Japanese) classic to which at the very least Japanese reading notes (*kunten* 訓點, *okoto-ten* フコト點) and, very often, marginal notes have been added. Characteristically, however, it contains the text with a line by line commentary in Japanese (though commentaries in Chinese, too, occur). If the commentary is the more important part of the work, the section of the original text that is to be explained is generally not given in full. The Japanese in which the commentaries are written, runs the whole gamut from pure classical Japanese to the contemporary vernacular. A rough distinction referring to the characteristic sentence endings is made between “nari-shiki” ナリ式 (*bungotai*) and “zo-shiki” ゾ式 (*kōgotai*). The readings are added to the main text. Since they are highly traditional, they are of course in *bungotai*.⁴

Nowadays, in Japan, these *shōmono* are rather intensively studied, both from a bibliographical and from a linguistic point of view,⁵ the most thoroughgoing bibliographical studies being those of Abe Ryūichi. In describing

³ Wajima Yoshio, *Chūsei no jugaku*, 1965; hereafter cited as “Wajima, *Jugaku*.”

⁴ Abe Ryūichi, “Muromachi izen hōjin senjutsu Rongo Mōshi chūshakusho kō,” 1, 2, publ. resp. in *Shidō Bunko ronsō* II (1963) and III (1964); hereafter cited as “Abe, ‘Ron Mō’ I, II.” In “Ron Mō” I, pp. 40-41, Abe gives the following definition: “Originally the meaning of ‘*shōmono*’ is ‘extract’; it is the name given to digests of the main points of a commentary or even to a compilation of summaries of a number of commentaries. The primitive stage of these *shōmono* were the marginal notes added to a text that gave a digest of its various commentaries (*kaki-ire* 書き入れ), endorsements (*uragaki* 裏書) and emendations (*kanmotsu* 勘物). When these kinds of notes are collected separately and independently copied, they become *shōmono*. Originally, the motive for making these compilations will have been to further one’s own studies or to use them as notes for lecturing. In the next stage there is a shift to the so-called *kana-shō* in which, to a certain extent with other readers in view, one rearranges the notes one has taken during a lecture, or gives a commentary in the same easy style as that of the lecture notes.” The definition I use here differs from that of Abe in that I also include copies of the Chinese texts with added reading notes, not only the commentaries. I prefer the more inclusive definition, because the distinction is, in many cases, tenuous, and for our purposes immaterial.

⁵ A number of facsimile editions have also been published, e.g. Suzuki Hiroshi, *Shūeki-shō no kokugogakuteki kenkyū*, 2 vols (1974); Okami Masao & Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, eds, *Shōmono shiryō shūsei*, 7 vols (1971-1976); Ōtsuka Mitsunobu, ed., *Zoku shōmono shiryō shūsei*, 9 vols (1980-1981). These are facsimile editions with appendices that contain linguistic studies, indexes, etc.

the transmission of the most eminently Neo-Confucian works, the *shōmono* of the Four Books, we will rely heavily on his findings.⁶

In describing the Four Books the Japanese scholars who during the Middle Ages studied, edited and taught these texts, made a number of distinctions. The most important one is the distinction between the *shinchū* 新註 and the *kyūchū* 舊註, here translated as the “new commentaries” and the “old commentaries.” With the “old commentaries” are meant the pre-Song commentaries, the most important of which were He Yan’s *Lunyu jijie* 集解, Zhao Qi’s *Mengzi zhengyi* 正義 and Zheng Xuan’s commentary on the *Liji*, the *Liji Zhengyi* 禮記鄭義. The Tang and pre-Tang sub-commentaries to these Han commentaries were also known and used; they were also considered as *kyūchū*. The “new commentaries” are, of course, those of the Song philosophers, especially the *Sishu zhangju jizhu* 四書章句集註 by Zhu Xi, but also later compilations like the *Sishu jishi* 輯釋 (twenty fascicles; first printed in 1341) by Ni Shiyi 倪士毅 (Yuan). Another distinction is the one made between the *kyūhon* 舊本 and the *kinpon* 近本, the “old text” and the “recent text,” sc. of Zhu Xi’s *Sishu jizhu*. The “old text” is the text as it was published by Zhu Xi in 1189. This is the one generally used until well into the Yuan period. The “recent text” purports to go back to late revisions made by Zhu Xi on his deathbed, and was taken as the authoritative version ever since it had become the basis of Ni Shiyi’s *Jishi* and of the *Sishu daquan* 大全 (thirty-six fascicles; completed in Yongle 12, 1414).⁷

A third distinction that is made, e.g. by Kiyohara Nobukata 宣賢 (1475-1550), is between the *koten* 古點 and the *shinten* 新點, sc. between the old, traditional way of reading the text in Japanese, based on the old commentaries, and the way in which they ought to be read according to the new commentaries. As is well known, the Kiyohara treated the *Mengzi* and the *Lunyu*

⁶ Apart from “Ron Mō” I, II, Abe Ryūichi has also published an article called “Honpō chūsei ni okeru Daigaku Chūyō no kōshō denryū ni tsuite,” *Shidō Bunko ronsō* I (1962); hereafter cited as “Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō”.”

⁷ For a general introduction see Yoshizawa Yoshinari, “Wa ga kuni ni okeru Gaku Yō Shu-chū no ni-bunryū,” in *Kokugo setsurei* (1931). See also Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 5-6. The classical works on the subject were written by the Qing scholars Wu Ying 吳英 and his son Zhizhong 志忠 (*Sishu zhangju fukao* 附攷). Zhizhong uses the “old text” in his edition of the *Sishu zhangju*

differently from the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*: while for the latter they recognized the new commentaries as authoritative, for the *Mengzi* and the *Lunyu* they still base themselves on the old commentaries. Even in the case of the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*, however, the readings they gave of the main text were generally based upon the old *Liji* commentaries, and several *shinten* that Nobukata proposed on the basis of the *Sishu jizhu* etc. were never incorporated, not even by Nobukata himself, into the *katen* 家點, the “house readings,” of the Kiyohara.⁸

A study of the extant copies of the *shōmono* of the Four Books shows, that these can be grouped into various traditions, which in turn can be associated with various schools or centres of scholarly activity. If one analyzes this separately for each of the Four Books, the following picture emerges

Daxue

Of the approximately fifty extant printed and manuscript *shōmono* of the *Daxue* (including both Chinese texts with Japanese reading notes and commentaries in Japanese) that are described by Abe Ryūichi, thirty-six belong to a tradition the original text of which was established or written by a Kiyohara.

The commentaries go back to the *Daigaku chōjin* 大學聽塵 by Kiyohara Nobukata, whose autograph of this work is still in existence. (It is undated; perhaps around 1540?)⁹ According to the *okugaki* 奥書 (postscripts, colophons) this text was used for lecturing by Nobukata’s heirs until the second half of the seventeenth century (a lecture by Funabashi Tsunekata 舟橋經賢 in 1666).¹⁰ The other texts that can be considered as belonging to this tradition are either copies of this *Daigaku chōjin* or (copies of) records of expositions of the *Daxue* by Nobukata and his descendants. The last printed edition of a *Daigaku-shō* of this tradition was made in 1630.

Text editions of the *Daxue* (with Zhu Xi’s preface) for the most part go

jizhu.

⁸ For examples see Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 10-11; pp. 15-16; pp. 34-35.

⁹ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 52-54.

back either to Kiyohara Munekata 宗賢 (1431-1503) or to his adoptive son Nobukata. Munekata completed his text in 1503; Nobukata his, according to the *okugaki* in an autograph, in 1514. Both editions follow the old text (*kyūhon*), although Nobukata shows, in the *fanqie* 反切 etc. that he introduces, that he knows the *Sishu jishi*. The same holds for the imperial printing of 1599 and a later printed edition of the beginning of the Edo period. In the extant copies of both these printed editions subsequently reading notes after the manner of the Kiyohara (*Sei-ke ten* 清家點) have been added.

The most important independent tradition of commentaries on the *Daxue* is the *Shisho dōji-kun* 童子訓. This work must have been completed before 1444. It is written by Ichijō Kanera 一條兼良 (1402-1481) and was introduced into the tradition of the Kiyohara by way of Nobukata.¹¹ Most of the extant copies of the *Daigaku dōji-kun* date from the first few decades of the Edo period. A printed edition, called *Daigaku dōji-kun*, appeared as late as 1670.¹²

Only one *shōmono* of the *Daxue* (text only) is definitely not part of the Kiyohara traditions, and a further two, although certainly heavily influenced by the Kiyohara, have perhaps an independent origin. One can possibly be attributed to an independent tradition that originated in the Ashikaga Gakkō 足利學校 (the extant copy dates from the end of the Muromachi period or the beginning of the Edo period).¹³ The other, according to the *okugaki*, goes back to an original written by Nakahara Morotomi 中原師富 (1434-1508) before 1498, when the first copy was made.¹⁴ The independent *shōmono* is the *kinpon* version edited and printed by the monk Keian Genju 桂庵玄樹 (1427-1508) in Kagoshima in 1481. An incomplete copy of the second edition of 1491 is still extant.¹⁵ The exact figures for the various traditions are as follows:

¹⁰ For these *okugaki* see also Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, Appendix, pp. 37-38.

¹¹ The *Daigaku dōji-kun* seems to be the only one of the *Shisho dōji-kun* to have actually been written. *Dōji-kun* of the other three of the Four Books, at least by Ichijō Kanera, do not exist. (see *infra*, n. 21). See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” p. 42.

¹² Abe comments that during the Edo period this text was no longer known for what it was, and was printed more or less by accident (“Daigaku Chūyō,” p. 43). His main argument, however, namely that the text was printed as an anonymous work, does not hold: all *shōmono*, even those of living authors, were printed this way.

¹³ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 12-13; pp. 36-37.

¹⁴ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 13-14.

¹⁵ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 14-17.

Total number of extant copies of <i>shōmono</i> of the <i>Daxue</i>	48
- <i>Shōmono</i> that give the text only	18
of which belong to one of the Kiyohara traditions	15
- <i>Shōmono</i> with Japanese commentary	30
of which belong to one of the Kiyohara traditions	21
of which belong to the <i>Daigaku dōji-kun</i> tradition	09

Zhongyong

For the *Zhongyong* the picture is more or less the same. The bulk of the extant copies (thirty-four out of forty-one) can be considered as part of one or other Kiyohara tradition. Again, the commentaries go back to a *Chūyō-shō* 中庸抄 by Nobukata, no autograph of which has survived. Most of the copies date from the sixteenth century or the first few decades of the Edo Period. Various printings have been made in the Genna and Kan'ei eras (1615-1643). The textual editions generally go back to either an edition completed by Nobukata in 1511 (five copies) or to an edition by his descendant Edakata 枝賢 (1520-1590), which dates from 1563 (three copies). The remaining manuscripts and printed editions cannot definitely be attributed to any one individual Kiyohara. The printed editions again include the imperial printing of 1599 and various printings of the Genna and Kan'ei eras. In most copies of these editions subsequently *Sei-ke ten* have been added.

There are three *shōmono*, giving only the text, that cannot be included in the Kiyohara traditions. One copy, completed in 1493, is a copy of a text that followed the *kyūhon* version and used *shinten*. This text was probably compiled independently at the Ashikaga Gakkō.¹⁶ The second one is a copy of the *kyūhon* version completed in 1382 in Southern Court circles.¹⁷ The last one is the famous “oldest copy” of a Neo-Confucian text in Japan. It was discovered by Ōe Fumiki, who on the basis of the colophon supposed it to have been written in

¹⁶ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 36-38.

¹⁷ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 25-26, 28.

1200. According to Abe, however, the copy dates at best from the end of the Kamakura period.¹⁸ The text follows the *kyūhon* version and uses reading notes after the manner of the Nakahara.

There are four independent *shōmono* that contain commentaries. The first one is an independent copy, dated 1616, the original of which was also written in the beginning of the Edo Period. According to the *okugaki* the text was made by someone who might have been a disciple of Kan Tokuan.¹⁹ The second one seems to consist of roughly edited notes taken down at a lecture given by either Kiyohara Munekata or an unidentified monk called Zen'ō-ken 善應軒. It was probably written between 1487 and 1492.²⁰ The third one is a copy in mixed “zo-shiki” and “nari-shiki” style, completed in 1533 and titled *Shisho dōji-kun maki no yon: Chūyō shōku zen* 卷之四、中庸章句全. The writer identifies himself as Uyūshi 烏有子.²¹ This text is the only *shōmono* of the *Zhongyong* that follows the *kinpon* version; the reading notes, too, differ from the *Sei-ke ten* and rather resemble what Nobukata called the *shinten*. The fourth one is again a late copy, dating from the beginning of the Edo Period²²; it is remarkable in that it has a postface by Suminokura (Yoshida) Soan. According to this postface the text was written on the orders of Hosokawa Tadatoshi.²³

Lunyu

In the case of the *Lunyu* the situation is in many respects different. Contrary to the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* (as well as the *Mengzi*) this text had been a

¹⁸ See Ōe, *Shisho*, pp. 11-13; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 28-29; Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 22-25; Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, pp. 32-36.

¹⁹ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” p. 74.

²⁰ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” p. 70; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 859-860.

²¹ See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” pp. 77-81. According to Ashikaga Enjutsu, Uyūshi was a pseudonym of Nobukata. Abe denies this; see Abe, op. cit., p. 79. For the meaning of the pseudonym, see Morohashi VII, 18998-11/12.

²² See Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō,” p. 81.

²³ The exact figures for the various traditions are as follows:

Total number of extant copies of <i>shōmono</i> of the <i>Zhongyong</i>	41
- <i>Shōmono</i> that give the text only	19
of which belong to one of the Kiyohara traditions	16
- <i>Shōmono</i> with Japanese commentary	22
of which belong to one of the Kiyohara traditions	18

recognized classic ever since the old days of the Daigaku-ryō. The old commentaries in use were the *Lunyu jijie* by He Yan and the *Lunyu yisu* 義疏 by Huang Kan (Liang). As in China, the *Zheng zhu Lunyu* by Zheng Xuan had disappeared early, and the *Lunyu zhengyi* by Xing Bing, completed in Xianping 2 (999), became known only in the Muromachi period, never equalling, however, the popularity of the *Yisu*.²⁴ Therefore, when the new commentaries were introduced, they had to contend with a prestigious tradition. And this tradition was never openly denied: every *shōmono* of the *Lunyu* declares that “it bases itself on the old commentaries.”

As the total number of extant editions of the *Lunyu* that were made during the Middle Ages, Abe Ryūichi mentions a figure of 120.²⁵ In his published research, however, he confines himself to the extant copies of the *shōmono* containing Japanese commentaries. Of these he lists over fifty copies.

A number of these works are no more than introductions, as their titles (*Rongo sōryaku* 論語總略, *Rongo hatsudai* 發題) indicate. They are independent works that list the same type of information as is provided by the introductions of the ordinary *shōmono* of the complete *Lunyu*: the origin and meaning of the title, hypotheses regarding the compilers, genealogies, etc. Their (probable) dates of completion vary between the end of the Kamakura period and the beginning of the Edo period.²⁶

Again, the majority of the *Rongo-shō* belongs to traditions that originated in the Kiyohara family, either as copies of carefully written annotations that contained the whole of the family lore, or as (copies of) more or less rearranged and edited lecture notes (*kikigaki* 聞書). Abe divides the *Rongo-shō* into ten traditions. With the exception of those belonging to Abe's ninth tradition, all extant copies are manuscripts. The (probable) dates of completion vary between the beginning of the fifteenth century (the *Higashiyama Go-Bunko bon* 東山御文庫本 of 1420) and the first few decades of the Edo period.

The *shōmono* of the Kiyohara represent of course the accumulated learning of the family, so it is difficult to assign individual passages or insights to

²⁴ See Abe, “Ron Mō” I, pp. 31-33.

²⁵ See Abe, “Ron Mō” I, p. 36.

individual members of that family. The major tradition within this group of *Kiyohara-shō*, however, can be associated with Kiyohara Naritada 業忠 (1407-1467),²⁷ his grandson Nobukata²⁸ and Nobukata's grandson Edakata.²⁹ At the basis of the whole line of *Kiyohara-shō* lies the *Higashiyama Go-Bunko bon*, which as to its contents may be attributed to the reader (*jidoku* 侍讀) of Emperor Shōkō (1401-1412-1428), Kiyohara Yorisue 頼季 (d. 1419), or to his father Yoshikata 良賢 (ca 1350-1431). Part of the surviving manuscript has been written by the emperor himself.³⁰

The printed editions all date from the Genna and Kan'ei eras. They are independent recensions, that are, perhaps, based on lectures that had been given by Kiyohara (Funabashi) Hidekata 船橋秀賢 (1575-1614).³¹

Most of the extraneous *shōmono*, too, show more or less heavy influences of the Kiyohara traditions. This holds for the various copies of the *Rongo-shō* made by the monk Shōun Jōsan 笑雲清三,³² for the *Rongo daizen* 論語大全,³³ the *Rongo shisha* 私車, *Rongo shishū* 私集 and *Rongo zokkai hikki* 俗解筆記,³⁴ and, as far as its *kana-shō* parts are concerned, for the *Gyojitsu shinryō* 魚日津梁.³⁵ The really striking thing is, however, that compared with the *Kiyohara-shō* they all show a greater preference for the old commentaries. The new

²⁶ See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 37-50.

²⁷ Abe numbers the traditions, Japanese style, with the syllable sequence according to the *I-ro-ha uta*. His *ro-*, *ha-*, and *nu-shu* (the second, third and tenth traditions) probably go back either to *kikigaki* of Kiyohara Naritada's lectures, or to a hypothetical *kana-shō* written by Naritada and used by him when lecturing. See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 61-71; id. II, pp. 1-4.

²⁸ Abe's *ni-shu* consists of copies of a *Rongo chōjin*, no autograph of which has survived, possibly because Nobukata never completed the work. See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 71-76.

²⁹ Abe's *he-shu* seems to have been compiled originally by Shigetaka, albeit on the basis of the *Higashiyama Go-bunko bon* and Nobukata's *Chōjin*. See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 86-88.

³⁰ See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 52-53; pp. 58-59.

³¹ See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, pp. 94-97.

³² According to the *okugaki* (dated 1514) Shōun wrote this *Rongo-shō* as a *kikigaki* of lectures delivered by Shinkyō Kogetsu 湖月信鏡, "adding to it from a *kikigaki* of Gichiku-oshō 宜竹和尚 (= Keijo Shūrin 景徐周麟)." Shōun Jōsan wrote more *shōmono*. His most famous one is a *shōmono* of the poems of Su Dongpo 蘇東坡, the *Shika jikkai* 四河入海 (for biographical details, see Ashika, *Jukyō*, p. 433; a facs. ed. of the text in *Shōmono shiryō shūsei*, vols II-V). Kogetsu was famous as a lecturer on both Zen works and Confucian Classics. He was for some time abbot of the Tōfukuji, and died in Ise in 1534. See Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, p. 456.

³³ The *Rongo daizen* has nothing to do with the *Sishu daquan*. It is a curious, composite work, compiled sometime during the seventeenth century on the basis of the old commentaries and late-Muromachi *kana-shō*, mainly those by Shōun and Rin Sōji 林宗二, who in their turn had relied heavily on the *Kiyohara-shō*. See Abe, "Ron Mō" II, pp. 11-25.

³⁴ See Abe, "Ron Mō" II, resp. pp. 33-38; pp. 38-41; pp. 41-45.

commentaries are quoted, of course, but they are less carefully integrated and used rather to elucidate the meaning of words than the general drift of the argument. In this connection special mention should be made of a group of eight related *shōmono* that confine themselves to explaining the *Lunyu jijie* (even the *Yisu* is just referred to, never quoted), and show a heavy Buddhist influence.³⁶

Lastly it should be noted that only two or three of the *shōmono* of the *Lunyu* can be associated with the Ashikaga Gakkō; these are rather late compilations, and hardly differ from the *Kiyohara-shō*.³⁷

The exact figures for the various traditions are as follows:

I. Introductory works		11
“ <i>hatsudai</i> ”	10	
<i>shō</i> of He Yan’s preface to the <i>Jijie</i>	01	
II. <i>Rongo-shō</i>		44
a) Kiyohara- <i>shō</i>	27	
<i>i-shu</i> (<i>Higashiyama Go-bunko</i>		
<i>bon</i> tradition)	05	
<i>ro-shu</i>	01	
<i>ha-shu</i>	01	
<i>ni-shu</i> (<i>Rongo chōjin</i>)	06	
<i>ho-shu</i>	05	
<i>he-shu</i>	02	
<i>to-shu</i>	01	
<i>chi-shu</i>	03	
<i>ri-shu</i> (printed editions)	02	
<i>nu-shu</i>	01	
b) <i>Shōmono</i> heavily influenced by the		
Kiyohara- <i>shō</i>	09	
to which belong <i>Shōun-shō</i>	04	
c) Unrelated (<i>okugaki</i> of Bunmei 7	08	

Mengzi

The *Mengzi* is again a different case. The text had been known, of course, from

³⁵ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, pp. 4-7; *Tenri Toshokan kisho mokuroku*, no. 463.

³⁶ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, pp. 25-33. The text that Abe mentions in “Ron Mō” I, pp. 55, also belongs to this same group. Most of the *shōmono* of this group bear the same *okugaki* of Bunmei 7 (1475).

³⁷ See Abe, “Ron Mō” I, pp. 45-46; pp. 91-92. The manuscript copy of Keichō 5 (1600), now kept at the Kyōto Furitsu Toshokan, is usually considered as having originated in the Ashikaga Gakkō. According to Abe, “Ron Mō” I, pp. 81-82, however, it is another Kiyohara-*shō*. For the work described by Abe, *ibid.*, pp. 91-92, see also Kawase Kazuma, *Shintei zōho Ashikaga Gakkō no kenkyū* (hereafter cited as “Kawase, *Ashikaga*”), pp. 94-95.

olden times, together with the *Mengzi zhengyi* by Zhao Qi as its authoritative commentary. Neither in China, however, nor in Japan, had its status ever been that of a Classic. It was only with the advent of Neo-Confucianism that as one of the Four Books it was finally raised to a position of eminence. Its reappraisal in Japan came even later, in the latter part of the thirteenth and the first part of the fourteenth century, as is, for instance, shown by entries in the diary of Ex-Emperor Hanazono 花園 (1297-1308-1318-1348) and an essay by Kokan Shiren 虎関師錬 (1278-1346).³⁸ This fact perhaps explains the relative paucity of *shōmono* of this text.³⁹

Although the *Mengzi jizhu* 孟子集註 and the *Mengzi jingyi* 精義 (both by Zhu Xi) had been brought back from China in 1241 by the monk Ben'en Enni 辨圓々爾 (1202-1280), the first printed edition of the *Mengzi*, made sometime at the end of the *Nanbokuchō* Period (1336-1392), was a reprint of a Chinese original of the *Mengzi zhengyi* by Zhao Qi. There exists, however, in manuscript form a text edition of the *Mengzi jizhu* that was written by the southern courtier Kazan'in Nagachika (Kōun) 花山院長親・耕雲 (ca 1347-1429) and completed, according to the *okugaki*, in 1379/1380.⁴⁰

The first Kiyohara to concern himself with the *Mengzi*, i.e. to add reading notes to the text, was reputedly Kiyohara Yoshikata. Although the Kiyohara did not have the monopoly (Nakahara Yasutomi 中原康富 in his *Yasutomi-ki* 記 mentions lectures on the *Mengzi* not only by Kiyohara Munenari 宗行業, but also by himself⁴¹), most of the extant text editions and *kana-shō* again belong to traditions originating within the Kiyohara family.

Outside of these traditions are the *Mōshi shitchū* by Kazan'in Nagachika already mentioned, two *Mengzi* copies kept at the Ashikaga Gakkō (both copies are manuscripts; the one, called *Chō-chū Mōji* 趙注孟子, dates from the end of the Muromachi period, and the other, called *Mōji chūso kaikyō* 注疏解經, dates from 1488) and finally yet another *Chō-chū Mōji* that originally was in the

³⁸ For details, see Abe, "Ron Mō" II, pp. 50-51; Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 71-72. The essays by Kokan Shiren are to be found in his *Saihoku-shū* (*Gozan bungaku zenshū* I, pp. 230-231; see also *ibid.*, pp. 289-290).

³⁹ See Abe, "Ron Mō" II, pp. 55.

⁴⁰ See Abe, "Ron Mō" II, pp. 51-52; "Daigaku Chūyō," pp. 26-28. See also Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, Appendix, p. 33, for the *okugaki*.

possession of Kōrin Hōkyō 光麟芳卿 (d. 1536).⁴²

On the side of the Kiyohara there exist two traditions: the first one goes back to an edition finished by Nobukata in 1503 and acknowledged by his father Munekata as containing the true family tradition; the second one goes back to the edition that was completed by Nobukata in 1517, with the aid of a “Chinese printed book.” In the *okugaki* to the second edition Nobukata quotes two *okugaki* of older editions of the *Mengzi*, made respectively by his forbears Yoshikata (dated 1386) and Naritada (dated 1441), that have not survived.⁴³ Differences between Nobukata’s two editions are indicated in the latter work. Both works follow the old commentary of Zhao Qi.

Of the editions with Japanese commentaries a *Mōji-shō*, again by Nobukata, is the oldest. Nobukata’s autograph of this work is still in existence: according to the *okugaki* it was finished in 1517 and used on several occasions, even as late as 1610, by Nobukata, Edakata and Hidekata, as a basis for their lectures.⁴⁴

Of this *Mōji-shō* a number of copies exist that have been made during the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. Apart from this series of copies of the *Mōji-shō* we have the usual series of (copies of) rearranged and edited *kikigaki*, all in “zo-shiki,” that date in this case from the end of the Muromachi period or the beginning of the Edo period. A printed *Mōji-shō* of the Genna/Kan’ei period is also part of this tradition. All of these *kikigaki* were based, according to Abe, on lectures given by Nobukata.⁴⁵

The exact figures for the various traditions are as follows:

Total number of extant <i>shōmono</i> of the <i>Mengzi</i>	16
A. - <i>Shōmono</i> that give only the text	
(old commentaries)	06
of which belong to the Kiyohara traditions (manuscripts by Nobukata)	02

⁴¹ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, pp. 53-55.

⁴² See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, p. 55; p. 57. The copy just mentioned is now in the possession of the Shidō Bunko. For Kōrin Hōkyō, who was an alumnus of the Ashikaga Gakkō, see Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 130-132.

⁴³ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, pp. 55-57. There also exists a manuscript copy of the *Zuantu huzhu Zhao zhu Mengzi* 纂圖互註趙注 that was probably completed in 1494, and to which somebody, possibly Nobukata, has added *Sei-ke ten* (see Abe, “Ron Mō” II, p. 56).

⁴⁴ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, pp. 58-59. The *okugaki* as given by Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, Appendix, pp. 35-36, is incomplete.

⁴⁵ See Abe, “Ron Mō” II, p. 78.

	extraneous: rpt Chinese original	01	
	extraneous: manuscripts Ashikaga Gakkō	03	
	- <i>Shōmono</i> that give only the text		
	(new commentaries)	01	
	which is extraneous ms by Kazan'in Nagachika	01	
B.	<i>Shōmono</i> with Japanese commentary		09
	of which are <i>Mōji-shō</i> by Nobukata	04	
	of which are <i>kikigaki</i> of Kiyohara traditions	05	

2. Printed works

Some general facts about printing and prints of the medieval period — those of the Azuchi-Momoyama and Edo periods we will not consider here — can be found in Ashikaga Enjutsu's monograph,⁴⁶ but by far the best study of printed works is, for the period under consideration, the *Gozan-ban no kenkyū* by Kawase Kazuma.

Kawase lists in this work a total of 277 titles (reprints of a work are included under the same title), of which 195 titles are of Buddhist works, the rest being lumped together as *kanseki* or *gaiten* 外典.⁴⁷ It is among these eighty odd secular works that the printings of Confucian Classics are included, to the total number of seven.⁴⁸

Apart from editions of Classics like the *Guwen Shangshu* 古文尚書, the *Chunqiu jingzhuan* 春秋經傳, and the *Mao Shi Cheng jian* 毛詩鄭箋, there were printed the following editions of the Four Books:

1. *Lunyu jijie* (no. 275 in Kawase's list): It gives both the text and the commentary according to He Yan. It was first printed in 1364, reprinted, in three different sets, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, and reprinted again in 1499 by Sugi Takemichi 杉武道, a retainer of the Ōuchi.⁴⁹
2. *Yinzhu Mengzi* 音注 (no 204): This is the *Mengzi zhengyi* of Zhao Qi, to

⁴⁶ Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 321-329.

⁴⁷ Kawase Kazuma, *Gozan-ban no kenkyū* I, pp. 345-494.

⁴⁸ Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 322-323, comes to a total of eight titles.

⁴⁹ See Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 188-189; pp. 259-260; pp. 492-493; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 329-344. One of the extant copies of this *Lunyu jijie*, now in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko, once was the property of Hayashi Razan (Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 492) or of his son Gahō (*Naikaku Bunko Kanseki bunrui mokuroku*, p. 31).

which the *Mengzi yinyi* 音義 by Sun Shi 孫奭 (Song) has been added. It was printed during the *Nanbokuchō* Period.⁵⁰

3. *Daxue zhangju* (no. 242): This is the only printed edition of the new commentaries that appeared during the Middle Ages. It was printed, according to the colophon, by Ijichi Shigesada 伊地知重貞 in Kagoshima in 1481, and reprinted by Keian 桂庵 in 1492.⁵¹
4. *Lunyu* (no. 276): This edition of the *Lunyu* is based on the *Lunyu jijie*, but it gives only the main text, not He Yan's commentary. It was printed in 1533 on the initiative of a member of the Asaino 阿佐井野 family of Sakai. The text was obtained from Kiyohara Nobukata, who also wrote a postface. Of the original printing of 1533 only one copy, with a colophon by Kiyohara Edakata, seems to have survived. In the beginning of the Edo period, however, new prints were struck of the same blocks. This explains the relatively large number of surviving copies.⁵²

Since Nobukata's postface to the last mentioned works is rather interesting, we will here translate part of it:

I (= Nobukata) think that in the reign of Emperor Ōjin (trad. dates 200-270-310) books came [to Japan] for the first time, and that, moreover, during the reign of Emperor Keitai (450-507-531) the five Classics were imported. Ever since this happened, the books that the Confucian families of our country explain and practise have been kept in secret storehouses⁵³ and [in this way] transmitted to later generations. But do not the Chinese books of olden times differ from modern ones? Would not our family copies contain too little or too much? [Those] times have receded further and further; we can no longer grasp and measure [all these differences]. [Therefore] I finally made a selection from the books of many generations [of my family] to give to you. I hope that gentlemen of extensive learning will correct [any mistakes] ! ⁵⁴

⁵⁰ See Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 464; Abe, "Ron Mō" II, p. 51.

⁵¹ See *supra*, p. 73; see also Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 261-263; p. 478.

⁵² See Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 270-278 (esp. pp. 274-275); Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 323-324.

⁵³ *Bifu* will be used here in the generalized sense of "secret storehouses" of the various families, and not in the sense of "imperial library."

⁵⁴ Quoted from Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 274. For the translation of the last phrase, see the ending of a *batsu* written by Gen'e (quoted Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 192), which concludes: "I hope that gentlemen who study after me will correct it." Nobukata uses other characters than Gen'e, but the meaning seems to be the same. See also another *batsu* written by, or on behalf of, Nobukata, that ends: "Alas! Nowadays the books of one's house are the books of the whole world. Let those

The *Guwen Shangshu*, *Mao Shi Cheng jian* and the *Lunyu jijie* of 1364 all followed the text of older Japanese manuscript copies, while the *Chunqiu jingzhuan jijie* and the *Yinzhu Mengzi* are reprints of Chinese printings of the Song. Only in the colophon of the *Lunyu jijie* is it indicated where the book was printed, namely in Sakai. It seems probable that the others were printed in Kyōto.⁵⁵

The later editions were all printed outside of Kyōto: a reprint of the *Lunyu jijie* in Yamaguchi (?) in 1499, the other *Lunyu* again in Sakai (in 1533) and the *Daxue zhangju* in Kagoshima (1481; reprint 1492). In view of the times, this is not surprising. It is, however, interesting to note that, before the *Daxue*, whenever we have an indication of the patrons who commissioned the printings, these turn out to have been laymen: one Dōyū-goshi 道祐居士⁵⁶ who ordered the first printing of the *Lunyu jijie*, a retainer of the Ōuchi who had it reprinted, a family of physicians, the Asaino, who sponsored another printing of the *Lunyu*, and lastly a retainer of the Shimazu by whom Keian let himself be patronized.

Finally we have to take note that the texts of both the *Lunyu* editions were provided by the Kiyohara.⁵⁷ It seems warrantable to assume that the same applies to the editions of the *Shujing* and the *Shijing*, which, as we have seen, were based on indigenous manuscripts.

3. Evaluation

We now come to the main questions: are these figures reliable, and what do they mean? It is, of course, possible to criticize the figures because a) they are at fault in that the number of manuscript text editions of the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi* is not taken into account,⁵⁸ and b) the tabulated books are books that have haphazardly survived and for this reason cannot be regarded as representative.

who study think of that!" (Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 271)

⁵⁵ See Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 33-34, 191, 192, 196.

⁵⁶ See Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 329-330.

⁵⁷ See *supra*, n. 49; n. 52; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, p. 341.

⁵⁸ Since the *Kokusho sōmokuroku* does not list this kind of works (see *KSM* I, p. 5: *Hanrei* 2) and the collections of a great number of libraries, monasteries etc. have as yet not been described, let alone usefully so, this cannot be helped. However, I do not think that these figures, if known,

This last point brings us to a problem of methodology. Abe puts it in the following way.

As regards the situation in which the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* were explained during the Middle Ages, the famous works by Dr. Nishimura Tenshū (*Nihon Sō-gaku shi*) and Ashikaga Enjutsu (*Kamakura Muromachi jidai no jukyō*) and, in more recent years, Dr. Haga Kōjirō's *Higashiyama bunka ni kan-suru kenkyū* are very detailed. Medieval works, however, that specifically treat the *Daxue* and *Zhongyong* are very few, apart from the so-called *kana-shō*, of which only a few remain. The studies mentioned above mainly list the materials that could be found in the Recorded Sayings and the Collected Literary Works of Zen monks and the diaries etc. of courtiers, and they make little use of the *kana-shō*. The best material, however, which tells us how in those days the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* were really read, are the manuscripts that were made and used in those times and the *shōmono* ... ⁵⁹

Anyone who has worked with the studies and materials that Abe is referring to, knows their tantalizing quality:

Today I summoned the *ason* [Sugawara] Kindoki 公時 and [Kajūji] Tsuneaki 勧修寺經顯 (1298-1373), and [Nakahara] Moronatsu 師夏. We talked a bit about the *Shang-shu*. Tsuneaki read, and Kindoki talked about the *Zhengyi*. ... We intend to discuss the Five Classics one after the other. I thought [by myself]: "In recent times the popularity of Confucianism has greatly deteriorated, but lately it has risen again. [Its appeal], however, is not yet wide, and sometimes [people have] different opinions. Especially in order to dispel the mistakes of others we discuss [the Classics]. I [personally] will for the time being not profit from it."⁶⁰

At best one gets to know when, who and where, but about the substance of the conversations one is left in the dark. Neither are terse statements culled from the works of Zen monks of much help in this respect:

The principle (*tiaoli* 條理) of the Four Books and the Five Classics is not to teach things we are not born with; it is the teaching that we must practise [the virtues of] benevolence, righteousness, etiquette and wisdom, which we possess by birth. People, however, who do not study,

would materially alter the picture.

⁵⁹ Abe, "Daigaku Chūyō," p. 4. See also "Ron Mō" I, pp. 35-36, where Abe repeats the same criticism, now in relation to the *Lunyu*.

⁶⁰ Ex-emperor Hanazono, *Shinki* 宸記, entry for Genkō 2/2/23 (1322); here quoted from Wajima, *Jugaku*, p. 104.

though by birth they are in the possession of benevolence etc., are like unpolished jade.⁶¹

Familiar sounds, to be sure. But phrases like these, selected not in order to prove, but merely to show how well somebody knew his Classics, and quoted out of context, nevertheless are not very informative. It is better to stick to more precise facts, and one of these facts is that the same Shōun who had such a high opinion of Zhu Xi, wrote a *Rongo-shō* that is based on the *Zhengyi* of Xing Bing and other old commentaries, and only every now and then quotes from the new ones. He does so much less, and less well than is done in the *shōmono* of the Kiyohara:

It (= Shōun's *Rongo-shō*) never exceeds the bounds of a reference work for stylists to be used when writing poetry and prose; the writer certainly never assumes a Confucian (*keigakuteki* 經学的), philosophical (*shisōteki* 思想的) attitude.⁶²

The importance of the evidence that the *shōmono* can bring, and the implications of the kind of quantitative analysis attempted here, are evident. In our opinion, both the figures and the evidence cannot be disproved easily. As a glance at Abe's articles or the *Kokusho sōmokuroku* will show, the *shōmono* have come to us through a great number of different collections. This means that the only basis on which the criticism that the surviving *shōmono* are a haphazard collection could possibly be made, would be a preconceived notion of what would constitute a representative collection.

⁶¹ Shōun Jōsan, *Komon shinpō shō* 古文眞寶抄; here quoted from Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, p. 443.

⁶² Abe, "Ron Mō" II, p. 11. Seika's judgement was the same. To Razan he writes: "Have a look at this manuscript by Tōgen Suisen 桃原瑞仙 (1433-1489). That Buddhist also already knew the old Masters Zhou Dunyi, the Cheng brothers, Zhang Zai and Zhu Xi. Why then does he, in what he annotates himself, continuously use the sub-commentaries of Wang [Bi] 王弼 (226-249), Han 韓, and Kong [Yingda] 孔穎達 (574-648)? From this one can imagine the blinding [effect] of a tradition. So difficult it is to change things suddenly. So fearsome, also, are the inveterate habits of our man. The glosses [that he added] in the course [of his reading] he [has written down on] strips of paper that he pasted roughly [into the text]. If you see these explanations of [the meaning of] words, then he must also once have browsed through the philological learning of the Han and Tang. Although he says, that [his explanations of] utensils, names and numbers, and of ancient punishments are [those of] the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi, many of them he has taken over unchanged from those [old commentaries], and quite a lot of them he does not even care to annotate." (Undated letter from Seika to Razan: Ōta I, pp. 154-155.)

This notion exists. It arose in the Edo period⁶³ and was responsible for directing the attention of the scholars of the Meiji period to the writings of the Zen monks and courtiers, and to Keian's activities in Kagoshima. Characteristically it assumes, that during the Middle Ages Neo-Confucianism, introduced by the Zen monks, was studied in the monasteries of the Gozan, that through these monks it came to be studied at court (reaching its apogee in the first half of the fourteenth century, at the time of the Kenmu restoration) and at the Ashikaga Gakkō, and that through the court it influenced the *myōgyō-ke*, the old-established families of scholars like the Kiyohara which, however, never jettisoned their old traditions. In the *sengoku* period the court aristocrats and the monks fled Kyōto, and in this way Neo-Confucianism became known in the provinces. There the first Neo-Confucian schools (in the sense of a pedigree of masters and disciples that handed down the teachings of the founder) were established, the important ones being the *Satsunan gakuha* 薩南學派 which Keian established in Satsuma, and the *Nankai gakuha* 南海學派, founded in Tosa by one Minamimura Baiken 南村梅軒 (dates unknown). These schools are then taken to be the forerunners of the Neo-Confucian schools of the Edo period.

When confronted with the evidence that we have introduced above, some distortions are immediately evident. While traditionally the Kiyohara are cast as the defenders of the old commentaries who rather belatedly tried to hitch on to the band wagon of Neo-Confucianism, the *shōmono* show that, to the contrary, of all the groups concerned the Kiyohara made the best use of the new commentaries and arrived at a great height of understanding of the doctrines exposed in them. The Zen monks who — nobody will deny this — knew these commentaries, always maintained that Neo-Confucianism was derived from Buddhism in the first place and was, at best, an *upāya* (i.e. a teaching expressed in a way that is adapted to the occasion or to the hearers), a way to introduce people to the Buddhist truths.⁶⁴ Their main concern was with Buddhism, and

⁶³ The single most important source is the *Kangaku kigen* by Ijichi Sueyasu, a retainer of the Shimazu of Satsuma.

⁶⁴ The Zen monk Gidō Shūshin 義堂周信 (1325-1388) said so to the *shōgun* in so many words: "In the ninth month of Eitoku 1 (1381) the *shōgun* ordered the followers of Confucianism to lecture on the *Mengzi* and he wrote down [the points where] he thought that the meaning was

their attitude towards Confucianism was essentially ambivalent. As far as Chinese studies were concerned, they espoused a literary ideal of civilized pursuits, not a Confucian one. Most of the works they printed were collected literary works of famous authors, rhyme dictionaries and general introductory works to Chinese history and the Chinese language,⁶⁵ and their best *shōmono*, too, like the *Tōgen-shō* 桃原抄⁶⁶ or Shōun's *Shika jikkai*, are concerned with poetry or Buddhism.

The figures bear out what one could have supposed already in view of the fact that the monks, after all, were monks, that they had important tasks as educators and as clerks in charge of the correspondence with China,⁶⁷ and that the most prized polite accomplishment in Japan was the ability to write poetry, both native and Chinese.

For the Kiyohara, on the other hand, and for the other *myōgyō-ke* their very *raison d'être* was their familiarity with the Classics. What would be more logical that to suppose (and the contents of the *shōmono* bear this out), that they would be the first to be interested in any new interpretations of their Classics and would be the most sensitive to any tremors in their field that reached them from

different. On the twenty-second day Gidō had an audience with the *shōgun*, and the *shōgun* came to speak of what happened the other day. Gidō then answered, saying: 'Nowadays, as regards the Confucian books, you have the old and the new commentaries. Wherever you look they are different. And the new interpretations have come from the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi. Generally speaking, all Confucians of the Song have studied in our Zen sect and have thus illuminated their hearts. Therefore [their interpretations] are completely different from the philological [explanations of words and phrases of the older commentaries].'" (*Kangaku kigen* 1: ZZGR X, p. 574) Cf. for this story Wajima, *Jugaku*, p. 77. Cf. also, for similar ideas regarding the relation between Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism, Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, Ch. 1, sect. 5 (esp. pp. 31-32), and Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 37-38.

⁶⁵ The figures for these various categories, applied to the list of *kanseki* in Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 463-494 (no. 201-276), are as follows:

-	collected literary works, poetry collections, handbooks	
	for writing poetry, literary anecdotes, etc.	47
-	rhyme dictionaries	05
-	dictionaries indicating tones	01
-	ordinary dictionaries	01
-	text books (i.e. primers like <i>Qianziwen</i> 千字文)	04
-	introductions to Chinese history, chronological tables, etc.,	07
-	Confucian texts	07
-	medical works	03
-	Taoist texts	02

⁶⁶ The *Tōgen-shō* is the *Chokushū Hyakujō shingi shō* 勅修百丈清規抄 by Tōgen Zuisen. See Wajima, *Jugaku*, p. 81.

⁶⁷ See Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, pp. 229-230; Takahashi Shunjō, *Nihon kyōiku bunka shi*, Ch. 14 ("Jiin

China? The medium through which these tremors reached them were, admittedly, the Zen monks who travelled to China and the books they brought back, but also books that were ordered directly through merchants trading with China and Korea.⁶⁸

Viewed in this light the stories of Kiyohara Yorinari's 頼業 (1122-1189) early involvement with the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* take a new interest.⁶⁹ Usually it is said that Yorinari lifted both the *Zhongyong* and the *Daxue* out of the *Liji*, but this is an amalgamation of two different stories told in different sources.

One source is the *Yasutomi-ki*. In the entry of Kyōtoku 3 (1454), second month, eighteenth day, it says:

Again, as concerns the matter of the commentaries on the *Zhongyong*, there was [a book with an *oku[gaki]* by the *daigeki* 大外記 (= Yorinari) of the Nin'an era (1166-1168) to the effect that he used the original classic (= the *Liji*. WJB) as the interpretation of his house (*kasetsu* 家説) and did not adopt the new commentaries. The year at issue corresponds to Shunxi 16 (1189), a time when Zhu Xi's new commentaries had not yet come to Japan. The same logic [of events] spontaneously [had prevailed both in China and Japan]: this is very remarkable.⁷⁰

This story is again introduced in Yorinari's biography in the *Dai-Nihon shi*⁷¹:

[Yorinari] once read the *Liji* and gave special prominence to (*biaochu* 標出) the *Zhongyong*. He explained it according to the original Classic and did not use the old (*sic*) commentaries.⁷²

The other source, this time regarding the *Daxue*, is the *Daigaku-shō* of the

no zokukyōiku” 寺院の俗教育).

⁶⁸ For the last point, see Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, p. 35 and notes. (N.B. The *Ukikai-shō* (*sic*) is *Daiki* 臺記 by Fujiwara Yorinaga 頼長.) See also *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 39, p. 418.

⁶⁹ See Ōe, *Shisho*, pp. 34-36. The most detailed, though not always reliable, account in a Western language is Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, pp. 32-38.

⁷⁰ See Ōe, *Shisho*, p. 35; Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, p. 37, n. 23. It is hardly necessary to point out that Yasutomi had his wires all crossed: the Nin'an era had ended some twenty years before “the year at issue,” Shunxi 16. Moreover, the virtuous rejection of the new commentaries at this stage seems rather anachronistic.

⁷¹ The *Honchō tsugan* seems to be using different sources. It says: “Yorinari read the *Liji*; he lifted the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* out of it and taught these to his disciples.” (Quoted from Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, p. 36, n. 21.)

⁷² *Dai-Nihon shi* 151 (*Retsuden* 78:8b). The *Yasutomi-ki* (entry for Kyōtoku 3, 1454) is given as the source. The substitution of “old commentaries” for “new commentaries” will be emendation by the editors of the *Dai-Nihon shi*, bent as they were on strengthening the parallel

Kiyohara, where we find the following:

Go-Hōju-in 後寶壽院 (= Kiyohara Naritada) is my grandfather. When he explained this passage (i.e. the date of Zhu Xi's preface to the *Daxue*: Shunxi 16. WJB), he wept and said: "My ancestor in the twelfth generation, Yorinari, had lifted this book out of (*chouchu* 抽出) the *Liji*. It later became a great treasure." Later on this book came from China to Japan as a separate volume. That [Yorinari's and Zhu Xi's] spirits were influenced by each other [and met as the two halves of] a tally fit together, is remarkable, remarkable.⁷³

The last piece of evidence regarding Yorinari's opinions on the *Zhongyong*, that has never been given due consideration, is an *okugaki*, dated Kyūju 2 (1155), fifth month, eleventh day, to book sixteen of the *Liji*, which contains the *Zhongyong*; it reads:

I have finished collating [this book (?)] with [the aid of] some [other] book(s) and the *Zhengyi*. This section (= the *Zhongyong*) does not only exhaust the deepest meaning of the whole work (i.e. the *Liji*), it will also do as [a summary of] the main principles of all the Classics.⁷⁴

The fountainhead of both stories evidently was Kiyohara Naritada, but the fact that he reportedly said the same thing about two different sections of the *Liji* has the effect of weakening his credibility, rather than that it allows us to say that Yorinari lifted both the *Zhongyong* and the *Daxue* out of the *Liji*. The account in the *Yasutomi-ki*, moreover, is so garbled as to be worthless as a source. With it goes the *Dai-Nihon shi*. I do not think that these accounts should be maintained, even though they seem to be confirmed by the one reliable piece of evidence, the *okugaki* to book sixteen of the *Liji*.

Nobukata's account in the *Daigaku chōjin* seems more trustworthy. It lacks confirmation, however, and the term he uses to describe Yorinari's action

with Zhu Xi. Cf. Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, p. 38.

⁷³ Ōe, *Shisho*, p. 34. My translation is from the *Daigaku chōjin*, but the same story is told in most other *shōmono* of the *Daxue* that belong to one or other of the Kiyohara traditions.

⁷⁴ Ōe, *Shisho*, p. 10; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, Appendix, p. 25. This *okugaki* is signed *chindo hinju* 沈土貧儒 ("poor Confucian scholar of the sunken land") and *chi-daiden* 治大殿 (*chi[bushō] kyō* 治部省卿). It occurs both in a printed edition of the *Liji* dating from the end of the Muromachi Period and in a manuscript copy that was made by Tōho Baisen 東甫梅仙. These two works contain twenty more *okugaki* that must be attributed to Yorinari; these are generally signed *daigaishi* 大外史 (= *daigeki*) or *kyūirei* 宮衛令 (= *ō-tonerigashira* 大舍人頭). Cf. Ashikaga, op.cit, t.p.

(“to lift out of”) seems to be patterned after what Zhu Xi did. It is probably anachronistic and, in view of the *okugaki*, less exact than the term that is used in e.g. the *Dai-Nihon shi* (“to give special prominence to,” “to highlight”).

The story as it stands, therefore, can only be regarded as a pious family legend. In the form of the *okugaki*, however, we do have proof that Yorinari had a high opinion of the *Zhongyong*. This is as was to be expected: contemporaries of his expressed similar opinions, singling out certain sections of the *Liji* for special attention,⁷⁵ and in China, already during the Northern Song (960-1127), the Cheng brothers and others had shown a special interest in the *Daxue* and *Zhongyong*.⁷⁶ Although, according to his own *okugaki*, the principal commentary used by Yorinari when collating the *Liji* had been the *Liji Zhengyi*, i.e. the *Liji* with commentary by Zheng Xuan and sub-commentary by Kong Yingda (Tang), this is nevertheless an indication that the Kiyohara were “with it” from the first and did not need to be prodded by Zen monks or retired emperors.

Another feature of the traditional conception of the growth of Neo-Confucianism is the importance accorded to various provincial centres: the *Satsunan gakuha* of Satsuma from which stemmed the school of Seika and Razan, the *Nankai gakuha* that was the origin of the teachings of Yamazaki Ansai 山崎闇齋 (1618-1682), and the Ashigaka Gakkō. The claims of the schools of Satsuma and Tosa, however, can hardly be taken seriously.

The position of the historian of the *Satsunan gakuha*, Ijichi Sueyasu, can be summarized as follows: in Satsuma a continuous tradition of Confucian studies had existed, based on the new commentaries; this tradition begun with Keian, whom we have encountered already as the editor of the first printed edition of Zhu Xi’s *Daxue zhangju jizhu* in Japan, and who, in his *Keian-oshō kahō*

⁷⁵ So Fujiwara no Yorinaga 頼長 in his diary (see *Daiki*, entries for Kōji 2/9/12 and 2/9/14 (1143)), as quoted in Ōe, *Shisho*, p. 10; Spae, *Itō Jinsai*, p. 35, n. 14.

⁷⁶ They were not the first to do so. Already during the Five Dynasties special attention was being paid to the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*. See Feng Yu-lan, *Chung-kuo che-hsüeh shih*, pp. 812-813; Kusumoto Masatsugu, *Sō Min jidai jugaku-shisō no kenkyū*, p. 7. Note that at first it was the *Zhongyong*, rather than the *Daxue*, that people were interested in. This tallies with the case of Yorinari.

Wa-ten 桂庵和尚家法倭點,⁷⁷ exposed some new conventions for the reading of Chinese texts in Japanese. Through the monks Gessho 月渚 (d. 1541), who had become a disciple of Keian in 1506, and Ichio 一翁 (1507-1592), a disciple of Gessho, the tradition came to Bunshi 文之 (Nanpo Genshō 南浦玄昌; 1555-1620)⁷⁸; Bunshi's pupil Tomari Jochiku 泊如竹 (1570-1655) printed Keian's *Kahō Wa-ten* (1624), and Bunshi's *Shisho Bunshi-ten* (1625) and *Shū-eki Tei-den hongī* 周易程傳本義 (1627).⁷⁹

These are all facts, although the degree of isolation in which this school developed is rather overstated: both Ichio and Bunshi had studied in Kyōto (Bunshi stayed there for twelve years, from 1569-1581). The story, however, that Seika had obtained the Four Books with the new commentaries in Satsuma when he stayed there for some time after the failure of his trip to China,⁸⁰ definitely is not a fact. The new commentaries to the Four Books were quite well known in Kyōto, too. Moreover, neither Seika nor Razan ever mentions the incident. It is true that Bunshi's edition of the Four Books was published earlier than that of Razan (the editions that Seika had made for Akamatsu Hiromichi were never published), and this may have given some likelihood to the rumour, probably spread by Jochiku, that Seika and Razan owed their knowledge to Satsuma.⁸¹ Nevertheless, the story lacks any factual basis and may have been inspired by the personal rivalries that must have existed between Seika, Razan etc. on the one, and Bunshi and Jochiku on the other hand. This considerably lessens the importance that, on the basis of the *Kangaku kigen*, Inoue and others have accorded to the *Satsunan gakuha*.⁸²

About the *Nankai gakuha* we can be short. The traditional genealogy of this school starts with Minamimura Baiken, who came to Tosa in the course of

⁷⁷ Modern edition in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* V, pp. 424-431, entitled *Keian-oshō kahō Wa-kun* 訓.

⁷⁸ The biographies of Keian, Gessho, Ichio and Bunshi are all collected in *Kangaku kigen* 3. See resp. ZZGR X, pp. 581-599; pp. 604-606; pp. 606-608; pp. 612-620.

⁷⁹ For Jochiku, see *Kangaku kigen* 4 (ZZGR X, pp. 627-633).

⁸⁰ This story is told in *Kangaku kigen* 3 (ZZGR X, p. 614).

⁸¹ The original locus of this story seems to have been the commonplace-book of Jochiku's disciple Aikō Kishun 愛甲喜春 (1605-1697), but as it was retold many times details began to differ (see Ōta I, pp. 44-47, summing up Ōe Fumiki, "Kinsei shoki ni okeru jugaku bokkō no jōtai"). For Aikō, see *Kangaku kigen* 4 (ZZGR X, pp. 634-639).

⁸² For the *Satsu-nan gakuha*, see Inoue, *Shushigakuha*, pp. 638-663; Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 215-222.

the Tenbun era (1532-1554), where he was well received by one of the local potentates, Kira Nobutsune 吉良宣經 (1514-1551). Baiken left Tosa after Nobutsune's death. His reputed disciples were Ninshō 忍性, Joen 如淵, and Tenshitsu 天室. Ninshō's dates are unknown; nothing much can be said about him. Joen lived from 1557 till 1590, and of his thirty-four years he spent twenty in Kyōto (from 1563 till 1582); he cannot possibly have been a disciple of Baiken. Tenshitsu died in 1623, so he, too, can hardly have been one of Baiken's disciples. Yet the line of succession should have passed through Tenshitsu, for it was his disciple Tani Jichū 谷時中 (1598-1649) who taught Yamazaki Ansai. It will be clear that the origins of the *Nankai gakuha* are less ancient and well-founded than local chauvinism would want us to believe.⁸³

The third and most serious candidate that remains is the Ashikaga Gakkō.⁸⁴ Although the tradition of the school claims Ono no Takamura 小野篁 (802-852) for its founder, there is no solid evidence for the existence of the school until its so-called restoration by Uesugi Norizane 上杉憲實 (d. 1455) in 1432. From that year on we have a continuous list of school principals, all of them Zen monks. The first one was Kaigen 快元 (d. 1469), while the most famous ones were the seventh and the ninth principals, Kyūka 九華 (1500-1578) and San'yō Gankichi 三要元佶 (1548-1612).⁸⁵

A for our purposes most interesting document, outlining the curriculum of the school, is the "School Rules" of 1466.⁸⁶ According to these rules the books to be used in the school were the Three Commentaries,⁸⁷ the Four Books, the Six Classics, the *Liezi*, *Zhuangzi* and *Laozi*, and the *Shiji* and *Wenxuan* — in this order. Explicitly it is stated that

Since fortunately the recorded sayings of Zen [monks], commentaries on

⁸³ The most voluminous study of the *Nankai gakuha* is Teraishi Masamichi, *Nangaku-shi*. Cf. also Inoue, *Shushigakuha*, pp. 664-682; Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 222-225. Material from the *Kira monogatari* 吉良物語 is quoted in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* V, pp. 258-262.

⁸⁴ By far the best study of the Ashikaga Gakkō is Kawase, *Ashikaga*. Cf. also Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 586-664; Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 226-259. Most of the relevant material can be found in *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 29.

⁸⁵ See *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 29, pp. 1103-1104; Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 81-118.

⁸⁶ See *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 29, p. 1107; Kawase, *Ashikaga*, p. 35.

⁸⁷ I.e. the *Qianzi wen*, the *Mengqiu* 蒙求, and the *Yongshih shih* 詠史詩 by Hu Tseng 胡曾 (Tang).

poetry and collected literary works can be found in the monasteries of the capital and the provinces and since for the teaching of Buddhism there are [separate] teaching institutions, in our domain (*shō*, i.e. in our school. WJB) everything apart from Confucian studies is strictly forbidden.

Practice followed these prescriptions to a certain extent. The books that Norizane presented to the school on the occasion of its restoration were Confucian classics⁸⁸; most of the twenty-one books that were, according to their *okugaki*, copied from those in the library of the school during the Muromachi period⁸⁹ were within the curriculum and the same applies, amongst other examples, to manuscripts made by Kyūka.⁹⁰

Nevertheless, the school grew into something different from the pure Confucian academy its founder had intended. According to Kawase,⁹¹ the Confucian curriculum culminated in the teaching of the *Yijing*,⁹² the other works merely being used as textbooks and introductions. Apart from the explanation of the *Yijing* as such (the so-called *seiden* 正傳), the practical aspects of fortune-telling, too, were taught (the so-called *betsuden* 別傳).⁹³ These divinatory practices were stressed in response to the demand for these skills amongst the military class, which was, of course, the main employer of the school's alumni. Practical demands by this class were also responsible for the

⁸⁸ See Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 30-34; p. 250.

⁸⁹ See Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 50-59:

-	Confucian Classics (i.e. the <i>Zhongyong zhangju</i>)	6
-	History (Chinese) (<i>Mengqiu</i>)	1
-	History (Japanese) (<i>Shokugen-shō</i>)	1
	(<i>Go-seibai shikimoku chū</i>)	3
-	Poetry: Chinese (4 titles)	5
	Japanese	3
-	Taoism (<i>Daodejing</i>)	1
-	Military (<i>Liu dao</i>)	1

⁹⁰ See Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 93-97:

-	Confucian Classics (<i>Lunyu</i>)	5
	(<i>Mao Shi Cheng jian</i>)	1
-	<i>Yijing</i> lore	1
-	Medical	1
-	Poetry (<i>Huang Shanyu shiji</i> 黄山谷詩集)	1
-	Military (<i>Shishi qishu</i> 施氏七集)	1

Two catalogues of the library of the Ashikaga Gakkō are extant. They date from Kyōhō 10 (1725) and Kansei 9 (1797) respectively, and are reproduced in Kawase, *Ashikaga*, p. 250 sqq. These show the same preponderance of Confucian and historical texts over Buddhist and literary ones.

⁹¹ Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 167-204; Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 249-252. Wajima follows Kawase's reasoning and conclusions.

⁹² Kawase, *Ashikaga*, p. 174.

important place that the study of military lore and medicine had come to occupy in the education given by the school. Kawase's reasoning is as follows:

1. The *bushi* were the main employers of the alumni of the Ashikaga Gakkō.
2. The skills most in demand by the *bushi* were divination and medical and military skills.
3. These skills were taught at the Ashikaga Gakkō.
4. The reason for the existence of the Ashikaga Gakkō was to teach these skills.

The first point Kawase does not prove. Proof is merely suggested. Kawase lists the names of seventy-four people of whom it can be proven that they studied at the school, but he gives no breakdown of their subsequent careers. The evidence that he gives in order to prove that in the Muromachi Period the alumni of the Ashikaga Gakkō were recognized authorities in the field of fortune-telling according to the method of the *Yijing* is, I think, inconclusive as far as the Ashikaga Gakkō is concerned.

On the basis of the materials that Kawase adduces, we can consider the second point as proven. The third point, too, is proven both by statements of alumni who studied the *Yijing* at the school and by a number of documents concerning the tradition and transmission of the way of divination as taught at the school; four of these documents date from Eiroku 11 (1568). Then there exists a number of books that purport to contain the "secret tradition" of the school, which all date from the Edo Period. Strictly speaking, however, all this does not amount to proof of the conclusion (4), that skill in divination was the main object of the school's education.⁹⁴

If Kawase's description is correct, it furnishes an adequate explanation of the derivative and unoriginal nature of the Confucian studies cultivated at the Ashikaga Gakkō, and of the relatively unimportant position that the new commentaries occupied there. If the Ashikaga Gakkō would have been a centre of pure Confucian studies, this might have been cause for amazement.⁹⁵

⁹³ Kawase, *Ashikaga*, p. 175.

⁹⁴ Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 175-176. See also Kawase, *op.cit.*, pp. 24-25, 69, 110, 119 sqq., 179-204.

⁹⁵ On the subject of the relative importance of the old and the new commentaries at the

4. Conclusions

Our conclusions will be obvious by now, but for the sake of clarity we will list them here and briefly discuss them.

First, from the time of Kiyohara Munekata and Nobukata onwards Neo-Confucian learning was, to all intents and purposes, monopolized by the Kiyohara. The few important independent *shōmono*, especially Kanera's *Shisho dōji-kun* and Nagachika's *Mōshi shitchū*, date from earlier times. Of later *shōmono*, even those that are associated with separate institutions like the Ashikaga Gakkō or the monasteries of the Gozan show heavy influences of the Kiyohara traditions. The one exception is Keian's printed edition of the *kinpon* version of the *Daxue zhangju jizhu*. Since the differences between the two versions of the *Sishu jizhu* are slight, however, and the *Sishu jishi* by Ni Shiyi, which gives the *kinpon* version, was known to the Kiyohara, the exception does not seem to be very important. Another recent Chinese commentary of the Four Books that Keian had obtained in China and introduced for the first time in Japan was the *Sishu xiangshuo* 詳説 by Cao Duan 曹端 (1376-1434).⁹⁶ A *Xiangshuo* is also quoted in one of the *kikigaki* of lectures on the *Daxue* by — presumably — Nobukata, but whether or not this is the same book, is difficult to establish.⁹⁷

Whether it is possible to speak of a decay of Neo-Confucian studies in the Zen monasteries, is hard to say. It is attractive to postulate that the ravages of the Ōnin War (1467-1477) had caused them to decline, but that on a small scale they had survived in Kagoshima. According to the *Kangaku kigen* the reasons why Keian did not settle in the capital after his return from China in 1473 were that the Nanzenji was in ashes, so that he would have nowhere to lecture, and that he was not a member of the old-established families of scholars, for which reason he would not be allowed to do so, anyhow.⁹⁸ On the basis, however, of

Ashikaga Gakkō, see Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 167-170.

⁹⁶ See *Kangaku kigen* 2 (ZZGR X, p. 582). Cao Duan was a Confucian scholar of the orthodox school and anti-Buddhist in his convictions. For his biography, see Goodrich, *Ming Biography*, II, pp. 1302-1303.

⁹⁷ See Abe, "Daigaku Chūyō," pp. 58-62.

⁹⁸ *Kangaku kigen* 2 (ZZGR X, p. 582). The remark about the *hakase* 博士 families seems rather

the material offered by the *shōmono*, no such thesis can be entertained.

Second, as far as the preponderance of the old commentaries is concerned, two aspects should be distinguished. In one sense, it is mainly a matter of external appearances. It is true that the *Lunyu*, which of old had been an important Classic, continued to receive by far the greatest attention and the readings of the main texts, even of the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*, were hardly ever changed to fit the new interpretations. To judge by Kanera's *Daigaku dōji-kun*, however, the *Daxue* enjoyed great popularity from a rather early date, and acceptance of the *Daxue* stands for acceptance of Neo-Confucian tenets. In order to read the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong* Zhu Xi's editions were commonly used, and Zhu Xi's prefaces were commented on just as diligently as the texts themselves. Moreover, in the Kiyohara-*shō* of the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi* the new commentaries are used just as much as the old ones, if not more.⁹⁹ What the Kiyohara did not do was choose. They almost never said that one commentary was right and another wrong,¹⁰⁰ let alone that they chose outright for Zhu Xi. Hayashi Razan's criticism in his *Rongo Wa-ji kai*, though still restricted to formal matters, approaches the really important point, namely that the Kiyohara may be said to have had Neo-Confucian knowledge, but lacked Neo-Confucian attitudes. In this sense, the preponderance of the old commentaries shows the strength of their family tradition.

Another characteristic mark of the Confucian studies of the Edo Period, however, the relative openness in which the discussion amongst the scholars was conducted, especially through the medium of printed works, we find foreshadowed in Nobukata's cooperation with the Asaino in printing the *Lunyu*.

anachronistic: inspired rather by the evident superiority that the Kiyohara had attained in this field in the sixteenth century, than by the existence of any form of positive legislation. Secondly, if the destruction of the capital would have been the major reason, it should have affected the Kiyohara in a similar way.

⁹⁹ For instance, in the Kiyohara-*shō* of the *Lunyu* passages where instead of the old commentaries the new ones, i.e. the *Sishu jishi*, are followed or quoted next to the old commentaries, amount to half or more of the total number of passages and important Neo-Confucian terms are explained exclusively according to the new commentaries (Abe, "Ron Mō" I, p. 57). The importance of the new commentaries is especially evident in the Kiyohara-*shō* of the Four Books (Abe, "Ron Mō" I, p. 76). The old commentaries are quoted, but rather to elucidate the meaning of words, while the new commentaries are used to explain the important, doctrinal contents of a passage (Abe, "Ron Mō" II, p. 72).

¹⁰⁰ There are, however, some exceptions to this generalization. See Abe, "Ron Mō" I, p. 64.

The postface does not leave much doubt as to his motives.¹⁰¹

The third point that I want to stress is that this tradition continued until the second half of the seventeenth century, and that at a time when the new Neo-Confucianism supposedly was in full swing, editions and *shōmono* were still being copied and printed and the Kiyohara were lecturing on the Classics as of old. One can almost say that it was in the shadow of this tradition that Seika, Razan and their disciples were writing and publishing. The scales tipped in their favour rather slowly, and later than is generally assumed.

These traditions can be told apart with the help of two criteria. The first one is that of the text being used: the old text (*kyūhon*) of the *Sishu jizhu* is the hallmark of the medieval tradition of the Kiyohara and is also used in the printed editions of the Four Books of the Genna and Kan'ei eras.¹⁰² During the Middle Ages the recent text (*kinpon*) is used only by Keian; later on it was used by Seika, Razan, Bunshi, and Nawa Kassho's disciple Ukai Nobuyuki (Sekisai) 鵜飼信之・石齋 (1615-1664), etc.¹⁰³ The second criterion is that of the readings (*kunten* 訓點): while the Kiyohara read the texts of the Classics according to the old commentaries and stuck to their traditional *kunten*, Keian, following Giyō Hōshū 岐陽方秀 (1361-1424), and also Bunshi, Seika, Razan, etc. read the texts according to the new commentaries.¹⁰⁴ The latter *kunten*, of course, won the day, but in the beginning of the Edo period the *Sei-ke ten* 清家點, too, were often used.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ The extent to which these "secret traditions" really were secret is difficult to measure. The fact that we know about them, and the fact that generation after generation copies were made which all contained the traditional conjuration "not to show this to outsiders," seem to indicate that in Japan, too, shared secrets are no secrets. For an interesting discussion of this problem, cseeTakahashi Shunjō, *Nihon Kyōiku bunka shi*, pp. 202-210. See also Scheid, Bernhard and Mark Teeuwen, eds, *The culture of secrecy in Japanese religion*, London: Routledge, 2006.

¹⁰² Examples are the Imaseki and Shimomura printings of the *Daxue* and the *Zhongyong*. See Abe, "Daigaku Chūyō," p. 14; pp. 33-34.

¹⁰³ See Yoshizawa, "Wa ga kuni ni okeru Gaku Yō Shu-chū no ni-bunryū," pp. 37-38; Abe, "Daigaku Chūyō," p. 17. Ukai Nobuyuki made on of the early Japanese editions of the *Sishu daquan*, which carried headnotes by Seika: see Ōta I, pp. 30-32; Ōe, *Shisho*, pp. 151-165.

¹⁰⁴ See Abe, "Daigaku Chūyō," p. 81. For Giyō, see Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 78-80. A famous discussion about the new and old *kunten* was carried on between Bunshi and the monk Kui (sometimes read as Kyōi); it is partly reported in the *Kangaku kigen* (ZZGR X, 616-619) and in Ōe, *Shisho*, pp. 84-95. Cf. also Wajima, *Jugaku*, pp. 221-222.

¹⁰⁵ These readings (*kunten*) must be distinguished from the way they are indicated (*tenpō* 點法). Examples of the various systems of *okoto-ten*, *kana-ten*, *kaeri-ten* etc., used by the various monasteries and *hakase* families, can be found in the *Shoke-ten zu* (GR XVII, p. 950-972). For a comparison of the *tenpō* of Seika and Bunshi, see Ōta I, Intr., pp. 34-36. Ōe, *Shisho*, pp. 52-84, pp.

B. The Bunroku-Keichō Period (1592-1614)

In the Bunroku-Keichō Period we find a growing number of people who concern themselves with Confucian or, more generally, with Chinese studies. This trend was stimulated in many ways by the centralization of political power: the concentration of the *daimyō*, each with his personal staff and band of retainers, in the Kansai brought wealth to the region, and the demands of the developing bureaucracies offered new career opportunities for men who were experts in these branches of learning. It also gave rise to a new self-consciousness, assertiveness, aggressiveness even, of those who had to make their mark in these fields that had not, as yet, been staked out. The most obvious signs of this change of atmosphere are a more or less virulent anti-Buddhism and a marked preference for the lay state: in short, the emergence of Neo-Confucian attitudes.

This is, in a nutshell, my interpretation of what happened, and I will try to prove it as we go along. Other interpretations, however, do exist. These interpretations have in common that they assume a clear and sudden break between the Middle Ages and the Edo period. With one of these interpretations, namely that Seika (re)discovered (Neo-)Confucianism unaided, we have already dealt. With a second one, which postulates a decision by Ieyasu or, in a more modern formulation, postulates that “the *bakufu* used Neo-Confucianism as its ideological base,” we will deal in chapter IV.

There exists yet a third interpretation, according to which the rise of Neo-Confucianism was connected with the advent of certain books. We have already seen this thesis advanced by Nawa Rodō, but in recent times, due to the writings of Abe Yoshio, it has gained currency. The only difference is that for Rodō’s Chinese books Abe has substituted an influx of Korean Neo-Confucian works and editions. It is with this thesis that we will first have to concern ourselves.

132-137, discusses these matters in detail. One of his conclusions (op. cit., p. 135), namely that the *tenpō* of Razan resembles that of the *myōgyō-ke*, rather than the various *tenpō* of the Gozan,

1. Korean influences.

Right in the beginning of his major work, *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen*, Abe Yoshio writes:

Seika will have received and transmitted the results of the Song Learning studies that were current in the Gozan, and it is a fact that he was stimulated by Sanjōn Hō Sōng 山前許箴 (1548-1612) and urged on by Kang Hang, but ultimately what we should call his direct teachers were books, and it is the opinion of this writer that most of these books will have been of those that were shipped to Japan because of the wars of the Bunroku and Keichō eras.¹⁰⁶

If we want to check the validity of this opinion of Abe, we will have to establish a) what books were shipped to Japan at what time, and b) to what degree these books were available in Japan to the likes of Seika and Razan.

Abe mentions a number of Japanese collections of Korean books,¹⁰⁷ e.g. those of the *daimyō* Ukita Hideie 宇喜田秀家 (ca 1572-1655; Hideie was one of the two commanders-in-chief of the Japanese expeditionary force during the second invasion and had commanded an army during the first), Katō Kiyomasa 加藤清正 (1562-1611; he commanded one of the armies on both occasions), Mōri Terumoto 毛利輝元 (1553-1625; he was the other commander-in-chief during the second invasion), Shimazu Yoshihiro 島津義弘 (1535-1619), Naoe Kanetsugu 直江兼續 (1570-1619; Kanetsugu was the strategist of Uesugi Kagekatsu 上杉景勝, 1555-1623),¹⁰⁸ and of the monk Ankokuji Ekei 安國寺恵

to which that of Keian c.s. belongs, is of importance.

¹⁰⁶ Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 3. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 4, for a similar passage concerning Hayashi Razan. Abe made a number of preparatory studies, the contents of which do not differ materially from the corresponding sections in *Chōsen*.

¹⁰⁷ See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 14-15.

¹⁰⁸ Kanetsugu was the one who had the so-called "*Naoe-bon*" printed (see Kodama Kōta, ed., *Kinseishi handobukku*, p. 353). The sole survivor of these is an edition of the *Wenxuan liuchen zhu* 文選六臣註, that he had printed in 1607 with copper movable types. According to the *Keiseki hōko shi* 6 (quoted from *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* 45, p. 1088), the text that Kanetsugu used for his edition was a Song edition from the library of the Ashikaga Gakkō, not a Korean edition. Razan, who had a copy of Kanetsugu's edition, criticizes it as follows (*batsu* of 1622, eighth month, nineteenth day): "... This work was printed recently in the Yōhōji by one Naoe Yamashiro-no-kami, a vasaal of the *kōmon* (= *chūnagon*) of Yonezawa, [Uesugi] Kagekatsu. I asked Akimoto Tanba-no-kami Yasutomo 秋元泰朝 (1580-1641) [to secure me a copy]. There-upon Yasutomo told Kagekatsu, got the book and gave it to me. Before this I had borrowed [texts of the *Wenxuan*] from friends and professional scribes and to those I had added red and black

瓊 (d. 1600).

About the contents of these collections we are not informed. Perhaps their owners, too, hardly knew what books they had. The story of the physician Manase Seirin 曲直瀬正琳 (sometimes rendered as Shōrin), who was presented by Hideyoshi with “several cart-loads of books,” brought back from Korea by Hideie, sounds rather ominous.¹⁰⁹ This was to be expected: the books were gathered in haste, while ransacking and plundering towns and villages, by soldiers who were hardly literate; they were shipped back to Japan as space allowed and deposited pell-mell in the castles and (Fushimi) town houses of the various *daimyō*.¹¹⁰

All of these collections are now split up. The only ones about which something is known, are the collections of Manase Seirin and Ankokuji Ekei. The collection of the latter was, after his execution in 1600, divided by Ieyasu between his advisors Shōtai and San'yō. The books that were given to San'yō ended up in the Enkōji (originally in Fushimi; now part of the Shōkokuji) and in the Ashikaga Gakkō.¹¹¹

The collection of Manase Seirin can also be traced, up to a certain extent.

reading marks, but as often happens the punctuation of the scribes contained many mistakes. Still later I borrowed a Chinese book and added corrections to [my own copy], and still it was not without [traces of] coarseness. Especially in the commentaries mistaken characters are numerous. Later on, when I have time to spare, I will have to collate it again. ... Is therefore this book [of Kanetsugu] not a treasure of my poor house, for me worth one thousand pieces of gold?” (*Bunshū* 54: II, p. 190)

¹⁰⁹ See Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 171; Miki Sakae, “Yōan'in zōshochū no Chōsen isho,” *CG* I (1951), p. 265.

¹¹⁰ How difficult it was at first to obtain complete copies of Korean books is shown by the story of Bunshi's attempts at editing the *Zhou Yi daquan*. In the *Kangaku kigen* (ZZGR X, p. 614) the story is told as follows: “In Keichō 4 (1599) Bunshi went to the Fushimi palace [of the Shimazu] in the suite of Shōrei-kō (= Shimazu Yoshihiro). At the time of the first invasion of Korea in the Bunroku era there had been a traveller who had returned from Korea bringing with him two volumes of the *Zhou Yi daquan*. Bunshi had bought these. [The man] again went to that country and obtained [a further] one or two volumes. Nevertheless, it was not yet complete. He hired people to copy [the missing parts] and added Japanese reading marks whenever he had secured [a new portion]. Now, at last, in the second month he had finally ended his labours and personally he added a postface. This is the basic text of all Japanese punctuated editions of the *Zhou Yi daquan*.” See also Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 70, where Bunshi's own *batsu* is given. Annotations to this story assure us, that this is “the book that twenty-nine years later, in the eleventh month of Kan'ei 4 (1627), his disciple Jochiku had printed,” but the work that Jochiku actually printed was the *Zhou Yi Cheng-zhuan benyi*, i.e. the *Zhou Yi* with the commentary by Cheng Yichuan and with Zhu Xi's *Benyi* 本義, as is stated in Jochiku's biography in the *Kangaku kigen* (ZZGR X, p. 629). The story, therefore, is not in all respects reliable, but it may serve as an indication of the difficulties one encountered in those days when working with Korean books.

¹¹¹ See Kawase, *Ashikaga*, p. 258. Of the books in the Enkōji and the Shōkokuji few details are known. For the figures and details concerning the Korean books in the Ashikaga Gakkō, cf. *infra*, n. 115

According to the family history of the Manase, the *Kan'i kafu* 官醫家譜, the founder of the house, Seirin, in 1597 “received books that had been brought [from Korea] on account of the war of Bunroku 1 (1592); of these he formed the Yōan-in Library 養安院文庫.”¹¹² The *gō* Yōan-in was given to him in 1600 by Emperor Go-Yōzei (1571-1586-1611-1617) and was used by him and by all of his successors. The *ex libris* seal “Yōan-in zōsho” 藏書 seems to have been used until the time of Manase Seikei 正珪 (1686-1748), Seirin’s grandson’s grandson. Also in Seikei’s days, in 1717, part of the collection was destroyed by fire. What was left, with later additions, became known as the Kaisenrō 懷仙樓 Bunko, Kaisenrō being the name of Seikei’s library. This collection was finally scattered in the beginning of the Meiji period. Two catalogues of this collection exist, called respectively *Yōan-in zōsho* and *Kaisenrō shomoku* 書目, and in all probability compiled not earlier than the end of the eighteenth century.¹¹³ It seems impossible to determine on the basis of these lists which Korean books Manase Seirin had received from Hideyoshi. The seal “Yōan-in zōsho” still gives the best indication, but as we have seen, it was in use for over a century, and Seirin could not have begun to use it until three years after he received the books.

In the first two decades of the seventeenth century probably the largest collection of all was the section of Korean books in the library of Tokugawa Ieyasu in Sunpu (present-day Shizuoka). In pursuance of Ieyasu’s last will, however, after his death the library was divided between the *go-sanke* 御三家, the three collateral branches of the Tokugawa headed by sons of Ieyasu, while some volumes were sent to Edo.¹¹⁴ These so-called *o-yuzuri-bon*, as far as they were given to the *daimyō* of Owari, Tokugawa Yoshinao, have become part of the Hōsa 蓬左 Bunko (Nagoya).

Another major collector of books was Hayashi Razan. Those of his books

¹¹² The *Kan'i kafu* was written in 1869 by a pupil of the Manase. See Miki Sake, “Yōan’in zōshochū no Chōsen isho,” *CG* I, pp. 263-266; the quotation, *ibid.*, p. 264.

¹¹³ The *Kaisenrō shomoku* is in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko. It has never been reproduced or published. The *Yōan’in zōsho* is in the possession of the Ōsaka Furitsu Toshokan. It has been reproduced in full by Ōtsuka Noboru in his “Chōseki bibō” (fu: *Yōan’in shomoku*), *CG* XLVIII, 1968, pp. 107-121, and Miki Sakae used it in his study quoted *supra*, n. 109. The origin of this list is not known (see Ōtsuka, *op.cit.*, pp. 111-112). It confines itself to Korean and Chinese books; *Chōsen-bon* are indicated as such.

that have survived the fire of 1657 are now mostly in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko (Tōkyō).

In other words, what remains of these several collections of Korean books is now part of larger collections, and this makes bibliographical research rather awkward. Here we will therefore content ourselves with giving some figures for the library of the Ashikaga Gakkō and for the Hōsa Bunko, and concentrate on the library of Hayashi Razan. After all, it is this library that furnishes the main of Abe Yoshio's evidence, too.

Of the 151 *kanseki* listed in the catalogue of Kyōhō 10 (1725) of the Ashikaga Gakkō, a disappointingly small number of fourteen titles is described as *Chōsen-bon*. Half of these have definitely been the property of San'yō; of the other half this is not clear.¹¹⁵ The difference with the Hōsa Bunko is striking: according to Kawase Kazuma, of the 377 *o-yuzuri-bon* that were kept there, 161 (nearly 43%) were Korean printings.¹¹⁶

We now come to Hayashi Razan. In order to check what books Razan had read that had either been written by Koreans or printed in Korea, Abe uses the "List of Books Already Read" (*Kikensho-moku*) that Razan drew up at the end of 1604, after he had made Seika's acquaintance.¹¹⁷ He concludes a) that seventeen of the 418 titles listed in it are works written by Koreans, and b) that Korean printed editions had been made of twenty-eight titles out of a series of

¹¹⁴ For details, cf. *infra* Ch. IV, n. 169

¹¹⁵ See Kawase, *Ashikaga*, pp. 257-271. We regard the books that are there marked "San'yō shutaku-bon" 三要手澤本 as the books that have definitely been San'yō's. These are the *Xiaowei tongjian* 少微通鑑 (p. 265), the *Shibashi lue* 十八史略 (p. 266), the *Mingchen yanxing lu* 明臣言行錄 (p. 267), the *Xingli daquan* (p. 267) and the *Sanfenji* (p. 268). Perhaps the *Hanwen zhengzong* 韓文正宗 (p.258) should also be included in this number. The other Korean books are the *Sishu zhangtu* 四書章圖 (p. 264; "incomplete from the time it was shipped from Korea"), the *Liu Xiang xinxiu* 柳向新序 (p. 266), the *Yanping dawen* (p. 267; "now lost"), the *Tianyuan fawei* 天原發微 (p. 267) and the *Qingpo quanji* 青坡全集 (p. 266). The final two books that are described as *Chōsen-bon* — the *Dijian tu shuo* 帝鑑圖說 (p. 267) and the *Zhuangzi Juanzhai kouyi* 莊子齋口義 (p. 266) — are respectively a Japanese *kokatsuji-bon* 古活字本 printed by Toyotomi Hideyori in 1606, and a *Gozan-ban* 五山版 (see Kawase, *Gozan-ban*, p. 477).

¹¹⁶ Of these 377 titles 249 are still extant. Within this group the percentages of works of Chinese, Korean, and Japanese origins are respectively 17%, 49% and 35%. Kawase, *Nihon shoshigaku no kenkyū*, pp. 628-629, adds a caveat that Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 172, ignores when citing these figures: "If ... one considers how many *Chōsen-bon* were in Ieyasu's keeping, taking into account the fact that amongst the books allotted to Edo, Mito, etc., too, there are many *Chōsen-bon*, and if one holds that these were chiefly imported as a result of the Korean invasions, one is astonished by the tremendous size of these shipments." Cf. also Nakamura Hidetaka, "Hōsa Bunko *Chōsen-bon* tenkansho kaisetsu," *CG* XIII.

thirty-two titles dealing specifically with Neo-Confucianism, that six of these titles were written by Koreans, and that of the twenty-two remaining titles (Chinese works reprinted in Korea) Razan had read at least eight, perhaps as many as eleven, in these Korean editions.¹¹⁸

The seventeen titles referred to under a) can be accepted, with the exception of the last one.¹¹⁹ Sixteen out of 418 titles, therefore, or nearly 4% of the books Razan had read by 1604, can be said to have been written by Koreans.

In regard to the series of thirty-two titles referred to under b), things are more complicated. According to Abe, of twenty-eight of these books Korean printings existed,¹²⁰ six of which were printed editions of works written by Koreans. The remaining twenty-two titles were those of Chinese works reprinted in Korea before 1585. Eleven of these thirty-two titles, Abe claims, were read by Razan in their Korean editions. He proves this for the *Yanping dawen*¹²¹ and for the *Kunzhiji* 困知記,¹²² and shows that it is likely in the cases of the *Xingli ziyi* 性理字義,¹²³ the *Dushulu* 讀書錄 and *Xu dushulu* 續,¹²⁴ the *Yiduan bianzheng* 異端辨正,¹²⁵ and the *Xuebu tongbian* 學部通辨.¹²⁶ He fails

¹¹⁷ List in *Nenpu* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 5-12).

¹¹⁸ See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 162-166, for the list of works by Korean authors; *ibid.*, pp. 172-176, for the series of Neo-Confucian works.

¹¹⁹ It seems to me that the *Fanchuan ji* 樊川集 (Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 166) should be identified with the manuscript copy of a Ming printing of this work, dating from the beginning of the Edo period, that Razan also had in his library, rather than with the *Fanchuan ji xiezhu* 夾注, as Abe proposes. Anyhow, even the attribution of the *Xiezhu* to a Korean is questionable.

¹²⁰ In order to establish this, Abe uses the *Kosa ch'waryo* 攷事撮要, or rather, the cumulative list composed by Haruyama Jin'ei on the basis of several editions of this work, made between 1554 and 1585. (The *Kosa ch'waryo* is a kind of encyclopaedia; its last chapter is a list, divided by circuit and district, that indicates where the printing blocks of a book could be found.) See Haruyama Jin'ei, "*Koji satsuyō* no sappan mokuroku ni tsuite." The cumulative list of titles is added to this article; Haruyama shows that this list is far from complete.

¹²¹ The manuscript copy in Razan's hand (now in the Naikaku Bunko) has the same number of lines to the page and of characters to the line, and the identical mistaken characters as a Korean edition. (Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 178-179; as Abe says, *op.cit.* p. 571, the identical number of lines etc. alone is not yet sufficient evidence.)

¹²² Again Razan's manuscript copy (now in the Naikaku Bunko) has the same number of lines etc., and shows the same typographical peculiarities as the Korean printed edition (Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 517-519).

¹²³ A copy of a manuscript copy by Razan shows the same number of lines to the page and of characters to the line as a Korean printed edition (Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 180).

¹²⁴ Same kind of proof (Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 180).

¹²⁵ Same kind of proof (Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 189).

¹²⁶ In his library Razan had a Korean printed edition of this work, the missing parts of which are supplemented in his own handwriting (Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 186-188).

to offer any proof as far as the *Zhuzi nianpu* 朱子年譜,¹²⁷ the *Xishan xinjing* 西山心經,¹²⁸ the *Huang Ming lixue mingchen yanxing lu* 皇明理學名臣言行錄¹²⁹ and the *Luzhai xinfa* 魯齋心法¹³⁰ are concerned. Finally, when Abe claims that in Razan's library there was a Korean printed edition of the *Song mingchen yanxing lu* 宋, he has probably mistaken this work for the *Wuchao mingchen yanxing lu* 五朝.¹³¹

This means that, even if we allow all of Abe's guesses, a mere twelve titles or 37.5% of thirty-two specially selected works, all dealing with the for his argument most sensitive area of Neo-Confucian thought, can be demonstrated to have been read by Razan in Korean editions.

If we look at what is left of Hayashi Razan's own library, the picture is much the same. This library,¹³² now part of the Naikaku Bunko and described in its catalogue, is represented by approximately 410 *kanseki*. Of these approximately 410 titles

- 127 (31%) definitely date from before 1604, 86 (21%) can definitely be dated 1604 or later, and the remaining 197 titles (48%) cannot be dated in relation to this year with any degree of certainty.

¹²⁷ The mere fact that Razan had the *Taishi huiguo Wengong nianpu* in his library in an undated Korean edition does not at all prove that Razan read this work in this edition before 1604. Cf. Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 174.

¹²⁸ The identification of this work with the *Xinjing fuzhu* seems rather arbitrary. Cf. Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 174.

¹²⁹ Since the colophon of a manuscript copy of the *Huang Ming lixue mingchen yanxing lu* is dated 1608 and signed Dōshun, it evidently is posterior to 1604; so even if it were a copy of a Korean original, this would not be relevant in this context.

¹³⁰ Neither the fact that a Korean printed edition of this work was part of the Yōan'in collection, nor the fact that the work is not mentioned in the *Jingji zhi* do yet prove that Razan read this Korean edition. Moreover, when Abe says that the work is not mentioned in the *Jingji zhi* 經籍志 of the *Ming shi* (sic! *Chōsen*, p. 181) he is misquoting his source: Itō Jinsai (quoted *Chōsen*, pp. 181-182) writes (in 1691, a full forty-eight years before the *Ming shi* was completed) that the *Luzai xinfa* did not figure in the *Jingji zhi* compiled by Jiao Hong 焦竑 (1541-1620) and was not listed (or: listed as missing) in the *Xingli daquan*. The *Jingji zhi*, however, was compiled in the beginning of the Wanli period (1573-1620) and is, according to the introduction to the *Yiwen zhi* of the *Ming shi*, rather unreliable. The *Luzhai xinfa* is a work from the Yuan dynasty (a Yuan edition could therefore very well have been brought to Japan) and a re-edition of it was made in the first half of the fifteenth century in China. See Also de Bary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy*, p. 236 (n. 186); p. 240 (n. 301).

¹³¹ See Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 176; *Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku*, p. 94, 95. The *Wuchao mingchen yanxing lu* does not appear in Razan's *Kikensho-moku*.

¹³² As belonging to Razan's library I count those books that bear the *ex libris* seal of Kōun iju 江雲渭樹 and are entered as such in the *Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku*. Since the argument is about Korean books, I have limited myself for the purpose of this disquisition to the *Kanseki mokuroku*.

- Of the works dating from before 1604, 102 (80%) are Chinese printed editions (mostly Ming editions), 22 (17%) are Japanese (both manuscripts and Japanese printed editions are included), and only three (2%) are Korean.
- Of the 197 titles that cannot reliably be dated, ninety-one (46%) are Japanese, ninety-six (49%) are Chinese, and ten (5%) are Korea.
- Of fifty-two books the catalogue indicates that Razan has either corrected it or written a postface. Of these fifty-two books, twenty-eight (54%) are Japanese (again including both manuscripts and printed editions), twenty (30%) are Chinese, and four (8%) are of Korean origin.
- The overwhelming majority of the printed works, 243 titles (80%), is Chinese, the rest is Japanese (forty-nine titles, or 16%) and Korean (thirteen titles, or 4%).
- 105 of the titles are manuscripts. These can be broken down as follows: nine are, wholly or partly, written by Razan, while the copyist of the other ninety-six is unknown; for none of the manuscripts of the first group a source is indicated, but of the anonymous manuscripts four appear to be copies of Chinese originals, two of Korean works, and of the remaining ninety again no source is indicated; all nine manuscripts by Razan and sixty-three of the anonymous ones are marked “written in the beginning of the Edo period” (seventy-two titles, or 69%). Eleven manuscripts, all of them anonymous, date from the Muromachi period (11%).

Whichever way one breaks down the figures, one never gets a clear quantitative indication of the importance of Korean books. The only relevant fact that emerges is that amongst the works that definitely appeared in 1604 or later there are no works of Korean origin at all. This might be taken to mean that after this date no Korean books were imported into Japan; it does not prove, however, that they were overwhelmingly important before this date.

If we compare what is left of Razan’s library with his *Kikensho-moku* of 1604, the picture changes slightly:

- Of the approximately 410 titles of Razan’s library *at most* sixty-five reappear in the *Kikensho-moku*. Seven of these sixty-five titles (11%) are of Korean origin, thirty are Chinese (46%) and twenty-eight (43%) are

Japanese.

- If we take only the forty-four titles that can *with certainty* be identified, we see that five are Korean works (11%), twenty-one are Chinese works (48%) and eighteen are Japanese works (41%).

This slight growth, however, of the incidence of Korean books must not blind us to the fact that on the basis of these figures¹³³ a very much more convincing case could be made for the decisive importance of Chinese books or of the native Japanese tradition.

Again we must ask ourselves the question of the relevance of these figures, particularly in regard to Abe's thesis that the sudden effervescence of Neo-Confucian studies in Japan around 1600 was due to sudden and massive Korean influence. Since, as one way of proving this thesis, Abe tries to use as a gauge the number of Korean books that were taken back to Japan between Bunroku 1 (1592) and Keichō 3 (1598), ideally bibliographical research should establish that the great majority of the *Chōsen-bon* has come to Japan between these two dates, that the number of *Chōsen-bon* was much larger than the number of Chinese works that were imported directly from China, not robbed in Korea, and that these works were not previously extant in Japan. Bibliographical research, however, does not and cannot do this. Quantitative analysis, as we have just seen, does not proffer evidence of the numerical importance of Korean books; more importantly, in most cases it is impossible to establish when precisely a Korean book (or a Chinese book, for that matter) was imported into Japan.¹³⁴ So even if this thesis were sound, it could not possibly be proven by

¹³³ Some final statistical material for reflection: if we divide the forty-four definitely identifiable titles in (a) works read by Razan (i.e. books copied, corrected or postfixed with a *batsu* by Razan before - vide the *Kikensho-moku* - 1604) and (b) others (i.e. books of which no such evidence exists), we get the following figures:

a.	Books read by Razan	13 titles of which are
	Japanese (manuscript copies)	08 titles (62%)
	Chinese	02 titles (15%)
	Korean	03 titles (23%)
b.	No details known	31 titles of which are
	Japanese (manuscript copies, printings)	10 titles (32%)
	Chinese	19 titles (61%)
	Korean	02 titles (7%)

The 23% under (a) looks promising, but by now the quantities are so small in absolute terms that the figure can hardly be taken as evidence of anything but the calculator's zeal.

¹³⁴ In the absence of a dated colophon or a clearly datable *ex libris* seal the *terminus ante quem* cannot be ascertained.

bibliographical means.¹³⁵

Abe, too, seems to have felt that this bibliographical approach would not have sufficient force to let him carry his point, for every now and then he shifts his argument from the quantity of the Korean books to the qualitative importance of some of these, e.g. the *Ch'ŏnmyŏng tosŏl* 天明圖說, the *Yanping dawen* and the *Kunzhiji*. Since such proof is admissible only when it has first been established that Abe's description of the philosophical system of Seika and Razan is correct, we will have to postpone the treatment of these doctrinal aspects to the following chapter.

My own opinion on the subject is that, even if we assume that a great number, the majority even, of Korean books at present extant in Japan were imported between 1592 and 1598, it must have taken quite a few years (*vide* the example of Bunshi, *supra*, note 110) to reassemble and edit these Korean works. It must also have taken quite some time for these books to find their way from the provinces to the interested readers, or to Ieyasu's library in Sunpu. On the other hand, precisely because these books often ended up in one or other private collection, access to them would have been anything but unimpeded.

Another possible vehicle of Korean influence, apart from the books, were visiting Koreans. Of Seika's relations with Kang Hang we have already spoken, but there were many more meetings with Koreans. Since these other Koreans were all members of Korean embassies to Japan, I will first give a short survey of these embassies and of the material relative to the meetings Seika and Razan had with their members.¹³⁶ During Seika's and Razan's lifetime the following

¹³⁵ Let me add at this point that I do not think that this thesis is at all sound: a mere availability of books does not mean that these books were read, or, if read, understood, or, if understood, understood correctly. If the impact of these Korean books was as sudden and important as Abe wants us to believe, this would imply that in some way individual Japanese, or Japanese society, had become receptive to the ideas expressed in these books. This whole problem of receptivity to alien, i.e. Korean, cultural influences Abe ignores.

¹³⁶ As regards these embassies, the basic sources are the *Sillok* and the *Tokugawa jikki*. Many diaries, records of poems, reports on Japan, etc., that were composed by Korean envoys, have been collected in the *Kaikō sōsai*. More material on the Japanese side is collected in the *Koji ruien: Gaikō-bu* 9 (*Chōsen* 1, 2) and in the *DNS*. Nakamura Hidetaka, *Nihon to Chōsen*, gives a useful account of the embassies exchanged during the Muromachi period (*op.cit.*, pp. 93-102) and of the embassies that were sent to the Tokugawa (*ibid.*, pp. 219-234); a chart of these embassies of the Edo period can be found *ibid.*, p. 222. See also his "Zen-kindai Ajia gaikōshi-jō no Tokugawa seiken ('Nihonkoku taikun' gaikō seiritsu to sono shūmatsu)," *CG* XLV (1967), p. 20. Several specialized studies of individual embassies have appeared in *Chōsen Gakuhō*: Miyake

embassies came to Japan:

1. The embassy of 1590, to Kyōto. It was led by Hwang Yun'gil 黄允吉 (chief envoy), Kim Sōngil 金誠一 (vice envoy) and Hō Sōng 許篈 (courier). Sōngil's *Kim Kakpong haesarok* 鶴峰海槎錄 is contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹³⁷ Seika met members of this embassy while they were staying in the Daitokuji in Kyōto. He exchanged poems with the courier, Hō Sōng, from whom he received an explanation (*shuo* 説) of his literary name Shiritsu-shi 柴立子.¹³⁸
2. The embassy of 1605, to Fushimi. It was led by the monk Yujōng Songun 惟政松雲 and by Son Munuk 孫文{X}. The embassy was sent to Japan for the specific purpose of concluding a peace treaty and reopening the relations between Korea and Japan that had been severed ever since 1592. For this reason it was staffed differently from the other embassies, and is never counted as one. Seika mentions it in his letters to Razan in strongly disapproving terms, because its leader was a monk. Nevertheless, Razan met Songun and sent the record of their conversation to Seika. Seika never saw the envoys; he only wrote two poems to them *in loco* of Kinoshita Katsutoshi.¹³⁹

Hidetoshi, "Tokugawa seiken shokai no Chōsen-shinshi," *CG* LXXXII (1977), treats the embassy of 1607; Yi Wōnsik, "Meiwa-do (1764) no Chōsenkoku shinshi (Sei Daichū to no hitsudan shōshūshi-kan o chūshin ni)," *CG* LXXXIV (1977), and Naba Toshisada, "Meiwa gannen no Chōsenkoku shūkō tsūshinshidan no torai to wa ga kuni no gakusha bunjin to no kanboku-jō ni okeru ōshū shōwa no ichirei ni tsukite," *CG* XLII (1967), treat the embassy of 1764. A study of the writings, inscriptions, etc., that were made by Korean envoys in Japan, is Yi Wōnsik, "Edo jidai ni okeru Chōsenkoku shinshi no iboku ni tsuite (bokuseki mokuroku)," *CG* LXXXVIII (1978). A very important study in a western language is Toby, Ronald P., "Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*: Diplomacy in the Legitimation of the Tokugawa *Bakufu*," *JJS* III, 2 (1977). Apart from these materials and studies, there exists an amorphous mass of poems, letters, recollections, either collected as such - see *KSM*, the lemmata starting with "*Chōsen*" - or tucked away in the collected literary works of Japanese and Korean scholars, as is the case with Seika and Razan. The embassies that came to Japan in the time of Seika and Razan are also described in Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 42-53; pp. 211-224.

¹³⁷ *Kaikō sōsai* I, pp. 98-189. This *Haesarok* contains poems, letters, etc., written by Kim Sōngil, and also Kim's *xingzhuang*.

¹³⁸ Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 43-46, gives a short biographical sketch of those five members of the embassy who exchanged poems with Seika. The *Siripcha-sōl* 柴立子説 and the poems that Seika received are grouped together in *Seika bunshū* 4 (Ōta I, pp. 287-290). His own poems are collected in *Seika-sensei bunshū* 1 and 6 (Ōta I, pp. 42-43; p. 95; *ZZGR* XIII, pp. 59-60; p. 87). Cf. Abe, *op.cit.*, pp. 42-46; pp. 51-53.

¹³⁹ Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 212-213. Abe gives a translation of the relevant passages of the letters. The letters themselves can be found in *Seika-sensei bunshū* 10 and 11 (Ōta I, p. 145; pp. 147-148; *ZZGR* XIII, pp. 106-108), the poems *ibid.* 4 (Ōta I, p. 73; *ZZGR* XIII, p. 76). Razan's record of this

3. The embassy of 1607, to Edo. This embassy, the first official embassy sent to the Tokugawa, was led by Yo Ugil 呂祐吉 (chief envoy), Kyōng Sōm 慶暹 (vice envoy) and Chōng Hogwan 丁好寬 (courier).¹⁴⁰ Sōm's diary of the journey, the *Kyōng Ch'ilsong haesarok* 慶七松海槎錄 is contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹⁴¹ Seika does not seem to have met any members of this embassy, but Razan, who was at the time staying in Sunpu, went to meet it privately when it passed on its way to Edo.¹⁴²
4. The embassy of 1617, to Fushimi. It was led by O Yun'gyōng 吳允謙 (chief envoy), Pak Che 朴{木宰} (vice envoy) and Yi Kyōngjik 李景稷 (courier). The diaries of both Yun'gyōng and Kyōngjik, resp. the *Ch'ut'an tongsa sang'illok* 吳楸{Mor. 18784}東槎上日錄 and the *Yi Sōngmun pusangnok* 李石門扶桑錄, are contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹⁴³

Seika did not meet any members of this embassy. Razan, too, left no records of any private meetings, but he was present at the occasion, for in his short description of the stay of this embassy in Kyōto, the *Chōsen-shinshi raikō no ki* 朝鮮信使來貢記, he “wrote down what he saw” according to Gahō,¹⁴⁴ and Seika writes, in a letter to Nawa Kassho,

The other day I heard that Korean envoys have come. What kind of people are they? Brother Dōshun is in attendance upon the *shōgun* at Fushimi, so why do you not go with him and have a look at them? If you would happen to have any written conversations with them, then I, too, would like to have a look at it. ... ¹⁴⁵

5. The embassy of 1624, to Edo. It was led by Chōng Ip 鄭笠 (chief envoy),

meeting with Songun, the *Kan-kyaku hitsugo* 韓客筆語, can be found in *Bunshū* 60 (II, pp. 262-263). For Seika's reactions, see Ōta I, p. 145; pp. 146-148.

¹⁴⁰ Beginning with this embassy, the title of the “courier” was changed from *sōjang* (= *sōjang-gwan* 書狀官) to *chongsa-gwan* 從事官. Since the function as such, however, did not change, I have stuck to the translation “courier.” Cf. Nakamura, *Nihon to Chōsen*, p. 223.

¹⁴¹ *Kaikō sōsai* II, pp. 1-77.

¹⁴² Recollections of this meeting can be found in *Bunshū* 68 (II, p. 396) and *ibid.*, 70 (II, p. 431). The meeting itself is also mentioned in Razan's *Nenpu* under Keichō 12 (1607) and in a letter to Seika (*Bunshū* 2: I, p. 25). Cf. Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 213-214, where translations are given of the relevant passages of Razan's *Bunshū*. See also Toby, “Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*,” p. 330.

¹⁴³ *Kaikō sōsai* II, pp. 77-110; pp. 111-204. For this embassy, see Toby, “Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*,” pp. 336-341.

¹⁴⁴ *Chōsen-shinshi raikō no ki* can be found in *Bunshū* 22 (I, pp. 248-250); Gahō's comment, *ibid.*, p. 250.

Kang Hongjun 姜弘重 (vice envoy) and Sin Kyeyŏng 辛啓榮 (courier). Kang's diary, the *Kang tongsarok* 姜東槎錄, is contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹⁴⁶ Razan met several members of this party, i.a. Kang Hongjung, whom he troubled with a number of - unanswered - questions about the *Chunqiu*, and one Yi Sŏngguk 李誠國.¹⁴⁷

6. The embassy of 1636, to Edo and Nikkō. It was led by Im Kwang 任統 (chief envoy), Kim Seryŏm 金世濂 (vice envoy) and Hwang Ho 黃{Mor. 11710} (courier). Im Kwang wrote a diary, the *Im-sanp'an pyŏngja Ilbon ilgi* 任參判丙子日本日記, Kim left a diary and a record of the poems he composed during the journey, the *Kim Tongmyŏng haesarok* 金東冥海槎錄, and Hwang Ho, too, left a diary followed by a description of Japan, the *Hwang Mallang tongsarok* 黃漫浪東槎錄. All are contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹⁴⁸

Razan and his brother Eiki played important parts in the reception of, and the negotiations with this embassy. In fact, it was at this occasion that the Hayashi were charged with the official correspondence with Korea.¹⁴⁹ In Razan's *Bunshū* we find, apart from the official letters composed by Razan, a number of private letters and records of conversations dealing with scholarly subjects and facts about Korea, and in his *Shishū* several poems that he wrote for members of the embassy.¹⁵⁰

7. The embassy of 1643, to Edo and Nikkō. It was led by Yun Sunji 尹順之 (chief envoy), Cho Kyŏng 趙綱 (vice envoy) and Sin Yu 申濡 (courier).

¹⁴⁵ Ōta I, pp. 171-172. See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 214-215.

¹⁴⁶ *Kaikō sōsai* II, pp. 205-311. For this embassy, see Toby, "Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*," p. 341-342.

¹⁴⁷ See Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 215. The questions put to Kang can be found in *Bunshū* 14 (I, pp. 155-156), and two poems that were written for Yi in *Shishū* 47 (II, p. 90). Cfr. also *Nenpu* under Kan'ei 1 (1624).

¹⁴⁸ *Kaikō sōsai* II, pp. 312-382; II, p. 383 - III, p. 48; III, pp. 49-115.

¹⁴⁹ The most important matter that came up was the correct appellation of the *shōgun*. See Nakamura, *Nihon to Chōsen*, pp. 214-218; Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 216-219, and the references given *ibid.*, p. 226, n. 4; Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 291-295; Toby, "Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*," pp. 343-353.

¹⁵⁰ Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 219-221. See also *Nenpu* under Kan'ei 13 (1636). The official letters can be found in *Bunshū* 13 (I, pp. 140-142); a private letter, addressed to "the three Korean envoys" and dealing with Korean history, ornithology, hot springs and Yi T'oegye, *ibid.* 14 (I, pp. 156-158); conversations with Kwŏn Ch'ik 權{Mor. 603} and Mun Hongjŏk 文弘續 in *Bunshū* 60 (II, pp. 263-269), and the poems in *Shishū* 47 (II, pp. 92-95). See also the detailed description

Kyŏng and Yu each left a collection of poems, resp. the *Cho Yongju tongsarok* 趙龍洲東槎錄 and the *Sin Chuktang haesarok* 申竹堂海槎錄. These are both contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*, as is an anonymous diary of a member of this embassy, the *Kyemi tongsa ilgi* 癸未東槎日記.¹⁵¹ Razan exchanged letters and poems with various members of this party, i.a. the three envoys and one Pak Angi 朴安期.¹⁵²

8. The embassy of 1655, to Edo and Nikkō. It was led by Cho Hyŏng 趙珩 (chief envoy), Yu Ch'ang 兪瑒 (vice envoy) and Nam Yongik 南龍翼 (courier). A diary, with poems and prose compositions inserted and followed by a detailed description of Japan, was written by Yongik. This *Nam Hogok pusangnok* 南壺谷扶桑錄 is contained in the *Kaikō sōsai*.¹⁵³ Razan, who was seventy-three at the time, again exchanged poems with the envoys and other members of the embassy and composed the official letters.¹⁵⁴

Because it is generally supposed that Seika's meeting with Hō Sōng and the other members of the embassy started the process that led to his eventual conversion to Confucianism, the embassy of 1590 may be regarded as the most important embassy, as far as the rise of Confucian studies is concerned.¹⁵⁵ The pivotal piece of evidence is the *Siripcha-sōl* 柴立子說, which I will here

in Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 295-303.

¹⁵¹ *Kaikō sōsai* III, pp. 116-158; 159-193; 194-249. The *Tongsarok* contains, next to the poems, a number of prose compositions, amongst which are two letters to Razan.

¹⁵² See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 221-223; *Nenpu* under Kan'ei 20 (1643). The official correspondence composed by Razan can be found in *Bunshū* 13 (I, pp. 143-147); his private letters (five to Pak Angi, one to the three envoys collectively, one to Sin Yu and one to Cho Kyŏng), *ibid.* 14 (I, pp. 159-163); the record of his conversation with Pak Angi, *ibid.* 60 (II, pp. 269-273), the poems which he wrote for Pak, Yun, Cho and Sin in *Shishū* 48 (II, pp. 96-105), and short surveys of Japanese annual festivals, rites and geography written at the request of Sin Yu, in *Bunshū* 61 (II, pp. 274-294).

¹⁵³ *Kaikō sōsai* III, pp. 250-294. *Ibid.*, p. 496, Nam gives short characterizations of Razan and his sons: see Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 223-224.

¹⁵⁴ See Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 223-224; *Nenpu* under Meireki 1 (1655). The official correspondence can be found in *Bunshū* 13 (I, pp. 149-154), a private letter to Yu Ch'ang, *ibid.* 14 (I, p. 163), and the poems addressed to Cho, Yu, Nam and one Yi Myŏngbin 李明彬, in *Shishū* 49 (II, pp. 107-116). Amongst these poems is the famous one that Razan composed overnight, in answer to a poem by Yu and using the same 150 rhymes.

¹⁵⁵ This interpretation is adopted e.g. by Abe (*Chōsen*, p. 50) and Imanaka (*Seiritsu*, pp. 80-81). See also Sagara Tōru, *Kinsei Nihon ni okeru Jukyō undō no keifu*, pp. 20-21.

translate in full:

In the fall of Wanli 18 (1590) I was appointed as courier of the embassy and sent to Japan. We stayed in the Daitoku-ji in Shibano, in the Northern Mountains, waiting for the *kanpaku* 関白 (= Toyotomi Hideyoshi) to come to the Eastern Mountains (i.e. to his castle in Fushimi. W.J.B.). One day there was a monk; his name was Shun and his literary name was Shiritsu. With a poem as his present he had come to visit us. I read his poem and observed his person. His nature was deep and harmonious, his appearance neat and refreshing, and what he expressed in his poem was like his person. Already I loved him in my heart. Since he came for the first time, I took some time to serve him wine and I exchanged a poem with him. [Then] I let him go.

A few days later his steps sounded again, and he came and said: "I, a poor monk, since I 'stand like a decayed tree,' call myself by the literary name Shiritsu. Its original meaning is, as Zhuangzi 莊子 of Meng explains, to have no feelings and just stand there.¹⁵⁶ This certainly is the meaning [I intend]. Why don't you amplify the explanation [of this name] for me and leave it with me, that it may [remain here as] your image in later days? Even after we have parted, you will still be in this. Not to mention that I, poor monk, will have an insight because of your explanation: with its lustre shining in my mind's eye, I will no longer need to open books. How could [your teaching] be something superficial?"

I said: "An explanation by me will not be something with which to throw light on your Way. [However,] if you say that you will keep this as my image, how could I, too, not have this intention? Well now, I once saw an explanation by a Buddhist. It said: "Act according to your feelings and be free, do not practise disciplined behaviour¹⁵⁷; when going, standing, sitting or lying, do just as you please. All is the subtle functioning of the Buddha."¹⁵⁸ If this were [true], why should one then attach importance to standing? And also, why should one then use firmness? Jumping over the void and entering into [the realm of] non-reality 無相 (*wuxiang*; S. *animitta*), sitting astride his horse and following the Caoxi 漕溪,¹⁵⁹ a Buddhist Saint strives to reach the [state of] illumination in which he smiles when a flower is shown to him.¹⁶⁰ You, however, remain stuck in

¹⁵⁶ Zhuangzi 19, 5. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* II, p. 17, translates: "A man should not retire and hide himself; he should not push forward and display himself. He should be like a decayed tree which stands in the centre of the ground."

¹⁵⁷ The term that we have translated as "disciplined behaviour" is *guanxing* 觀行 (J. *kangyō*), the third stage of the *liuji* 六即 (J. *rokusoku*) or "six stages."

¹⁵⁸ Origin unknown.

¹⁵⁹ Name of a river in Guangdong. The allusion is to the story of the monk Zhiyao 智藥 (Liang) who at the head of this river founded the monastery called Baolinsi 寶林寺. In Tang times this monastery became famous as the seat of the Zen patriarch Huineng 惠能. In Korea Chogyŏ (the Korean reading of the characters Caoxi) became the general name of the Zen sect: see Vos, *Die Religionen Koreas*, p. 147 (n. 75); p. 148; p. 154.

¹⁶⁰ Allusion to the anecdote of Mahākāśyapa (Mahakashō) who, when at a gathering at the Lingshan the Buddha showed a flower, was the only one who understood the Buddha's intention,

the skills of disciplining your behaviour. You do not [seem to] expect [anything] from that subtle functioning, but [seem] satisfied to remain in your corner. You call yourself Shiritsu, but what exactly does that mean?

"I have not studied the Way of the Buddhists. Please, let me elucidate this by means of an explanation according to my own school. Confucius said: 'We may get established [in the principles] along with them.'¹⁶¹ Mencius said: 'Let a man first stand fast in the supremacy of the nobler part of his constitution.'¹⁶² Nobody who enters the Way does not first start with standing up.¹⁶³ One who wants to nurture his body must first establish the important thing. This has ever been the route to enter into the Way. Although the ends that the Ways of Confucianism and Buddhism lead to are different, the effort in exerting one's strength will not be dissimilar. [Therefore,] when these exertions truly have accumulated over a long time and one has reached the realm of sudden insight, we Confucians speak of 'complete knowledge' and the Buddhist speaks of 'enlightenment.'

"Polishing tiles certainly is not the way to make mirrors, but on the other hand, that what gives a mirror its brightness, undoubtedly is the effort of the one who polishes it. What is called 'enlightenment when the words barely have been uttered'¹⁶⁴ does not mean that somebody's words effect my enlightenment just like that. It is all due to the fact that my efforts in fixing my ambitions and [firmly] placing my feet have accumulated over a long time; his words merely touched off the outburst of my heart. The opportunity of enlightenment will depend on a concurrence [of factors], but the effort of establishing oneself cannot be evaded. People who without it have entered the hall are only some tens or some hundreds in number, and those who only heard a word and understood, are no more than one or two. If it were true that everything lies in the impulse given by the Buddhist priest, and nothing would come from oneself, everybody at a Buddhist service would obtain the Way and experience enlightenment. The fact[, however,] that they do not reach enlightenment, how could that not be because they have not first established what is in themselves? In that case, however, the subtle functioning has always yet arisen out of establishing oneself. And with establishing oneself one actually prepares the ground for the subtle functioning. This surely must have been the reason that you have been able to find something [to your advantage] in [the concept of]

and smiled.

¹⁶¹ *Lunyu* IX, 29; Legge's translation. Like Legge, Couvreur interprets the verb *li* ("to stand") as a reflexive verb and translates "permettre de s'affermir dans la vertu." Yoshikawa, *Rongo* I, p. 300, takes it in a transitive sense and translates "to establish something."

¹⁶² *Mengzi* VI A, 15. As the rest of the section makes clear, the "nobler part of his constitution" (*da zhe* 大者) is the heart (*xin*).

¹⁶³ "To enter the Way" is a quotation from *Lunyu* IX, 29. However, when Hō Sōng says that *li* (to stand up) is a precondition for "entering into the Way" (or, as Legge translates it, "going on to principles"), he is reversing the order in which the steps are mentioned in the *Lunyu*.

¹⁶⁴ Later on, in a conversation reported in the *Baison saihitsu*, Seika returns to this topic: "When smart people are in a discussion [with a Master], they sometimes hit on the answer right away, when the words have [barely] been uttered, even though they have not regularly followed ascetic practices. Generally they are near, but *one does not approve of it*. In Zen circles one calls this 'to get it while [still] sitting'." (*Baison saihitsu*, *Zuihitsu taikan* III, p. 60)

establishing oneself?

“Well now, when once you have set your thoughts on something your heart will become diseased. [Then] unavoidably you will do things by halves and [let the work be unfinished] for want of one basket of earth.¹⁶⁵ Therefore Mencius said: ‘There must be the constant practice of this righteousness, but without the object of thereby nourishing the passion-nature.’¹⁶⁶ Confucius said ‘His learning will not be solid.’¹⁶⁷ In that case, how could the abolition of feelings not be the method of establishing one’s ambitions, and firmness the way to pose one’s feet? When you, truly starting from the abolition of feelings, can fulfil your ambition of establishing [yourself], when you can be resolute, that you make your feet, which you have posed, go through, then one day you will show your *tathatā* body (“thusness body”) and easily enter into the realm of *samādhi* (concentration, meditation). Then in all your actions you will be pure and straight of heart, quiet and untroubled, empty and clean. What formerly was called magical powers and subtle functioning, must have lain in this. And the two characters ‘decayed tree standing’ will then have been no more than a trap, a snare for fishes and crabs. How could one not rejoice!

“Alas! Confucius said: ‘Those whose courses are different cannot lay plans for one another.’¹⁶⁸ Mencius said: ‘Whoever is able to oppose Yang and Mo is a disciple of the Sages.’¹⁶⁹ You are a Buddhist and I am a follower of the Holy Ones. I should oppose you unremittingly, but I am doing [quite the] opposite, laying plans for somebody whose Way is not the same [as mine]! Have I not broken the commandment of the Holy One, and fallen myself into something similar to heterodoxy? But to give somebody a [helping] word is the work of a humane man. And my words most certainly will not throw light upon your Way. If only they are sufficient to serve as an image in later days, then this, too, is something like Master Han’s leaving his clothes, nothing more.¹⁷⁰ How could it do any harm?

“Only, we have been born in different countries and the time of our parting is drawing near. That we cannot make a covenant [as] in the *Bailianshe* 白蓮社¹⁷¹ and cannot roam together outside [the pales of] this world,¹⁷² is a cause of regret to both of us. If in later days we long for

¹⁶⁵ Reference to *Shujing* 7, “Lü ao.” Legge, *Shu Ching, Book of History*, p. 134, translates the passage as follows: “Oh! Early and late never be but earnest. If you do not attend jealously to small actions, the result will be to affect your virtue in great matters. In raising a mound of nine fathoms, the work may be unfinished for want of one basket of earth.” An allusion to this passage of the *Shujing* can be found in *Lunyu* IX, 18.

¹⁶⁶ *Mengzi* II A, 2; Legge’s translation.

¹⁶⁷ *Lunyu* I, 8; Legge’s translation.

¹⁶⁸ *Lunyu* XV, 39; Legge’s translation.

¹⁶⁹ *Mengzi* III B, 9; Legge’s translation.

¹⁷⁰ The meaning of the remark probably is, that Han Yu can safely leave his clothes to someone, for, even if this someone should wear his clothes, he would still not be able to emulate Han’s talents. At least, in this sense the expression is used by Razan in *Bunshū* 48 (II, p. 117).

¹⁷¹ *Bailianshe* (“White Lotus Club”) is the name of a group of devotees to Amitābha that in the beginning of the fifth century gathered in the Donglinsi. Both Buddhists and laymen (Confucians) were amongst its members. See Morohashi VIII, 22678-1199.

¹⁷² “Outside of this world” is a translation of *fangwai* 方外. For this expression, see *Zhuangzi* 6,

each other, will this not be written here?"

Wanli 18 (1590), last day of the tenth month.¹⁷³

Siripcha-söl is a very neatly written essay. First, in a few strokes, the background is sketched and a monk is introduced who is not of the ordinary run of monks: he is a personality, cultivated and a gentleman, somebody one can talk with. This monk asks for an essay about his literary name, something quite in accordance with the conventions, but in asking he employs a rather monkish argument: he might experience enlightenment through it. Seika, of course, only meant it as a compliment, but nevertheless Sōng decides to take his cue from this. The rest of the essay is constructed around two poles: on the one hand (paragraphs four to six), a straightforward explanation of the meaning of the two characters of Seika's literary name¹⁷⁴; on the other, (paragraphs three and seven), a comparison of Confucianism and Buddhism. The main criticism levelled at Buddhism is that the idea of a sudden enlightenment, which one can experience without having undergone any prior discipline is nonsense.

The writer states in the essay that Buddhism and Confucianism are incompatible as to their goals (fifth paragraph), but that as to method they are rather similar. This makes it possible for him to explain Seika's literary name by means of Confucian texts. In fact, the distinction that he makes between the extreme wing of believers in the possibility of sudden enlightenment and Seika, who evidently does not, is also applicable to Neo-Confucianism where, on the one hand, one knows the orthodox opinion that prolonged study, practice and a mild form of discipline would gradually lead to a state of mind in which something like enlightenment could be experienced and, on the other hand, the conviction, current among some of the followers of Wang Yangming, that enlightenment could be sudden and did not depend on prior study, discipline, etc. In other words, Sōng's typology of Buddhism is representative of only some

11. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* I, p. 251, translates: "Confucius replied: 'Those men occupy and enjoy themselves in what is outside the (common) ways (of the world), while I occupy and enjoy myself in what is within those ways'."

¹⁷³ Text in Ōta I, pp. 287-288. Cf. Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 46-51; text *ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

¹⁷⁴ *Li* 立 (K. *ip*; J. *ritsu*) means "to stand," "to establish"; *chai* 柴 (K. *si*; J. *sai, shi*) means "brushwood," "firewood." The second word, here translated as "withered tree," is to be interpreted as a symbol of the state of being without feelings. Since the more common reading of this character is *sai*, this *gō* of Seika is often read "Sairitsu-shi." In reading "Shiritsu-shi" I follow Morohashi VI, 14664-127.

tendencies within this religion. Since he explicitly exonerates Seika on this score (fourth paragraph), his criticism cannot have stung very much.

If one assumes that Sōng is proselytizing, it is remarkable that he concerns himself only with these methods of reaching enlightenment and does not use the stock argument against Buddhism, which the young Razan will use a few years later when he makes his escape from the Kenninji, namely that Buddhism is destructive of the Five Human Relations. This should have been the first argument to come to his mind. What Sōng does, in the course of an explanation of Seika's literary name, and all the while assuring him of his personal esteem, is saying that Buddhism and Confucianism are different. In what respect they differ he does not say, and when, in the last paragraph but one, he elaborates on this difference, the note he strikes is one of irony.

Taken all in all, I find it difficult to agree with Abe's opinion that "It will probably not be a mistake, if we suppose that the *Siripcha-sōl* occasioned a great perturbation in Seika's mind."¹⁷⁵ Neither the contents nor the phrasing of the essay are such as to warrant this conclusion, however guardedly expressed.¹⁷⁶ It is true that one of the most striking differences between the medieval Confucianism and the Confucianism as practised in the Tokugawa period is the vociferous anti-Buddhism of the latter, but to impute this wholly to Korean influences, i.e. to Sōng's influence on Seika, on the strength of a few poems and this literary essay seems rather too simple.

About Razan's relations with Koreans we can be short. From the first Razan was wont to trouble the Korean envoys with a barrage of unanswerable questions that seem to be meant to impress them with the weight of his erudition, rather than to elicit information. The poetical encounters he evidently enjoyed. For him as for other Japanese writers of Chinese verse, to be praised by a Korean was to be praised indeed. (In his case the praise was qualified, however.¹⁷⁷) It would,

¹⁷⁵ Abe, *Chōsen*, 53.

¹⁷⁶ Sagara, *Jukyō undō no keifu*, pp. 20-21, seeks the main effect of Sōng's words not in their critical content, but in the mere fact that he states that "you are a Buddhist and I am a follower of the Holy Ones." According to Sagara, this would be something that, because of the prevailing mood of *Ju-Butsu itchi* 儒佛一致 which had permeated Japanese Confucian studies during the Middle Ages, Seika at the time supposedly had not yet realized. Sagara, however, is using a very simplified picture of what the Confucian studies in the Middle Ages were like.

¹⁷⁷ See Nam Yongik's evaluation of Razan as a poet, quoted in Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 223-224.

therefore, be a work of supererogation to try and improve on Abe's summing-up:

We can say that the only thing Razan gained by meeting the envoys was a detailed knowledge of Korea. On the other hand, he seems to have played an important part in showing to Korea the existence of Confucianism in Japan, thus making the Koreans reconsider their common impression that Japan was a culturally underdeveloped country.¹⁷⁸

Conclusions

The main problem we have confronted in this section is the protean quality of Abe's thesis. For reasons that need not detain us here he is convinced that a new Japanese Neo-Confucianism arose in the Edo period, due to and under important Korean influence. What he does prove, however, is that, probably as a result of the Korean invasions,¹⁷⁹ quite a number of Korean books were brought to Japan and that some of these books ended up in the hands of Bunshi, Fujiwara Seika, or Hayashi Razan, who are commonly supposed to have played a major role in the initial stage of Neo-Confucian studies in Japan. He also proves that Seika and Razan had some contacts with Koreans, i.e. with members of various embassies and with Kang Hang. When he has also succeeded in proving that Bunshi used a Korean book to perfect his edition of the *Zhou Yi chuanyidaquan* 周易傳義大全, and that Seika and Razan spoke with more or less qualified praise of three other texts, i.e. the *Ch'ŏnmyŏng tosŏl*, the *Yanping dawen* 延平答問 and the *Xuebu tongbian*, Abe thinks he can put q.e.d. behind his thesis.

The first problem with his argument is that Abe has made assumptions about the previous history of Neo-Confucianism in Japan and about the nature of the Neo-Confucianism of Seika and Razan that actually still remain to be proven. As we have shown in the first part of this chapter, medieval Japanese

¹⁷⁸ Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 224. Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 226-228; Boot, "Yi T'oegye and Japan."

¹⁷⁹ This is more or less proven by the fact reported by Nakamura Hidetaka, that nearly all *Chōsen-bon* in the Hōsa Bunko date from the sixteenth century or earlier, and only one or two from the seventeenth. See Nakamura Hidekata, "Hōsa Bunko *Chōsen-bon* tenkansho kaisetsu," *CG* XIII, p. 203. In Razan's library, too, there were no Korean books that can definitely be dated

Neo-Confucian studies had already reached a fair level of sophistication and most of the important books were already known. Abe completely ignores these medieval studies. He also ignores the books that were directly imported from China: as we have seen, the Chinese and Japanese books by far outnumber the Korean ones, and as we will show in the next section, China and various Japanese monasteries and private persons were the main sources from which Razan drew his books. A study of the direct, personal contacts with Koreans also leads to inconclusive results, even in the case of Seika: as we have seen in Chapter I, the nature of Kang Hang's influence on Seika is difficult to ascertain,¹⁸⁰ and our little exercise with the *Siripcha-söl* has shown to what extent the thesis is used to interpret the evidence. (For a discussion of the importance that should be attached to the contents of the Korean books Seika and Razan mention in their letters, the reader is referred to the next chapter, where the doctrinal aspects will be dealt with.)

Above this whole discussion, of course, hovers the problem of "influence" as such: Is it useful to speak of A influencing B, and how should influences be proven? Many influences are by their nature untraceable: a book one happened to glance through, a chance remark one overheard. On the other hand, one would do away with one of the most important tools of intellectual history, if one would conclude from this, that "ideas are in the air." Such a conclusion would be needlessly pessimistic, anyhow. Most thinkers and philosophers develop their ideas in a conscious discussion with older doctrines and systems of thought, and thus are clearly aware of the origin of their own ideas, certainly in the Far East, where the genealogy of an idea often occupies the place that in the west is given to its logical cogency. I see therefore no problem in speaking of "A influencing B," if B acknowledges such influence ("having read A, I realized that ...") or when B, without mentioning his source, gives assenting quotations

later than 1564, and none of which it can be proven that they were acquired after 1604.

¹⁸⁰ Kang Hang himself is not very communicative as far as the contents of his relations with the Japanese are concerned. In Japanese sources Hang is generally introduced in order to praise Seika (see not only Seika's *Gyōjō*, but see also the two references made to him by Seika and reported in the *Baison saihitsu*, *Zuihitsu taikan* III, p. 52, 60). This, of course, involved playing down any possible influences that Hang might have exercised on Seika. That Seika and Hang held each other in mutual esteem and friendship can be inferred from the sources. As far as mutual influences are concerned, one may indulge in more or less probable guesses, but precious little evidence remains to prove any such suppositions.

or paraphrases from A, on condition that we can prove that A's ideas were not so commonly known as to constitute part of the intellectual background of the period in which B was living. For Abe, however, everything seems to be grist to his mill.

A third problem, which Abe does not even see, is that of receptivity: a book will remain lying in the corner unless it finds a reader who is interested in it and can do something with it; foreign cultural influences will remain isolated traits, oddities, unless they can function in some way or other within the receiving culture (see also *supra*, n. 135.) In the case at hand, this means that, in order to be able to appreciate Kang Hang, Seika and Hiromichi must have shared many of his values. Seika must have had a previous and thorough knowledge of Neo-Confucian thought in order to be able to appreciate the differences between Yi T'oegye and Luo Zhengan. Razan must have had anti-Buddhist inclinations before he was able to enjoy the *Xuebu tongbian*.

2. The education of Razan

The question that now obtrudes itself is, what did Seika and Razan themselves say about the reasons for their interest in Confucianism and about the sources they drew their books and learning from? Unfortunately, but for the references in his letters, Seika left little information regarding these points. In the few letters that have survived from the time before he met Razan, Seika occasionally mentions books, e.g. the *Shujing*, which he was punctuating,¹⁸¹ the *Liji*,¹⁸² and the Four Books.¹⁸³ The major part of his letters, however, as we find them collected in the *Seika bunshū*, is addressed to Razan and dates from after 1604. It seems better, therefore, to introduce their contents as we proceed with our discussion of Hayashi Razan.

Razan not only left a description of the way in which he had come to read (and believe) the Classics and study Neo-Confucianism, he also wrote a number

¹⁸¹ DNS 12/31, p. 621.

¹⁸² DNS 12/31, pp. 621-622.

¹⁸³ DNS 12/31, p. 630.

of postfaces for his own and other people's books¹⁸⁴ and left references to his reading in his letters and commonplace-books (*zuihitsu*).¹⁸⁵ So in his case the course of his education can be followed rather closely.

During one of his first meetings with Seika, in 1604, when he was twenty-one years of age, Razan described the quest that had guided his studies as follows:

When I was a child I sometimes read modern stories. The person who explained them to me [told me that he] thought that such-and-such a word came from Su Dongpo 蘇東坡 (1037-1101) or from Huang Dingqian 黃庭堅 (1045-1105), and that such-and-such a phrase came from Li Bai 李白 (701-762), Du Fu 杜甫 (712-770), Han Yu 韓愈 (768-824) or Liu Zongyuan 柳宗元 (773-819). When I read the collected works of Li, Du, Han, Liu, Su and Huang, I noticed that very often what they based themselves on were the *Wenxuan*, and the *Shiji* and the *Han Shu*. When I read the *Shiji* and the *Han Shu*, I saw that they followed the texts of the ancient period. I then read the Five Classics, and saw that before them there was nothing from which they derived. Thereupon I clearly realized that they were the bulwark of all later theories and in this broad perspective I knew what the Way was based on. I only cherished the extra (i.e. added to the Classics. WJB) teachings of the Cheng and Zhu Xi, and looked up to the abundant relics of Confucius and Mencius.¹⁸⁶

Since this coincides very well with the course of his reading as outlined in the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō*, we will present the relevant material in chronological order, adding from the various other sources to the account in the *Nenpu*.¹⁸⁷

When still in the Kenninji 建仁寺 Razan availed himself of the books that were present in the Taitō-an 大統庵, where he was boarding and studying under Kokan Jikei 古澗慈穉 (1544-1633), and in the Jūnyo-in 十如院, where Eiho Eiyū 英甫永雄 (d. 1602) kept his library. (The Taitō-an and the Jūnyo-in were both subsidiary temples, *tatchū*, within the compound of the Kenninji.) The books that he read were primers like the *Menqiu*, and a selection of poems and prose literature of the Tang and Song dynasties. At his own expense he

¹⁸⁴ *Bunshū* 51-55 (II, pp. 133-209); *batsu* and *dai* for the books of his own collection, *ibid.* 54 (II, pp. 184-199).

¹⁸⁵ Letters in *Bunshū* 2-11 (I, pp. 12-129); *Zuihitsu*, *ibid.*, 65-75 (II, pp. 338-505).

¹⁸⁶ *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 3, p. 37.

¹⁸⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, the following account is based on the *Nenpu* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku*

acquired “on the market” the works of Su Dongpo (*Dongpo quanji*), to which he added the punctuation. He attended Eiyū’s lectures on the *Nanhua kouyi* 南華口義,¹⁸⁸ of which he would write later that they had been like “the eastern wind in a horse’s ear,”¹⁸⁹ and he wrote annotations to two of Bai Juyi’s most famous poems, the “Changhen ge” 長恨歌 and the “Pipa hang” 琵琶行.¹⁹⁰ The *Gyōjō* adds that at this point he read the “Five Classics with the old commentaries” (*Jiuzhu wujing* 舊注五經).

After he had left the Kenninji in 1598 he read the *Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書¹⁹¹ and the *Shiwen leiju* 事文類從,¹⁹² which he had obtained “by accident.” Where he had done so is not indicated. From Eiyū he borrowed the *Wenxuan liuchen zhu* 文選六臣註¹⁹³ and the Histories of the Former and Later Han dynasties. As Razan himself tells in his commonplace-book:

1-2, pp. 1-34)

¹⁸⁸ This is the *Zhuangzi kouyi* by Lin Xiyi 林希逸. In those days this was still a rather unknown commentary: see *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 187), “*Rō-shi kōgi* no batsu,” and n. 189. For Lin Xiyi, see *Song Yuan xuean* 47.

¹⁸⁹ He writes this in a letter to Sohaku (Kotetsu-sai) 祖博・涸徹齋 of 1602 (*Bunshū* 3: I, p. 31). In this letter Razan criticizes Sohaku for not using the *Kouyi*, but the older commentaries by Guo Xiang 郭象 (Jin) and Cheng Yuanying 成元英 (Tang), sc. respectively the *Zhuangzi zhu su* 注疏 and the *Nanhua zhenjing zhu su* 南華真經注疏.

¹⁹⁰ The autograph manuscript of these annotations is preserved in the Naikaku Bunko; it is entitled *Kakō rosetsu* 歌行露雪. It contains a *batsu* by Eiyū, dated Bunroku 5 (1596), second month of winter. See Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 167; p. 184. In *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 193), moreover, there are two *dai* by Razan, the “*Biwakō* no ato ni dai-su” (undated) and the “*Chōgonka* no ato ni dai-su” (dated 1596).

¹⁹¹ The *Genkō shakusho* is a history of Japanese Buddhism, written by Kokan Shiren (1298-1346). It is patterned after the Chinese official histories, and divided like these into biographies, treatises, and tables. It was completed in 1321. It covers the 700 years that had elapsed since the meeting, in the twenty-first year of Empress Suiko (613), between Shōtoku-taishi and Bodhidharma. (Cf. Kamstra, J.H., *Encounter or Syncretism, the Initial Growth of Japanese Buddhism*, pp. 394-395, for the *Nihon shoki* version of the incident.) In Keichō 4 (1599) a new edition was printed with movable types. Razan’s feelings about this work were mixed. As his *Nenpu*, entry under Keichō 3, reports: “He sighed at (i.e. admired. WJB) Shiren’s talent, but when thereupon he read it for a second time, he said: ‘Him! Him!’” If these last words are intended as a criticism, and I think they are, this criticism is elaborated in the two “*Genkō shakusho* no ben” (*Bunshū* 26: I, p. 302), which are totally dismissive: unwarranted usurpation of Confucian styles to embellish a Buddhist book. See also *Bunshū* 53 (II, p. 182), “*Genkō shakusho* no batsu.” Razan had in his library the edition of Kan’ei 1 (1624).

¹⁹² The Naikaku Bunko has a copy of this work (a Ming printing) that has formerly been part of Razan’s library.

¹⁹³ See *Bunshū* 65 (II, p. 339) where the story is told in detail and placed in “the spring of Keichō 6 (1601).” See also *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 190), “*Go shin chūbun monzen* no batsu” (1622), which has been partly translated *supra*, n. 108.

In the year 1598 I read Fan Ye's *Hou-Han Shu*¹⁹⁴ and added a colophon too it, as well as an punctuation in red and black. In the year 1603 I read Ban Gu's 班固 *Qian-Han Shu*, all the Annals, Tables, Treatises and Biographies, one hundred chapters in all. Some of the chapters were divided into three parts! I started in summer, on the seventeenth day of the fifth month, and finished on the fourteenth day of the seventh month, in autumn. Then I gradually came to realize the difference in quality of the prose of Ban and Fan. Truly, whoever wants to write prose and record facts must read these two histories.¹⁹⁵

He acquired the new edition Yoshida Soan had made of the *Shiji* and read it with the help of "an old edition with punctuation" that he borrowed from a monk of the Tōfukuji 東福寺, one volume at the time.¹⁹⁶

Then Razan turned to the Five Classics. Where he obtained the texts of these is not told; he wrote a number of postfaces for the various Classics, but only two of these date from before 1620. These are the *Jiga no batsu* for the *Erya* 爾雅 and the *Raiki kohon no batsu* for the *Liji*. This last one reads:

On the tenth day of the first month of winter, Keichō 8 (1603), I have corrected [this book] with the help of a book of the Kiyohara. I have added red [reading marks] and ?.¹⁹⁷

That in this period Razan entertained relations with the Kiyohara is also indicated by some entries in the *Keichō nikken roku* 慶長日件録, the diary of Kiyohara Hidekata 秀賢, for Keichō 8 and 9 (1603, 1604).¹⁹⁸ We may assume from this that one of the sources from which he obtained his books was the

¹⁹⁴ Fan Ye 范曄 (398-446) compiled the annals and the biographies of the present *Hou-Han Shu* on the basis of a number of fragmentary historical works regarding the Later Han dynasty. The treatises were added later, during the Song.

¹⁹⁵ *Bunshū* 65 (II, p. 355).

¹⁹⁶ The "old edition" will have been the *Shiki-shō* by Tōgen Zuisen. See Seika's letters to Razan (Ōta I, p. 167, 273). According to Gahō the copy of the *Shiji* that Razan read at this time was lost in the fire of 1657. Nevertheless, the Naikaku Bunko retains two copies of the *Shiji* that were originally part of Razan's library. One of these is a Chinese printed edition of 1596, the other the printed edition (movable types) that Yoshida Soan had made in the Keichō era. Cf. also *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 188), "*Shiki no batsu*," written by Razan in 1620 for a copy that one Kamesaburō (= Genko; see *supra*, Ch. I, n. 214; for the identification, see Ōta I, p. 278) had made of "an old book that is the property of our house."

¹⁹⁷ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 186). The meaning of the final character (Mor. 30573) in this context is unclear.

¹⁹⁸ Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 172, n. 12; Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 40; *Keichō nikken roku* I, entries under Keichō 8/11/4 (6-12-1603), 9/1/1 (31-1-1604) and 9/4/27 (25-5-1604).

library of the Kiyohara.¹⁹⁹

In the fall of 1602 Razan journeyed to Nagasaki. It was probably on this trip that he acquired the *Jiandeng xinhua*; at least, in his postface for this book he wrote:

Fifth day of the tenth month, Keichō 7 (1602). Under the lamp of the inn I have finished adding red and black reading marks. The student (*shosei*) Hayashi Nobukatsu has written this.²⁰⁰

According to the *Gyōjō* he also went through the *Hongwu zhengyun* 洪武正韻 during this trip.²⁰¹

In 1603 Razan lectured on the *Lunyu* and read the *Sishu zhangju jizhu*. This is the first time that the *Nenpu* mentions the *Sishu jizhu*, but, as the text makes clear, it cannot have been the first time that he read it. Details are given by Razan himself, in the *Nozuchi* 野槌, where he writes

I first read the *Lunyu* with the commentary by He Yan and the sub-commentary by Huang Kan and when I was seventeen or eighteen years old (i.e. in 1599 or 1600. WJB) I read Zhu Xi's *Jizhu* for the first time. I pondered over the [*Sishu*] *daquan*, and looked into the *Chengzi yishu* 程子遺書 and the *Xingli daquan*. To my friends I roughly explained what was the purport of the *Jizhu*.²⁰²

Again it is not indicated where he obtained these books.

During these years Razan had also been studying Japanese institutional

¹⁹⁹ In 1606 Razan read the *Zhou li* 周禮 and the *Yili* 儀禮: "The *Zhou li juanjing* 全經 I had already seen, but the *Zhou [li]* and the *Yi[li]* not yet. My will to see them was firm, but I could not pry them loose. In the fall of 1606 in the [*baku*]*fu* [library] in Fushimi I saw the *Zhou li juanjing*. I also saw the ..., *Xiangshan ji* 象山集, ... I was very, very glad, especially with the *Xiangshan ji*. It had a preface by Wu Cheng 吳澄 of the Yuan and another by Wang Shoujen (Yangming) 王守仁・陽明 of the Ming. It was in ten volumes." (*Bunshū* 68: II, pp. 399-400) Seika mentions the *Quli* 曲禮 several times in letters to Razan that probably date from 1605 (Ōta I, p. 158; p. 162; ZZGR XIII, pp. 124-125), and once in a letter to Junchi 順知 (?); Ōta I, p. 168). In one of these letters (Ōta I, p. 158; ZZGR XIII, p. 129) he also mentions that he wishes to see the *Zhou li* and the *Yili*. One is, therefore, inclined to feel doubtful when in his *Kikensho-moku* Razan mentions two editions of the *Zhou li* and two of the *Yili* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 6).

²⁰⁰ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 199). This book, with this colophon, still is in the Naikaku Bunko. See Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 166. It is a Korean edition; the circumstances suggest that Razan bought it in Nagasaki.

²⁰¹ The only memory of this stay in Nagasaki is a vivid description of a tiger he saw there: see *Bunshū* 66 (II, p. 378).

²⁰² *Nozuchi* (*Kokubun chūshaku zensho* XII, p. 227), quoted in Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 42-43.

history²⁰³ with Kikutei Harusue 菊亭晴季 (1543-1617) and Shinto (*jingi no michi* 神祇之道) with “an old monk of the Kenninji,” probably Tōho Baisen 東甫梅仙,²⁰⁴ “who transmitted the doctrines of the two houses of the Urabe 卜部 (= Yoshida 吉田) and the Kiyohara.”

Razan’s son Gahō describes the circumstances under which he pursued his studies during these years as follows:

The house of the Master (= Razan) did not have any library of its own. Initially, when he was in the Kenninji, he read the books that Eiyū and Jikei had collected. When he had returned home, he either browsed through bookshops and bought books, or he borrowed them from people whom he knew and copied them. Within a few years he had nearly filled the house with them. Generally, for both Japanese and Chinese books, he made no distinction between new and old: everything that met his eyes he read through.²⁰⁵

The *Gyōjō* is more elaborate, but it, too, only sparingly mentions names of teachers, acquaintances and purveyors of books (a convention of biographical writing that we have already met with in the first chapter):

Originally his (= Razan’s) family had no collection of books and very few printed works were in circulation. Therefore he borrowed them here and there, and copied them. Sometimes he saw [a book] in a shop and bought it. I think that when he had laid hands on a book, he would not part from it for ten thousand pieces of gold. When he read them and had finished a chapter, that was for him the greatest pleasure on earth. When he heard that somebody had a secret book, then by all means he went there and asked for it. Sometimes he agreed to borrow it for a certain length of time in order to read it. Following the method mentioned in the *Jiaxun* of Yan

²⁰³ The term used is *honchō kanshoku no koto* 本朝官職之事. Meant is, of course, the so-called *yūsoku kojitsu* 有職故實. Traces of these activities can be found in the *Kikensho-moku*, e.g. the *Engi-shiki* 延喜式, *Shōji-roku* 姓氏錄, *Shokugen-shō* 職原鈔, etc., which are listed there (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 12).

²⁰⁴ In his *Zuihitsu* (*Bunshū* 65: II, p. 348) Razan mentions Baisen as his teacher of the *Shujing*, not of Shintō texts: “These days, together with Kotetsu-sai Sohaku and others, I follow courses on the *Shang-shu* with the commentary by Kong [Anguo], which are given by the monk of the Kenninji, Baisen. Baisen’s father, [Rin] Sōji, had heard this text [explained] by a Confucian scholar of the Kiyohara, the *shōnagon* Nobukata. Therefore he considers himself as belonging to the Kiyohara tradition.” Nevertheless, it seems safe to identify the “old monk of the Kenninji” of the *Nenpu* with Baisen. See also Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 162 sqq.

²⁰⁵ *Nenpu* under Keichō 9 (1604) (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 5).

Zhitui 顏知推, he took good care when reading.²⁰⁶ When the number of volumes and pages was great he hired a copyist, and every time when a few pages had been copied, he first corrected them. He did not bother with the neatness or coarseness of the writing, nor with the quality of the paper. The most important thing was that the copying be finished quickly.²⁰⁷

As we have seen, at the end of 1604, Razan, perhaps considering that the first phase of this education was over, composed the “List of Books Already Read” (*Kikensho-moku*). To this list Gahō added a postscript that also deserves partial translation:

This list of more than 400 (*sic*) titles in the Master’s own handwriting is now in Jo 恕 (= Gahō)’s library. I once heard that formerly the Zen monk Shūsō 周宗 at the age of eighteen had read all the books in the capital and went to the country to search for books that he had not yet read. When the Master was in the Kenninji he had heard this story. When he returned home he collected Japanese and Chinese books, but still he did not find them sufficient. Therefore he looked up people who had books. He did not ask whether they were high or low, related or strangers; he borrowed their books and read them.

Amongst these books there are books that he read carefully and completely, and others of which he quickly grasped the main points. As far as Buddhist works, miscellaneous works and such were concerned, he merely read their most important parts and from these inferred their purport. Then he composed this list. ... *In those early days ships from China did not come one tenth as frequently as nowadays. Therefore to buy books was very difficult and to borrow them was not easy either.* (*Shishū II*, *Furoku* 1, pp. 12-13)

Another source, more contemporary than the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō*, is the postfaces and colophons that Razan wrote before 1605. Only a few of these have survived, and some of these I have already mentioned. The others are:

- “*Yōshi hōgen* 楊子法言 no ato ni daisu”:
(Razan had some doubts about a commentary in the “old edition” of the *Yangzi fayen*.) “The great physician [Manase] Seirin had a new printed edition of the *Yangzi fayen*. One day I went to his house and talked some with him. Then I opened [the book] and looked at [the passage]. When I

²⁰⁶ Yan Zhitui lived from 531-591. The *Yanshi jiaxun* 顏氏家訓, a collection of essays for the instruction of his sons, he finished ca 589. The passage that Tokkō-sai 讀耕齋 alludes to her probably is *Yanshi jiaxun* 1.17b-18a; see Teng Ssu-yü, *Family Instructions for the Yen Clan*, pp. 20-21 (“How to be careful with borrowed books”).

²⁰⁷ *Shishū II*, *Furoku* 3, p. 36.

came to the commentary ... it was quite different from the old printed edition and identical to what I had thought it should be. Thereupon I told the master (= Seirin) this, saying: 'It really is like this.' He thought it strange. The same day I returned home, opened the book, wrote it down and added [this emendation] to this [passage]. Keichō 6 (1601), sixth day of the last month of winter."²⁰⁸

- "Daigen-kyō 太玄經 no ato ni daisu":
"I ordered a boy to make a fair copy of the *Taixuanjing*. When he had already finished I saw in the Collected Works of Wu Caolü 吳草廬 that there also exists a *Taixuan xulu* 續錄. Therefore I put this note here. Keichō 6 (1601), ninth month, first day."²⁰⁹
- "Ryū bun 柳文 batsu":
"On the tenth day of the fourth month I finished adding the punctuation. I have really done my best on the *Liu wen*. One could even call this a 'good edition' (*zenpon* 善本). At this time I am in my twentieth year. Nobukatsu 信勝 writes this."²¹⁰
- "Gekijō-shū 擊壤集 no ato ni daisu":
This colophon only gives a date: Summer of Keichō 8 (1603).²¹¹
- "Chin Kōsan shū 陳后山 batsu":
"The collected Works of Chen Zhengzi 陳正字 in thirty chapters is a very rare [book]. Superficial and ignorant as I am, I have added the punctuation as I went on reading. If there would be gentlemen who would correct this, what more could I want? Day and month in the year Keichō 7 (1602). Master Two Trees (Niboku-shi, = Hayashi)."²¹²

In Seika's correspondence with Razan, too, books were one of the main topics. Here we will quote, in chronological order, the relevant passages from

²⁰⁸ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 188). No books of this description seem to have survived. The *Yangzi fayān* is written by Yang Xiong. It consists of thirteen chapters which each contains a number of questions and answers on a Confucian topic. It was written in imitation of the *Lunyu* (see Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, pp. 289-290). The *Yangzi fayān* that is listed in the *Yōan'in zōsho* is not a *Chōsen-bon* (see Ōtsuka, "Chōseki bibō," *CG* XLVIII, p. 118).

²⁰⁹ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 188). No manuscript copy of this description is mentioned in the *Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku*. The *Taixuanjing* is a work by Yang Xiong. It is inspired on the *Yijing* and contains fifteen essays. Its metaphysics are of Taoist origin, its ethics are Confucian (see Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, pp. 289-291).

²¹⁰ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 191). No book of this description seems to have survived. With the *Liu wen* are meant the collected literary works of Liu Zongyuan.

²¹¹ *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 194). The *Gekijō-shū* is the *Yichuan jirang ji* 伊川擊壤集, the collected literary works of the Song philosopher Shao Yong 邵雍. The library of the Shōhei-kō possessed a Korean edition of the *Jirang ji* marked "corrected by Hayashi Razan" (now in the Naikaku Bunko). No mention of a *dai* is made, however (see *Kanseki bunrui mokuroku*, p. 333).

²¹² *Bunshū* 54 (II, p. 195). The *Chin Kōsan shū* is the collected literary works of the Song scholar Ch'en Shih-tao 師道 (Hou-shan). For Shih-tao, see *Song shih* 444; *Song Yuan hsüeh-an* 4. No

the letters that were written in Keichō 9 (1604).

1. (twenty-sixth day, eighth intercalary month) “Again, I have sent back the *Daxue* and the *Lunyu* of the [*Sishu*] *zhixin rilu* 四書知新日錄, two books in three volumes, that I had borrowed. [Please,] send me the [*Chong*] *yong* and the *Meng*[*zi*] with a later message. The ones that I have finished glancing through were like fish and bear paws: I want more.”²¹³
2. (Undated) “I have received the [*Chong*] *yong* and the *Meng*[*zi*] of the [*Sishu*] *zhixin rilu*, three volumes [in all]. I will send them back very soon.”²¹⁴
3. (Undated) “The *Shōbun ikō* 肖文遺稿 has reached you, you say? Good! Good! I heard somewhere that this books is not your own, but that you borrowed it from somebody else in order to lend it to me. I am very much obliged, more that I can say. [Therefore] I have returned it quickly. That was all. ... The *Chunqiu daquan* (twelve volumes in all) I will let you have, as I have promised.”²¹⁵
4. (Undated) “The *Chunqiu daquan* still remains with you, you say? That is quite all right. When you have not yet finished with a chapter, don’t return it. Furthermore, I would like to have a peek at the *Ryūsui-shū* 流水集. I am very glad that you will send it to me with a later message.”²¹⁶
5. (Fourth day, twelfth month) “The *Yiduan bianzheng* 異端辨正 in three volumes and the *Sixu wenzong* 四續文宗 in two volumes have arrived. The *Ch’ōnnmyōng tosōl* in one chapter I have not yet seen. Since these days I am rather busy, I will keep them here for some little while. After I have read them, I will return them.”²¹⁷

book of this description is mentioned in the *Naikaku Bunko Kanseki bunrui mokuroku*.

²¹³ Ōta I, p. 140; ZZGR XIII, p. 113. The Naikaku Bunko has in its possession a copy of the *Sishu zhixin rilu* in six volumes, which has been part of Razan’s library. The preface of the copy in the Naikaku Bunko is dated 1534; it was (re)printed in 1536. The writer, Zheng Shenfu (Weiyue) 鄭申甫・維嶽, belongs to the school of Wang Yangming. The book is also mentioned by Razan in the *Seika-sensei gyōjō* (see NST XXVIII, p. 193) and in the *Rongo Wa-ji kai* 論語和字解 (p. 5b).

²¹⁴ Ōta I, p. 140; ZZGR XIII, p. 114.

²¹⁵ Ōta I, pp. 142-143; ZZGR XIII, p. 115. I have not been able to trace the *Shōbun ikō*. Perhaps the name refers to a number of writings by the monk of the Rinzai sect Ishō Tokugan 惟肖得巖 (fl. 1490) whose *Tōkai keika shū* 東海瓊華集 is listed in Razan’s *Kikensho-moku*.

²¹⁶ Ōta I, p. 261. The *Ryūsui-shū* was written by a monk of the Rinzai sect, Tōshō Shūgen 東沼周 {Mor. 14272} (1391-1461). According to the *KSM* a copy of this work is kept at the Ryōsoku-in (Kenninji), while the Naikaku Bunko has a manuscript copy of this work, dating from the beginning of the Edo period, which has been part of Razan’s library. For Seika’s comments on the *Ryūsui-shū*, see another of his letters to Razan (undated; Ōta I, p. 143; ZZGR XIII, p. 115).

²¹⁷ Ōta I, pp. 261-262. The *Yiduan bianzheng* is a polemical work directed against Buddhism. It was written by the Ming scholar Zhan Ling 詹陵. The Naikaku Bunko preserves a manuscript copy of the work in Razan’s handwriting, possibly made after a Korean printed edition (see *supra*, n. 125). According to a *batsu* that Gahō later added to this book, Razan had borrowed it from somebody and “quickly copied it.” For a detailed description of the copy and the text of this *batsu*, see Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 189-190.

6. (Undated) “The *Sishu chengmo* [xunmeng] 四書程墨訓蒙 in three volumes and the *Wenxuan* of Li Yulin (= Li Pan-lung) 李于麟・攀龍 in three volumes I have returned after I had read them once.”²¹⁸

Unfortunately, few of Razan’s letters of the Keichō era have survived, and amongst these there are only six letters that were directly or indirectly addressed to Seika.²¹⁹ The first three letters, that were addressed to Yoshida Soan but intended for Seika, we have already described. The three remaining letters, addressed directly to Seika, fall outside the scope of this chapter on account of their contents. Razan, however, not only corresponded with Seika, he also wrote to others. We have already had occasion to quote from one of his three remaining letters to Sohaku, in which Sohaku was ticked off for using antiquated commentaries on the *Zhuangzi*.²²⁰ Two other interesting letters are addressed to Matsunaga Teitoku, whom Razan adjures to convert to Confucianism.²²¹

The *Ch’ōnmyōng tosōl* is a work by the Korean scholar Chōng Chiun 鄭之雲 (1509-1561), amended somewhat by Chiun’s friend Yi T’oegye (see Vos, *Die Religionen Koreas*, p. 167; text in Abe Yoshio, comp., *Ilbon kakk’an Yi T’oegye chōnjip* II, pp. 226-245; T’oegye’s postface to the work also in Sōng Akhun, transl., *Yi Hwang*, pp. 127-135). Seika mentions the work several times in his letters to Razan (see Ōta I, p. 146; p. 149; p. 150; ZZGR XIII, p. 117; p. 119), once saying that some phrases of the *Cheng-an chi* 整庵 (= Kunzhiji; Zhengan was the literary name of its writer, Luo Qinshun) that he had remarked upon the other day in some respects agreed with the *Ch’ōnmyōng tosōl* (Ōta I, p. 146; see Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 104). In one of his *batsu* to the *Ch’ōnmyōng tosōl* Razan quotes Seika as saying: “[To say that] the Four Beginnings (*si duan* 四端) originate from the *li* and the Seven Passions from the *qi*, this theory is correct. Compared with what is said in the *Kunzhiji*, this [*Ch’ōnmyōng tosōl*] is better. Genna 7 (1621), first day of summer.” (*Bunshū* 53: II, p. 176) A manuscript copy of Razan’s hand is preserved in the Shiryō Hensanjo (Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 164). I have not been able to trace the *Sixu wenzong*.

²¹⁸ Ōta I, p. 262. I have not been able to trace the *Sishu Chengmo xun meng* (under this title it appears in Razan’s *Kikensho-moku*). Seika mentions the book once more in a letter to Razan (Ōta I, p. 149; ZZGR XIII, p. 119), this time as the “*Chengmo*,” and says that he has sent it back together with the “*Li Cangming wen*.” Li Panlong (1514-1570; hao: Cangming 滄溟) was one of the most famous poets of his time, but he never made an edition of the *Wenxuan*. The most likely solution is that Seika with the “*Li Yulin wenxuan*” meant the *Tang shih xuan*, the famous anthology of Tang poems that appeared at the end of the Ming. This anthology was wrongly attributed to Panlong (see Maeno Naoaki, ed., *Tōshi-sen* I, Iwanami Bunko, p. 6). It is, however, possible that a *Wenxuan* edition circulated that was attributed to Panlong: in Razan’s *Kikensho-moku* a *Cangming wenxuan* appears next to the *Wenxuan* edition of Zhang Fengyi 張鳳翼 (Ming).

²¹⁹ Compared with the number of letters to Razan in the *Seika bunshū* and the *Seika-sensei bunshū* the number of letters of Razan to Seika is disproportionally small. Gahō (*Bunshū* 2: I, p. 28) imputes this to the fact that Razan had not made extra copies of the letters that he had written in his youth. Of the *batsu* and *dai* that Razan wrote for his own books, too, relatively few are left. This is due, again according to Gahō, to the fire of 1657 (*Bunshū* 54: II, p. 199).

²²⁰ Two of these letters are dated Keichō 7 (1602); the third one is undated, but was written from Sunpu in the beginning of 1612.

²²¹ *Bunshū* 3 (I, pp. 32-33). These letters are undated, but because of their position in the

These data furnish a consistent and convincing picture of Razan's intellectual development. We see how he started out with the standard literary, heavily Chinese education that he received in the Kenninji and how, in a natural search for the *locus classicus*, he ended up reading the Classics and the Four Books and became interested in Neo-Confucian literature. That this was by no means the whole of his interests is only to be expected from someone of his multifarious talents. The data show this clearly, as does the *Kikensho-moku*. (In general this list seems to be reliable, although every now and then one suspects that works Razan had not yet read at the time have been added, or works that he certainly had read, e.g. popular Japanese novels like the *Taiheiki* 太平記 or Buddhist and Shinto works, have been deleted or left out.²²² Like Razan's description of the course that his studies had taken him, it seems to have been tailored a little to fit him in the part of a Confucian scholar that he had to support versus Seika.)

With his studies his circle of acquaintances had broadened: beginning with Kokan Jikei and Eiho Eiyū, with whom, notwithstanding his precipitous flight from the Kenninji, he never severed relations, it broadened to include Tōho Baisen, who was also a monk, but who entertained relations with the Kiyohara, and the *kuge* Kikutei Harusue. Baisen, or Harusue, will have introduced him to the Kiyohara. Another acquaintance, whom he visited at least once, was the court physician Manase Seirin. It was in these circles, the Zen monasteries and the court erudites, that Razan received the major part of his education and that he must have obtained most of the books that he read.

Apart from this, there existed a rather ill-defined group of friends, of which Sohaku, Teitoku, Yoshida Soan and others were the members.²²³ It is

Bunshū, and because of the otherwise documented fact that Razan in these days associated with Teitoku — at the occasion of his famous visit to Fabian Fukan ハビアン不干 (see “*Hai-Yaso*,” 排耶蘇 *Bunshū* 56: II, pp. 228-230), which took place in 1606, Teitoku was Razan's guide — they must date from the first few years of the seventeenth century. Since the contents of the two letters are in many places identical, Gahō supposes the one to have been the draft of the other.

²²² Of the 418 titles listed in the *Kikensho-moku*, 184 (44%) can roughly be classified as Chinese historical, geographical, or Confucian texts and classics, 101 (24%) as Chinese *belles lettres*, 47 (11%) as miscellaneous Chinese texts, 29 (7%) as Japanese texts, and 57 (14%) as Buddhist (including sutra, collected sayings and collected literary works). Nearly all titles that are mentioned in the *Nenpu* or the correspondence reappear in this list. The only problematical identifications are those of the *Li Yulin wenxuan* with the *Canming wenxuan* and of the *Shōbun ikō* with the *Tōkai keika shū* (see *supra*, n. 215; n. 218).

²²³ Reliable information about intellectual life in Kyōto in these years is scarce. We have to

through them that Razan finally meets Seika. Through Seika, again, he gets to know people like Kinoshita Katsutoshi. They were linked by their common interest in poetry and Chinese studies: as the case of Teitoku shows, their views on Confucianism were widely divergent.

Razan's letters give some vivid impressions of this circle of friends:

- (To Sohaku)

The people of old had a saying: "If for three days you do not make a poem, thorns will grow in your mouth." For some time now I have not presented myself at your house. Many think this strange. If I had not become known to you, it would not have mattered. If I had, but had not engaged in leisurely discussions with you, that would have been the end of it. But since I have, not seeing [each other even] for one day is like [not seeing each other for] three autumns. For this reason those who think it strange are not few. Sima Qian (the Grand Historian) said: "There is always something shorter than an inch, and longer than a foot." My heart is one inch long, and this paper is one foot short; how shall I put my heart, which is long and boundless, on this paper, which is short and limited? Please, think about this.

When will you give your lecture on the *Nanhua zhenjing* (= *Zhuangzi*)? I wait for it with my eyes peeled. If we receive your instruction, it would be our [good] fortune. ... In the capital there are now I do not know how many thousands, tens of thousands of houses, and I do not know how many millions, hundreds of millions of people. But I have never yet heard of one man amongst them who [made his living by] reading books. How come? They are either monks, and do it (sc. reading books. WJB) when they can spare the time from reading *sutra*'s, or they practice medicine and do it when they have time left from curing and treating [patients]. Alas! For a long time learning has not been discussed, [for] monks and physicians do not count, do they? ...

Why is it that these days I have not made one poem, and even now have thorns growing in my mouth? This also has a reason: if we sit talking together, that is even better than making poems. I have never been a miser at heart! Moreover, I will cut these thickets and thorns of three years. The poem of one day [as long as] three autumns I will thrice repeat. In emulation of Nanyong's 南容 [repeating the poem] on the *Baigui* 白圭 [thrice daily]?²²⁴

make do with passing references in letters, prefaces to poems or commonplace-books. Interesting sidelights are also afforded by autobiographical works, e.g. the following remark in Matsunaga Teitoku's *Taion-ki*, which indicates the existence of the "circle of friends": "Afterwards Dōshun (= Razan) started reading the new commentaries of the *Lunyu*. Sōmu read the *Taiheiki*, and my friends from the southern part of the city (i.e. the part of Kyōto where the common people dwelt. WJB) urged me to read some works of poetry." (*Taion-ki*: ZZGR XXXII *ge*, p. 615)

²²⁴ *Bunshū* 3 (I, pp. 30-31). Nanyong is a disciple of Confucius: see *Lunyu* XI, 6. For the *baigui*, see *Shijing* 256 (5); for "one day as long as three autumns," cf. *Shijing* 72 (2).

- (To Teitoku)

The other night I wanted to explain myself [more clearly], but there was no time. I am always negligent, as my elder brother does [well] know. Why should you now be surprised at it? There is one thing that I ask you to let me speak about. I do not know whether my elder brother will be astonished or not.

Well then, Confucianism is solid (*shi* 實) and Buddhism is empty (*xu* 虛). ... If one [had the choice] between [something] empty and [something] solid, what man would take the empty [thing] and throw away the solid? Therefore, if one takes something un-solid like Buddhism, it is not merely a mistake [due to] not having heard of the Way. Is it not [rather] a mistake [due to] not knowing empty from solid [things]? ... Alas! What they call the Way is not the Way; what we call the Way, is. [The difference between] being the Way or not being the Way is nothing but [the difference between] being solid or empty, impartial (*gong* 公) or egoistic (*si* 私). I only hope that my elder brother will throw away that emptiness and egoism of the heterodox Way, and take the solid and impartial Way of our *Daxue*. Then we can say that you are good at correcting your mistakes. If you do that, it will not merely be the good fortune of my elder brother. Will it not be the good fortune of those young pupils of yours, too?²²⁵

It is interesting to notice that nowhere in this connection mention is made of the circumstance that some of the books that Razan and his friends were reading had been written by Koreans, printed in Korea, or brought to Japan during the Korean invasions. On the contrary, Gahō's remark at the end of the *Kikensho-moku* (made, admittedly, fifty years later) seems to indicate that the Chinese, rather than the Koreans, were regarded as the main purveyors of books. None of the materials introduced above indicates that Seika, Razan or anybody else felt a heavy debt towards Korea, or that the Korean invasions were in any way felt to be responsible for a new start of Confucian studies in Japan.

3. Evaluation and conclusions

Speaking historiographically it is much more likely and satisfying to assume that the acceptance of Confucianism was not a sudden occurrence, but an evolutionary process that had its roots in Japanese tradition. That a Japanese Confucian tradition existed, we have already shown. We have also seen that

Razan entertained relations with the Kiyohara, who embodied this native tradition. In regard to Seika the same can be proven.²²⁶ Also, the same simultaneous pursuit of Confucian and Shinto studies that is characteristic of the medieval scholars (that is, in fact, epitomized in the mutual adoptions between the Kiyohara and the Yoshida), reappears in the case of Seika and Razan.²²⁷ This is one of the things for which the Korean thesis does not furnish an explanation.

Another curious anomaly, which furnishes an argument against this thesis, is the following: the Korean Confucianism with which Razan and Seika came into contact, and which supposedly inspired their own conversion to Neo-Confucianism, was that of the orthodox school of Zhu Xi, as represented mainly by T'oegye Yi Hwang 退溪李滉 (1501-1570).²²⁸ Seika had established relations with Koreans as early as 1590 and he already knew many of the important *daimyō* when Razan had not yet even entered the Kenninji. In other words, he had a greater and earlier opportunity than Razan to acquaint himself with Korean Confucianism, both through his personal contacts and through the books that were even then being sent over from Korea. Seika's Confucianism, however, is surprisingly eclectic. Contrary to Razan, he does not turn against Lu Xiangshan 陸象山 and other exponents of "dangerous thought," and in his *Daigaku yōryaku* 大學要略 (*vide* next chapter) he shows that he was very much influenced by the writings of Lin Zhaoen 林兆恩 (1517-1598), who certainly did not meet with orthodox approval.²²⁹ Razan, on the other hand, was very orthodox in his opinions. If any deviations from the Neo-Confucian orthodoxy can be imputed to him, these stem, according to Abe, from Luo Qinshun 羅欽順,

²²⁵ *Bunshū* 3 (I, pp. 32-33).

²²⁶ See Nishida Nagao, "Fujiwara Seika den hoi zokuchō," in: *Nihon shintōshi no kenkyū* VI, pp. 103-120.

²²⁷ See Taira Shigemichi, "Kinsei no shintō shinsō," *NST* XXXIX, p. 518. For Razan's achievements in the field of shintō studies, see *infra*, Ch. 3.

²²⁸ Hō Sōng was a disciple of Yi T'oegye in the second generation (see Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 44; p. 50). Kang Hang studied under various teachers; his affiliations are not clear (see Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 65).

²²⁹ Lin Zhaoen was a proponent of the "unity of the three teachings (i.e. Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism)" in the late Ming. He was heavily influenced by Wang Yangming, and Zen Buddhism. Huang Zongxi does not mention him in the *Mingru xuean*, and the one small essay he wrote about him, the "*Lin Sanjiao zhuan*" 林三教傳 (*Huang Lizhou wenji*, pp. 46-47), is very critical. See also Liu Ts'un-yan, "Lin Chao-en: Master of the Three Teachings," *T'oung Pao* LIII (1967); Berling, *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*; Mano Senryū, "Mindai ni okeru sankyōshisō (toku ni Rin Chōon o chūshin to shite)," *Tōyōshi kenkyū* XII, 1 (1952).

but no direct debts, either to Yulgok Yi I 栗谷李珥 (1536-1584), T'oegye's greatest opponent, or to Luo Qinsun are acknowledged.²³⁰ If Korean influences had been a decisive factor, this anomaly would be inexplicable.

The anti-Buddhism of Seika and Razan is another case in point. Their anti-Buddhism can be interpreted as proof of the influence exerted by the anti-Buddhism that permeated the Yi Dynasty, and was inspired by Neo-Confucianism.²³¹ However, anti-Buddhism for reasons of state, too, has a long history in East Asia, and starting with Nobunaga's sacking of the Enryakuji (1571) and his siege of the Ishiyama Honganji (1570-1580), Japan had just lived through a short but glorious history of this sort of interference. The troubles with the Ikkō Sect 一向宗, the earlier regime of the Hokke Sect 法華宗 in Kyōto (1532-1535), the latent threat of Christianity²³² and the military might of the great monasteries must have awoken Japan's statesmen to the necessity of "doing something about it," once they were powerful enough.²³³

Also, in the cases of Seika and Razan, there were individual causes for their anti-Buddhism. Since from the *Nanbokuchō* Period onwards the only pool on which the feudal magnates could draw for their clerks, secretaries and fortune-tellers had been the monasteries, in the Azuchi-Momoyama period still many monks were employed in these and similar, often fairly important positions. We have already met Ankokuji Ekei, Shōtai, San'yō and others, and the positions that later on were held by Ishin Sūden 以心崇傳 (1569-1633) and Tenkai (Jigen-daishi) 天海慈眼大師 (d. 1643) show, that this pattern continued until well into the Edo period. This state of affairs may have given an edge to Razan's feelings against Buddhism, for after all he was a layman who competed with the monks for the same kind of jobs and the same patronage. Seika's case is different: he was a monk who had returned to the lay state, and

²³⁰ Often, within Neo-Confucianism, schools are distinguished on the basis of the relative importance accorded to the two cosmological principles *li* and *qi*. In this scheme, Zhu Xi, who ascribed equal importance to both, is put down as a dualist (*li qi er yuan lun* 理氣二元論), Yi T'oegye as an idealist monist (*li yi yuan lun* 理一元論), and Luo Qinsun or Yi Yulgok as materialist monists (*qi yiyuan lun*). See Abe, "Nis-Sen-Min ni okeru shuri-ha shuki-ha no keifu to sono tokushitsu (*Konchiki Tenmeizusetsu Jishōroku o megutte*)," *CG* XIV (1958).

²³¹ See Vos, *Die Religionen Koreas*, pp. 148-150; pp. 163-164.

²³² For a discussion of these points, see Elison, *Deus Destroyed*, pp. 116-124.

²³³ For purely economic motives that prompted e.g. Nobunaga's anti-Buddhist policy, see Tsuji Zennosuke, *Nihon bukkyō shi* VII, Ch. 1.

had a past to live down.²³⁴ Perhaps for that reason, though he condemns individual Buddhists, his theoretical position towards Buddhism is benign:

The anti-Buddhism that is vented in your letter I can be short about. Under the Tang there were Fu Yi 傅奕 (d. ca 640) and Han Yu, under the Song, Ouyang Xiu 歐陽修 and countless other masters. Ever since the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi all former Confucians have held this conviction. What you are now expounding - how could I not hold this intention? However, if above there is a ruler who holds the reins of government and below there are teachers [who belong to] the tradition of the Way, how could they obstruct us? And if [these rulers and teachers] are not there, what could we do to them? Moreover, if someone like me, whose purity is insufficient, would unreasonably try to blacken them, he could be criticized by them. What could be more shameful than that?²³⁵

Here, again, Korean influences do not offer a sufficient explanation.

We would do well, at this stage, to remind ourselves that, basically, there are two problems that we are here confronted with. The first one concerns the origin of the knowledge of Neo-Confucianism. The second one concerns the chronological factor: why did a renewal of Confucian studies occur precisely in the first decade of the seventeenth century? We have seen that the solutions the proponents of the Korean thesis offer for both problems are, to say the least, difficult to prove and insufficient. We have also seen that an alternative solution to the first problem, namely to posit an autonomous indigenous development, is viable.

What remains, then, is the second problem. And the second conclusion that we have to draw from the above is that, if we want to solve it, we will first need to rephrase it, for it no longer seems possible to speak of a sudden upsurge and victory of the new Neo-Confucianism. As we have seen, its advent was neither as sudden nor as massive as later Confucian scholars believed, the medieval tradition still made its influence felt for quite some time, and the amount of official backing it received was never as great nor as undivided as, again, later Confucian scholars want us to believe. On the other hand, it is

²³⁴ That he was rather touchy on this point is shown by one of his altercations with Shōtai and San'yō. See *supra*, Ch. I, n. 212.

possible to speak of a general upsurge of cultural life that took place in the Azuchi-Momoyama Period and for which quite solid historical and social causes can be pointed out. Consequently, Confucianism, as part of the larger field of Chinese studies, must be seen as one, but by no means the only field of cultural and intellectual endeavour that profited by the upsurge.

To tell the whole story of this cultural renaissance, with its links to both the cultural life of the Middle Ages and to that of the Genroku period, falls outside the scope of this study. In pursuance, however, of the last section, in which we have tried to give some idea of Razan's place within the cultural milieu of his time, we will touch on a few other aspects that are, in our opinion, relevant.

The relative political stability that Kyōto enjoyed from the fifteen-eighties onwards, and the concentration of wealth that took place when Hideyoshi, with all the *daimyō* in tow, had established his main residence in Kyōto (Fushimi), gave many cultural activities a new lease on life. Hideyoshi's gorgeously appointed buildings and his lavish patronage of the tea ceremony are too well known to need any comment. The important thing is that, once Hideyoshi had set the tone, no *daimyō* could afford to stay behind.

The first amongst the intellectuals who, after the tea masters, benefitted from this new wealth and patronage, were the *renga-shi* 連歌師, the professional writers of poetry. After all, the ability to write poems was a much-prized accomplishment, and writing linked verse was, after drinking tea, the most popular pastime. Famous *renga-shi* were e.g. Satomura Jōha 里村紹巴 (1524-1602), who led the last poetry party Akechi Mitsuhide 明智光秀 (1526-1582) held before he embarked on his ill-fated revolt against Nobunaga, and Sekigo's father and grandfather, Matsunaga Teitoku and Eishu. *Daimyō*, too, distinguished themselves in this field, foremost among them Hosokawa Yūsai (Fujitaka) 細川幽斎・藤高 (1534-1610) and Kinoshita Chōshōshi. Chinese poetry, for long the preserve of the monks of the great Zen monasteries,

²³⁵ Ōta I, p. 138. See NST XXVIII, p. 98 and notes.

received new patronage, e.g. from Toyotomi Hidetsugu 豊臣秀次.²³⁶ Since everyone who could write Chinese verse could also write Japanese poems, mixed poetry sessions, too, were held. (In fact, the best way to gain an impression of the extent and composition of the cultural milieu in Kyōto during this period would be to tabulate the names of the participants of these sessions.)

Another field of cultural endeavour that was much patronized was printing. In this field the imperial court, rich merchants like Yoshida Soan, and *daimyō* like Tokugawa Ieyasu distinguished themselves. Many of these printings were made with movable types. Those made by Soan are known as the *Saga-bon*, those that Ieyasu had made as the *Fushimi-* and *Suruga-bon*, depending on the place where they were printed. In collating versions of the text and correcting the printers' errors, many intellectuals, both Buddhists and laymen, were employed.

With the exception of the monks of the Zen sect, who traditionally had been in charge of the foreign correspondence of the Ashikaga *shōgun*, however, these intellectuals were hardly ever employed directly, as members of the bureaucracy. Generally, they were either rewarded for their services *ad hoc*, entertained for some time as visiting reader or poetry master, employed for specific projects etc., or they entered into the personal *entourage* of a *daimyō*, the *otogi-shū* 御伽衆.²³⁷

The *otogi-shū* in principle attended on the *daimyō* in his leisure hours and assisted him in his personal pursuits. The membership ranged from falconers and storytellers to Nō actors and erudites in Japanese and Chinese literature and history. In exceptional cases it could function as a kind of brain trust, and sometimes the erudites among its members could be charged with the drafting of memoranda, letters, laws and regulations. In this way some of them managed to enter the regular bureaucracy. This tendency was especially strong in the first decennia of the Tokugawa period, when, because of the sudden expansion of the bureaucracy and the doubling of functions that occurred between Edo, where Hidetada resided as *shōgun*, and Sunpu, where Ieyasu,

²³⁶ See Araki Yoshio, *Azuchi Momoyama jidai bungaku shi*, pp. 88-89; NST XXVIII, p. 189 (an instance of patronage by Toyotomi Hidetsugu).

²³⁷ A basic and thorough study of the *otogi-shū* is Kuwata Tadachika, *Daimyō to otogi-shū (zōho shinpan)*.

nominally retired, still held the reins of government, there were many positions to be filled.

It was this phase of the history of Japan, when intellectuals from all over the country gathered together in Kyōto,²³⁸ where they met at poetry sessions and at the courts of the major *daimyō*, where the former barriers between court nobles, *bushi*, monks, and *roturiers* broke down in the scramble for patronage and new careers opened themselves for people who were versed, not merely in Chinese verse, but in Chinese history, law, medicine and classics, that must have been the main stimulus for Seika's and Razan's conversion to, and advocating of Confucianism.

In the last section I have done little more than give some pointers. In Chapter IV I will try to fill in some of the outlines of this sketch. I do think, however, that this approach offers the best chances for arriving at an adequate explanation not only of Seika's and Razan's pursuit of Neo-Confucian studies, but also of the differences between medieval Confucianism and its counterpart in the Tokugawa period.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

²³⁸ Apart from San'yō who, after the fall of the Hōjō of Odawara, was taken to Kyōto by Toyotomi Hidetsugu and later threw in his lot with Ieyasu, we could name Bunshi or Ōmura Yūko. Yūko was a monk who had returned to the lay state; he was a member of Hideyoshi's *otogi-shū*. For his relations with Seika, see Ioriya Iwao, "Ōmura Yūko to Fujiwara Seika," *NR* 365 (1978).

CHAPTER III

THE DOCTRINES

In view of the foregoing chapter the reader will perhaps expect us to show, this time by means of internal evidence, that Seika and Razan continued at least in certain respects the medieval tradition of the Kiyohara, and furthermore, that we attempt to situate Seika and his disciples in the intellectual landscape of their time.

Preliminary researches, however, have led me to the conclusion that at this stage, pending further investigation of the medieval *shōmono* of the Kiyohara from an intellectual-historical point of view, it would be difficult to prove the existence of direct influences of the Kiyohara in the works of Razan, at least if one would go about it in the ordinary way of looking for quotations, e.g. in Razan's *Rongo Wa-ji kai*, from Nobukata's *Rongo chōjin*. It is quite true that certain concepts and metaphors return and that in their outward appearance Razan's *shōmono* closely resemble those of the Kiyohara.¹ The genres that Seika and Razan practised, too, are clearly a continuation of medieval genres. Their commentaries like Razan's *Daigaku genkai* or *Rongo Wa-ji kai* or Seika's *Daigaku yōryaku* easily lend themselves to comparison with the *shōmono* of the Kiyohara and others. For their annotated collections of sayings from the various Classics (e.g. Seika's *Suntetsu-roku* 寸鐵錄 of Razan's *Seisho yōgo kai* 聖書要語解) and essay-like writings like the *Shunkan-shō* 春鑑抄 or the *Santoku-shō* 三徳抄 (both by Razan), too, medieval examples can be found. (Examples of these last two genres, however, all originated outside the tradition of the Kiyohara.) These facts all tend to strengthen the provisional conclusions we reached in the foregoing chapter, namely that the new Confucian movement had many indigenous roots. Nevertheless, the best evidence, i.e. internal evidence in the shape of assenting, direct quotations from medieval *shōmono*, is (still) lacking.

Another possible approach attempted amongst other scholars by Imanaka Kanji and Ishida Ichirō is to distil from the writings of the Kiyohara or the Zen monks, whichever one thinks are the most likely candidates, a representative set of common philosophical notions, and then compare these with those of Seika, Razan, etc. The

notion Imanaka and Ishida come up with most often is that of the importance of the concept of “heart” (here and below the translation of *xin*, J. *shin* or *kokoro*). Both Imanaka and Ishida find that a great importance is attached to this concept in, e.g., the *Mōji-shō* 孟子抄 by Nobukata or the writings of the Zen monk Kiyō Hōshū 岐陽方秀.²

In the “Explanation of the style (*zi* 字) Meishi” 明之說, which he wrote at the request of a friend, Kiyō says:

Considering [this style] in relation to the hexagram *li* 離 of the *Zhou Yi*³ I explain it as follows: *li* means brightness (*ming*); brightness or illustrious virtue (*mingde* 明德) is what the followers of our Holy One (i.e. the Buddha. WJB) call “the one heart.” All men have it. It is the great root (*daben* 大本) that everybody necessarily possesses. It is quiet and always shining, shining and always quiet, like still water, like a luminous mirror, like the pearls of the nets that adorn Indra’s palace.⁴

Now, this illustrious virtue is the function of the one heart, and the one heart is the substance of the illustrious virtue. If a man does not illuminate it, he will become mad, but even a madman, if he is able to illuminate it, will become a Holy One. Being holy or not depends of nothing but whether one’s heart had been made luminous or not.⁵

The term *daben* that Kiyō uses to explain the concept of “heart” and that he defines elsewhere as “nature” (*xing* 性),⁶ hails from the *Zhongyong*.⁷ Zhu Xi in his

¹ For an argument along these lines, see Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, pp. 209-304. See also Ch. II, n. 105.

² Kiyō is commonly regarded as the initiator of public lectures on the Classics according to the Neo-Confucian commentaries, and as the first to have added Japanese readings to these texts. As far as his Confucian studies are concerned, he seems to have been an autodidact. He believed Buddhism and Confucianism to be completely compatible, as is shown by his literary name Funi-dōjin 不二道人 (*funi* means “not to consider as two”). Cf. *Kangaku kigen* 2 (ZZGR X, pp. 576-577); Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 359-367.

³ In the second appendix of the *Yijing*, to which Kiyō refers at the end of the Explanation, it is said that “The trigram for brightness, repeated, forms *li*. The great man, in accordance with this, cultivates more and more the brilliant virtue and diffuses its brightness over the four quarters of the land.” (Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 304) Honda, *Eki*, p. 277, gives a different interpretation. According to him, the second sentence should mean that “the rulers of illustrious virtue succeed one another, and rule over the four quarters.” This idea of “succession” is also present in Kiyō’s “Explanation of the Style Meishi”; it is part of the programme that he enjoins on its recipient, so the second interpretation will be the one Kiyō had in mind.

⁴ *Taimōju* 帝網珠: *Tai* is short for *Taishakuten* 帝釋天, i.e. Indra, who lives in a palace on Mount Sumeru and commands the Four Heavenly Kings (see Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten* I, pp. 182-183). The nets that adorn his palace have a pearl in each of the meshes (see *ibid.*, I, p. 184).

⁵ *Funi ikō* 3, “Meishi setsu,” *Gozan bungaku zensho* III, pp. 2996-2997. See also Ishida Ichirō, “Zenki bakuhan-taisei no ideogōji,” *NSTXXVIII*, pp. 421-422; Ashikaga, *Jukyō*, pp. 364-365.

⁶ *Funi ikō* 3, “Taihon setsu,” *Gozan bungaku zensho* III, pp. 2997: “The heavenly nature (*tianxing*) is the

commentary also explains it as “nature.” The identification, however, of “heart” with “nature,” and even more the definition of “illustrious virtue” as the *function* of the heart, are incorrect according to orthodox Neo-Confucianism.

A similar incorrect interpretation of the concept “nature” Imanaka finds attested in Nobukata’s *Mōji-shō*. Here it is said that

The Confucian scholars of the Song considered [the four virtues of] Benevolence, Righteousness, Etiquette and Wisdom as the nature. The Confucian scholars of the Han did not. [According to them] this “nature” is the original substance (*dangti* 當體) [in its primal state] when the one *qi* has not yet stirred; it is without feelings or thought.⁸ When [one can speak of] Benevolence, Righteousness, Etiquette or Wisdom it is already moving and coming forth. These, therefore, are not nature. Benevolence etc. must be situated where nature stops and the passions begin.⁹

According to Ishida this same incorrect interpretation is also found in the works of Fujiwara Seika, and on this basis he argues that Seika’s Confucianism was still influenced by his Buddhist background.¹⁰ Imanaka, however, draws less plausible and more sweeping conclusions. He uses the above quotation not merely to trace the influences that medieval Confucian studies exerted on Seika or Razan, but to define the difference between Japanese and Chinese ethics. This seems to be rather too much weight for one single quotation to bear.¹¹ Nevertheless, the approach has it

great root of man.”

⁷ *Zhongyong*, first *zhang*.

⁸ *Dangti*, here translated as “original substance,” is a Buddhist synonym of *benti*. *Benti* occurs in the first *zhang* of the *Zhongyong* (fourth paragraph) and is explained by Zhu Xi as “the substance of the Way,” “from which the heaven-ordained nature and the *li* of the world originate.” The phrase “the one *qi* has not yet stirred; it is without feelings or thought” is not a quotation from the “Confucians of the Han” as Imanaka intimates (cf. *infra*, n. 11). It does not occur either in Zhao Qi’s commentary on the *Mengzi* or in the *Mengzi zhengyi*.

⁹ Quoted from Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 311. The quotation is from the *Mōji-shō*, commentary to *Mengzi* VI A, 6.

¹⁰ *NST* XXVIII, pp. 420-422. Cf. Ishida Ichirō’s treatment of Seika in “Hayashi Razan: Muromachi jidai ni okeru Zen-Ju no itchi.”

¹¹ Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, p. 311. Though in Ishida’s case one might make objections from a methodological point of view, his data and reasoning lead to conclusions that are in themselves probable. Of Imanaka, however, the same cannot be said. The quotation he gives from the *Mōji-shō* comes at the end of the commentary to the paragraph in question, and since it is not preceded by some phrase meaning “in my opinion ...,” it seems to me that it should be interpreted as a curiosity thrown in by Nobukata at the end of the section, just to round out the picture. Furthermore, if the opinion expressed in Imanaka’s quotation was Nobukata’s real opinion, this would have been a strange place to give it. After all, this is not the first time that the term *xing* occurs in the *Mengzi*, so Nobukata would have had earlier opportunities to give a definition. Moreover, right at the beginning of his commentary to the same paragraph he has given a quite orthodox definition of *xing*: “With ‘feelings of distress and pity’ is meant

attractions and under the circumstances it is perhaps the only viable one.

To situate Seika and Razan in the intellectual landscape of their times, too, is rather a large order. The period under discussion is one of the most complicated periods in Japanese intellectual history. It would not be easy to define and delineate, on the basis of contemporary polemics, the various shades of articulate philosophical opinion, which run from Confucianism, Buddhism and Shinto to Christianity and *tentō shisō* 天道思想,¹² let alone to give an assessment of their mutual influences and relative importance. Moreover, the results of this effort would in all likelihood be only of minor relevance to the problem with which we are concerned here, i.e. the relation between Seika and Razan.

It might seem more to the point to compare Razan with Seika's other disciples, but in that case we are hampered by a lack of material. Apart from Razan's writings only two doctrinal works by scholars who might be regarded as disciples of Seika have survived,¹³ namely the *Irin-shō* 彝倫抄 by Matsunaga Sekigo,¹⁴ and the *Gogyō genkai* 五行諺解 by a disciple of Kan Tokuan, Kumagai Reisai 熊谷荔齋 (fl. 1685).¹⁵ Since

'benevolence.' Benevolence, righteousness, etiquette and wisdom are nature. [The feelings of] pity, shame, reverence and the sense of right and wrong are the passions that come forth because of the movement of the nature. 'Heart' (*xin*) subsumes both the nature and the passions." Earlier, in the same book of the *Mengzi*, he has already said that "With 'nature' is meant the *li* (principles) which man has received from heaven; with 'that what he is born with' (*sheng* 生) is meant the *qi* which man has received from heaven." In other words, the phrase that Imanaka quotes can hardly be regarded as faithfully representing Nobukata's opinion.

¹² *Tentō shisō* could be best defined as the belief that Heaven (*tentō*), a vaguely anthropopathic entity, watches over man, punishes conduct that is ethically wrong and rewards conduct that is right. Rewards take the form of material prosperity and can pass on to one's heirs. The same applies to the misfortunes that befall the wicked. These last refinements were needed, of course, to counter the inevitable objection that some wicked people are seen to prosper, while good men are poor. See Ishige Tadashi, "Sengoku Azuchi-Momoyama jidai no shisō," and his "*Shingaku gorin-sho no seiritsu jijō*"; see also Boot, "Hayashi Razan as a Confucian philosopher."

¹³ The situation differs for the various disciples. Of Hori Kyōan quite a few writings have survived, though most of them are extant only in manuscript form or, at best, in old printed editions. With the exception of his *Chūzan nichiroku* 中山日録 (ZZGR IX), no modern editions of his work exist. The only work of Kan Tokuan that seems to have survived at all (two copies of an old printed edition) is a commentary to a medical work. Of Nawa Kassho's works again no modern editions exist. I may add that the few works by Kyōan and Kassho that I have seen are rather disappointing as far as the doctrinal aspects are concerned. We do have a few isolated Kanbun essays in their collected literary works and a few entries in their commonplace books, but what we do not have, and what for the purpose of a comparison we would need, is some kind of *kana-shō*.

¹⁴ Modern edition in NST XXVIII

¹⁵ The *Gogyō genkai* is inserted in the *Reisai shibunshū* 荔齋詩文集, of which only one manuscript copy

these are isolated and not very original works, they may suitably be treated as footnotes to our discussion of Seika and Razan.

This course is all the more appropriate, since the real question that has prompted most of the writing about the *Irin-shō* — the *Gogyō genkai*, written by a second generation disciple of Seika and existing only in manuscript, is never mentioned at all — is, which of the two, Sekigo or Razan, was the truer disciple of Seika.¹⁶ If this is the question, the *Irin-shō* assumes an importance far greater than is warranted by its intrinsic value, for it is the only evidence that can be adduced to prove that Sekigo, not Razan was Seika's real heir. However, since we have a different approach and other points of interest, the matter is of less importance to us. We are interested in the antecedents, real and alleged, of Razan's Confucianism.

For these reasons I feel justified to limit myself in this chapter to a description of Seika's thought, Seika's philosophical doctrine, and to a similar description of the philosophy of Razan. From the comparison of these two we will draw conclusions regarding the extent to which Razan can rightfully be regarded as Seika's heir, defined in the strict sense of allegiance to identical philosophical tenets.

I realise that a more extensive approach that, specifically, would include a comparison with the Confucianism that is expressed in the medieval *shōmono*, might yield interesting results, but for the reasons mentioned this cannot be attempted here.

A. Fujiwara Seika

The materials on the basis of which Seika's Confucian doctrines can be reconstructed are surprisingly few. The most important sources are his comprehensive treatises the *Suntetsu-roku*¹⁷ and the *Daigaku yōryaku* (*Chikuroku-hyō* 逐鹿評).¹⁸

exists, made in the middle of the Edo period and now in the possession of the Kyōto Furitsu Sōgō Shiryōkan. Reisai also published annotated Japanese editions of the *Xingli ziyi* 性理字義 and the *Taijitu shuo* 大極圖說.

¹⁶ E.g. Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, pp. 38-39; Tamagake Hiroyuki, "Matsunaga Sekigo no shisō to Kose Hoan no shisō," *NST* XXVIII, p. 507.

¹⁷ *NST* XXVIII, pp. 9-39; Ōta I, pp. 319-354. Although the work was published anonymously and is

The *Suntetsu-roku* was written in 1606 for Seika's patron Asano Yoshinaga, daimyō of Kii, whom Seika visited several times in his castle in Wakayama between that year and 1613, the year of Yoshinaga's death. The problems it treats are concrete; sometimes they seem to apply only to the "ruler of men": when to punish and how, the ends and means of government, what to guard against in oneself and others, and maxims for the selection of servants and ministers. Sometimes the application seems to be wider: rules for taking revenge on somebody who has killed one's father, brother or friend, what to do when entering another country, why somebody who is wearing armour does not bow, etc. The level of abstraction is very low, but the tone of the work and its psychological and economic assumptions are thoroughly Confucian. It is, however, a generalized Confucianism; the words that in Neo-Confucianism have become technical terms can in most cases be taken at their face value.

The *Daigaku yōryaku* is largely written in Japanese, in the same simple classical style with occasional vernacular forms as the *Suntetsu-roku*. Its subject is the interpretation of the *Daxue*. In the first part Seika treats the Three Principles, i.e. illustrating the illustrious virtue (*ming mingde* 明明德), renewing (loving) the people (*xin* or *qin min* 新・親民), and resting in the highest good (*zhi yu zhishan* 止於至善), and, very summarily, the rest of the words of Confucius that constitute the *jing* 經, i.e. the first part of the *Daxue*. This part concludes with the following words:

If one has learned this one book by heart, one will not need [to read] another hundred, thousand or ten thousand volumes. No Confucianism could exist outside this work. Such lectures, exclusively treating only the literary arts, which are so popular nowadays will be of no use to a ruler of men. Somebody who is a ruler of men must only practise the disciplining of his own heart and

sometimes ascribed to Razan, the reasons for ascribing it to Seika are cogent. See Ōta I, pp. 80-81; *NST* XXVIII, p. 9. The standard text, used by both Ōta and the editor of the *NST* XXVIII, is the printed edition in two volumes of Kan'ei 5 (1628). The *Suntetsu-roku* is a collection of thirty-one sayings culled from the Classics (8 from the *Shujing*, 19 from the *Liji*, 5 from the *Mengzi*, 7 from the *Lunyu* and one each from the *Zhongyong* and the *Daxue*), to which explanations in Japanese have been added. The Japanese is written in a simple, classical style, quite similar to the *nari-shiki* of the medieval *shōmono*. Vernacular forms are rare; the emphatic particle *zo* is used sparingly, and often together with *nari* in the same sections.

¹⁸ *NST* XXVIII, pp. 41-78; Ōta I, pp. 379-417. Although the *Daigaku yōryaku*, too, was published anonymously, the ascription to Seika seems safe. See Ōta I, pp. 83-84; *NST* XXVIII, p. 41. The standard text, used by both Ōta and the editors of *NST* XXVIII, is that of the printed edition of Kan'ei 7 (1630).

try [to follow the prescriptions of the *Daxue*].¹⁹

Then, as a kind of appendix, there follow some remarks about the meaning of *gewu* 格物 (“the investigation of things”) and a number of quotations from the works of Lin Zhaoen, in the original Chinese. The second and third parts are continuous. They treat again the Three Principles and the rest of the *jing* and then they move on to the *zhuan* 傳 (the commentaries on the *jing*, traditionally ascribed to Zengzi 曾子).

The text of the *Daxue* Seika uses is not the new text as established by the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi, but the text as it appears in the *Liji* and was made fashionable again by Wang Yangming. His explanations, too, deviate from those of Zhu Xi and generally follow those of Lin Zhaoen’s *Sishu biao zhai zhengyi* 四書標摘正義 and *Daxue zhengyi*. Seika wrote the work in 1619 at the behest of Asano Nagashige, Yoshinaga’s brother and at the time *daimyō* of Makabe (Hitachi).

Next to these two works there are two minor writings of a doctrinal nature: the *Goji no nan* 五事之難²⁰ and a series of short remarks on several topics having to do with the human relations.²¹ The *Goji no nan* (“Critique of Five Things”) is written in Chinese. The “five things” are “The Way of Heaven,” “Disasters,” “Cause and Effect,” “Why There Are People Who Are Upright But Poor, And Others Who Are Crooked But Rich,” and “On the Prosperity of the Wicked.” The interpretation of the term “Way of Heaven” (*tentō*) is orthodox (i.e. *tentō* is equated with *li*, principle), but the other four sections are, as regards their subject matter, heavily influenced by the *tentō shisō*.

The series of ten sections on human relations is written in Japanese. The sections are called “Lord and Servant,” “Friends,” “Sons by Legitimate Spouses and Sons by Concubines,” “Daughters,” “Concubines,” “Relations with Neighbouring Countries” and “Retirement.” The essays were written in response to questions asked by Emperor Go-Yōzei 後陽成 after his retirement in 1611. The most striking aspect of this text is the monumental inapplicability of its contents to any situation in which an emperor, let alone a retired Japanese emperor, might conceivably find himself. Only

¹⁹ Ōta I, p. 38; NST XXVIII, p. 44

²⁰ Text in Ōta I, pp. 131-134; NST XXVIII, pp. 91-95.

²¹ Text in Ōta I, pp. 241-249.

the sections about lawful wives and concubines may possibly be regarded as exception. The tone of the work is again Confucian, and its contents are orthodox. It is interesting to note that Seika several times uses the term *tentō*,²² and once the words “intuitive knowledge” (*liangzhi* 良知) and “innate ability” (*liangneng* 良能).²³

Apart from these there exist no works by Seika that are primarily concerned with propagating or explaining Confucianism.²⁴ In their phrasing, references, attitudes, and argumentation his other writings, poems, essays, prefaces, postfaces, inscriptions etc. show that Seika was influenced by Confucianism. If dated, they would be helpful if one would want to establish a chronology of Seika’s development as a Confucian. But inferences regarding specific points of doctrine can hardly be made from them. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to yet another text entitled *Suntetsu-roku*, that contains a great many quotations from Confucian, Taoist, and Buddhist books, the histories, etc., not furnished with any commentary and rather haphazardly arranged.²⁵

External sources, too, are rare. The most important ones are Kang Hang’s various writings, esp. the *Seisai-ki*, and Razan’s *Seika-sensei gyōjō* and *Seika mondō*.²⁶ Apart from this rather limited number of primary sources, a number of modern

²² The places are Ōta I, p. 242 (synonymous with *li*); p. 247 (personified: “The *tentō* gives the empire to someone who has virtue”); p. 248 (twice; both times used in the depersonified sense of *li*).

²³ Ōta I, p. 247. The context and the fact that both terms are here used together, make it seem likely that their use was inspired by Mencius, rather than by Wang Yangming.

²⁴ The *Kana seiri* 假名性理 (= *Chiyo motogusa* 千代茂登草) and the *Tenka kokka no yōryaku* 天下国家之要略 are not Seika’s. Together with the *Shingaku gorin sho* 心學五倫書, *Honsa-roku* 本佐録, *Tōshōgū go-yuikun* 東照宮御遺訓 etc., they must be regarded as representing a different strain of writings that reflect the *tentō shisō*. For more details see Ōta II, pp. 13-40; Itō Tasaburō, “*Tenshō nikki to kana shōri*”; Boot, “Hayashi Razan as a Confucian philosopher.”

²⁵ This text is only transmitted in manuscript; its ascription to Seika is based on an oral tradition handed down amongst his descendants. The writing of the extant manuscript copy is probably not Seika’s. For details see Ōta I, pp. 81-83; text, *ibid.*, pp. 355-378.

²⁶ The *Seika mondō* (text in *Bunshū* 32: I, pp. 346-350; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 198-205) consists of two parts, the first one of which contains the minutes of Razan’s first meeting with Seika. Razan wrote them down the following day and submitted them to Seika for comment. These comments are added at the end of each section. A variety of topics, both personal and doctrinal, are treated. The second part is written at a later date, perhaps even after Seika’s death, and consists of three sections. No comments of Seika are added. Its contents are all doctrinal. The second part commences in *Bunshū* I, p. 349, resp. *NST* XXVIII, p. 203. The first section starts with the words “Dōshun (= Razan) formerly once asked ...,” the second one with “Again I (= Razan) asked ...,” and the third with “The Master (= Seika) once asked” Other *obiter dicta* of Seika that were noted down by Razan may be found in Razan’s *Zuihitsu* and in the *Baison saihitsu*.

studies have appeared which deal with Seika's life, writings, and thought.²⁷

1. The doctrine

The best way to give an impression of the contents of Seika's doctrine is to start from the descriptions given by Kang Hang and Hayashi Razan. Hang writes in the *Seisai-ki*:

The place where he lives has an inscription reading "Studio of awakening" (Seisai).²⁸ Nobody understood what was meant by this, but I heard it and was glad, and said: "I know what it means. Grand and immense are heaven and earth. Looking up or down, no boundary is to be seen. Man is between them, in his intimate place in their midst.²⁹ That acceding to heaven and earth he becomes the third [entity] is because he has this heart. This heart is the lord of the body; the ten thousand principles are inherent in it; the ten thousand affairs react to it³⁰; 'nature and passions are subsumed in it.'³¹ If he throws it away, how could man be man?

However, this heart is a living being. 'It is empty and spiritual and unobscured.'³² It shifts and moves and is hard to set at rest. 'It goes in and out

²⁷ The most important studies are Inoue Tetsujirō, *Shushigakuha*, pp. 11-48; Ōta I, pp. 5-72; Abe, *Chōsen* pp. 37-114; Imanaka, *Seiritsu*, pp. 19-159; Kanaya Osamu, "Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku shisō," *NST* XXVIII, pp. 449-470.

²⁸ In the *Daigaku yōryaku* (Ōta I, p. 396, 398; *NST* XXVIII, p. 60) the character *xing* 惺 (J. *sei*) is given the Japanese reading of *suzuyaka*, "clear and refreshing," but the normal reading is "to be awake" (see also Kanaya, *NST* XXVIII, p. 467). This is also the interpretation Razan gives in a lengthy passage in his *Daigaku genkai*: "*Chang xingxing* 常惺々 means 'being awake.' It means 'to keep the heart awake at all times.' If it is not awake, it is dark. With the method of keeping awake' is meant that the heart is not dark, but bright, as somebody who, having been roused from a drunken stupor, has opened his eyes. This is what is meant with 'seriousness' (*jing* 敬). When modern people do really take pains, [even] *their* appearance will not be negligent, and [even] *their* deportment will not be careless. How much more [this must apply to] someone who is awake at all times!" (*Daigaku genkai* II, commentary to the third *zhuan*; cf. *infra*, n. 38.)

²⁹ See the first line of Zhang Zai's *Hsi ming* 西銘. Transl. in Chan, *Chinese philosophy*, p. 497.

³⁰ See Zhu Xi's commentary to the first line of the *Daxue*. Hang has changed Zhu Xi's wording somewhat: cf. next note.

³¹ See Zhang Zai's definition of the heart (*Jinsilu*, "*Daoti*" 近思錄·導體 50; Chan, *Reflections*, p. 34): "The mind commands man's nature and feelings." Kang Hang has changed the sentence from "*xin tong xing qing che yeh*" to "[*xin*] *xing qing zhi suo tong ye*." In the foregoing semi-quotation from Zhu Xi's commentary to the *Daxue* Hang has made the same grammatical change. See also Zhu Xi's commentary to *Mengzi* VII A, 1.

³² Quotations from Zhu Xi's commentary to the first line of the *Daxue*, there used to explain the "illustrious virtue" (*mingde*). The word I have here and *infra* translated with "spiritual" is "*ling*" 靈. It is an adjective that denotes the properties of the finest and purest kind of *qi* and, by extension, those of the things that are made of this *qi*. It is, however, especially used to qualify the mysterious, elusive

at no fixed times, and nobody knows where it is.’³³ Sometimes it looses its control of the functions of the ears and eyes.³⁴ And what man does during daytime may disturb or destroy it.³⁵ When from the outside sounds, colours, smells, and tastes soak in,³⁶ and within joy, anger, grief, and happiness are moving, then the heart flies off in no time, it runs a thousand miles away, and the human body becomes like an empty house. Its Old Master has left his place, and foxes, hares, and goblins in his place become its masters. How little is man [in that state] removed from the birds and beasts!

The Holy ones and Sages knew that this was so. [And therefore] they nurtured and scrutinized this heart, they roused it and prodded it and changed it [in order that] it should be continually awake. ‘Then the heart is immovable, and the whole body follows its commands.’³⁷ The vastness of the eight wastes (i.e. the whole world. WJB) is all within my gates. This is what the Sages of old called ‘the method of always being bright,’³⁸ and this is why Renpu (= Seika) called his studio like this.

Aye! From olden times until now, who has not had this heart? But this heart becomes the servant of the form (i.e. comes to be ruled by the senses and the passions. WJB). With the whole world it is the same. ... And since Renpu alone makes it his business to collect [this heart], and [makes] ‘being awake’ his method, we can say [of him], that he ‘first stands fast in the nobler part of his constitution.’³⁹ How then could the less important things be wrested away from him?”⁴⁰

Razan, too, stresses the same point, i.e. the importance that the concept of “a method of the heart” (*xinfa*) had for Seika, in a passage in the *Gyōjō* where he explains another of Seika’s *noms de plume*, Hokuniku-sanjin:

The Master read about the *genbei xinfa*⁴¹ 艮背心法 of Lin Zhaoen. He said:

operations of the heart. Cf. Shimada, *Daigaku Chūyō*, p. 26. See also the appendix at the end of this chapter.

³³ *Mengzi* VI A, 8; see Chan, *Reflections*, p. 143.

³⁴ *Mengzi* VI A, 15.

³⁵ *Mengzi* VI A, 8.

³⁶ Cf. the usage of *shuo* 鑠 (to melt, to smelt) in *Mengzi* VI A, 6, and Dobson’s translation of this passage (Dobson, *Mencius*, p. 113).

³⁷ For this phrase see Morohashi III, 5833-485.

³⁸ *Chang xingxing fa*: the “method of always being awake” is a definition of “seriousness” given by Xie Shangzai 謝上蔡 (1050-1103). For Xie, a pupil of the Cheng brothers, see *Song Yuan xüean* 24; see for the definition *ibid.*, 24.9a; see also Kusumoto Masatsugu, *Sō Min jidai jugaku shisō no kenkyū*, pp. 162-165.

³⁹ *Mengzi* VI A, 15. Cf. *supra*, Ch. II, n. 162.

⁴⁰ Ōta I, pp. 16-17; *NST* XXVIII, p. 365; *DNS* XII.31, p. 636.

⁴¹ *Ken* is the name of the seventh of the eight trigrams, and of the fifty-second of the sixty-four hexagrams. Its meaning is “to stop,” “to rest” (cf. *infra*, n. 44).

“The character *bei* (back) is composed of the characters ‘north’ and ‘flesh.’ The northern direction belongs to [the element] water and is Yin. The southern direction belongs to [the element] fire and is Yang. What I have to the south is in front of me and what I have to the north is at my back. That with the north, i.e. [the element] water that is at my back, I wash the south, i.e. [the element] fire, i.e. my heart,⁴² is what the *Zhou Yi* calls: ‘To wash one’s mind and hide it in secrecy.’”⁴³

Since the Master’s “resting was like that of the back,” and since [the hexagram] “*gen* (to rest) is composed of two trigrams representing a mountain,”⁴⁴ he called himself by the literary name “Hokuniku- sanjin” (“Recluse of the Northern Flesh”). Somebody who, as the phrase goes, is not partial to this mountain but considers the mountains [everywhere] in the empire and of all times as his own mountain, is a recluse of the empire and of all times. That is to say, he is a recluse of [the school of] Confucius and Mencius. How could he be of the type of Chao [Fu] 巢父 and Xu [You] 許由?⁴⁵

Basic to the concept of *xinfa* are the way in which the term “heart” is used in the *Mengzi*, and the concept that is introduced there of “preserving the heart and

⁴² As an organ the heart was supposed to be made of the finest particles (*jing* 精) of the element fire. Cf. e.g. Razan, *Santoku-shō*, NST XXVIII, p. 162.

⁴³ *Yijing*, third appendix 1, 67. See Honda, *Eki*, pp. 510-511. Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 372, translates: “The Sages having by the possession of these three virtues (sc. the virtues of the stalks, the diagrams and the six lines. WJB) cleansed their minds, retired and laid them up in the secrecy of their own consciousness.” This passage is a paraphrase of Lin Zhaoen’s *Xinsheng zhi zhi* 心聖直指, transl. in Berling, *The syncretic religion of Lin Zhaoen*, pp. 116-117, and of his *Jiuxu zheyen* 九序摘言, transl. *ibid.*, p. 146.

⁴⁴ Two quotations from the *Yijing*. See Honda, *Eki*, pp. 387-389; Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 175; pp. 331-332. The second quotation continues (Legge, loc. cit.): “The superior man, in accordance with this, does not go in his thoughts beyond the duties of the position in which he is.” As an emblem of “seriousness” the character *ken* was rather popular with the Song Confucians, as is shown by various sections of the fourth chapter of the *Jinsilu*. About the precise meaning, however, of the first explanation that the *Yijing* gives of the hexagram, *gen qi bei* 艮其背, not even the patriarchs of Neo-Confucianism could agree. See Chan, *Reflections*, pp. 124-125. A slightly different interpretation, which is perhaps nearer to what Seika had in mind, is recorded by Razan: “He (= the *Yijing* scholar Jūsen 壽仙) said to me: “The hexagram *ken* contains an ascetic discipline that can lead one to enlightenment. Therefore Master Shū 周 (= Zhou Dunyi ?) said that [reading] the whole of the *Kegon-kyō* 華嚴經 or *Hoke-kyō* 法華經 could not compare with dissolving [one’s self] in the hexagram *gen*. For it means ‘no desires.’ ‘To rest like the back’ means that, though a man’s ears, eyes, nose and mouth all have desires, only the back has no desires. *Gen* means ‘to stop,’ ‘to rest in [the state of] having no desires.’ The [essence of] the *Kegon-kyō* and the *Hoke-kyō* is [also] to be without desires.” I answered: “To be without desires is admissible. On top, however, of the layer of ‘no desires’ there is the layer of principle. [You,] Jūsen, are a Buddhist. How could you understand principle?” (*Bunshū* 65: II, p. 355; written during the Keichō era.) For a detailed discussion, both of the various Neo-Confucian interpretations of *gen qi bei* and of the contents of Lin Zhaoen’s ideas, see Berling, *Syncretic religion*, pp. 116-194.

⁴⁵ According to a Chinese story (Legge, *Texts of Taoism* I, pp. 169-170), when Yao 堯 wanted to give the empire to Yu, Yu washed his ears with the water of a stream. Another recluse, Fu, thereupon considered this stream so much defiled that he did not even want to let his cow drink from it. The text of this quotation may be found in NST XXVIII, p. 196; Ōta I, p. 11; DNS XII.31, p. 478.

nurturing nature.”⁴⁶This concept was adopted in Neo-Confucianism,⁴⁷ but in order to explain what was meant by it, we will first have to digress a little and explain what was meant by the word *xin*.

Xin has a wide range of meanings: “heart” in the anatomical sense, “heart” in the figurative sense, hence “mind,” “will,” “feelings,” “centre,” and “meaning.” In Neo-Confucian doctrine⁴⁸ the heart is, on the one hand, defined as a compound of material and immaterial elements, but, on the other hand, it supposedly acts as one single entity: it is the intellective principle in man, the organ with which he thinks and reacts and ideally should control his senses.

In the operations of the heart two modes are distinguished. In one mode, regarded as the real, basic, original state and accordingly classified as the *ti* 體 (J. *tai*; substance) of the heart, it is at rest: it has not yet reacted to a stimulus and just quietly is. In its other mode, classified as *yong* 用 (J. *yō*; function) it has reacted to a stimulus and has put forth feelings, the so-called “seven passions” of joy (*xi* 喜), anger (*nu* 怒), sorrow (*ai* 哀), fear (*ju* 懼), love (*ai* 愛), hate (*wu* 惡), and lust (*yu* 欲).

The immaterial component of the heart is *li* 理 (J. *ri*; principles), which are completely good, and are considered as the basic nature (*xing*, J. *sei* or *shō* 性) of man. In its first mode, when it is at rest, the heart can be equated with *li* or nature, and it may be referred to as “the heart of the Way” (*daoxin* 道心), the “original heart” (*benxin* 本心) or, very confusingly, as “the heart” (*xin*) *tout court*. The *li*, which together make up human nature, are the “four virtues” of benevolence (*ren* 仁), righteousness (*yi* 義), etiquette (*li* 禮), and wisdom (*zhi* 智); sometimes a fifth, trust (*xin* 信), is added. These *li* are sometimes collectively regarded as manifestations of one fundamental virtue, generally identified as benevolence.

⁴⁶ *Mengzi* VII A, 1.

⁴⁷ See *Jinsilu* 4; *Xingli daquan* 46; 47.

⁴⁸ The following discussion is not based on the writings of any particular philosopher. It is a systematized account of various opinions that together constitute the contents of the word *xin* as a technical term in orthodox Neo-Confucianism. For similar attempts at definition, see Graf, *Kaibara Ekiken*, pp. 237-243, and Graham, *Two Chinese philosophers*, pp. 61-66.

The material component of the heart is *qi* 氣 (J. *ki*; material force, ether). It can be either good or bad; it is referred to as the “native endowment” 氣質 (*qishi*, J. *kishitsu*) of man. In its second mode, when it is acting, the heart necessarily has to act through the *qi*. Consequently, its actions, i.e. primarily the feelings or passions, are also good or bad. This can be phrased in various ways. Sometimes it is said that the good feelings arise from the *li*, while the (bad) passions originate in the *qi*⁴⁹; sometimes, that good passions are those that are in accord with or ruled by nature, while in the case of bad passions the heart (in the pregnant sense, i.e. nature) is overridden (“swept off”) by the senses. In this second mode, especially when it is “putting forth” bad passions, it is possible to refer to the heart as “the heart of man” (*renxin* 人心).⁵⁰

The passions are thought to arise automatically, once the heart has been roused by some stimulus that has reached it through the senses. Since these outbursts of feelings are inevitable, they are not, as such, censored, but everyone agrees that through some sort of semi-ascetical practices they should be controlled and brought to conform to the *li*. One also agreed that, once the external stimulus had gone and the

⁴⁹ This is the point Yi T'oegye made in the famous dictum that he added to the *Ch'ŏnmyŏng tosŏl*: “The four beginnings (*siduan* 四端) originate from the *li* and the seven passions from the *qi*.” The “four beginnings” are the feelings (*xin* 心) of commiseration, shame and reverence, and a sense of right and wrong.

⁵⁰ The terms *renxin* and *daoxin* come from the *Shujing*, “*Ta Yü mo*” 書經·大禹謨 (cf. Legge, *The Shu Ching*, p. 23). From the foregoing discussion it will be clear that even as a technical term *xin* has several meanings. The first meaning is expressed in the definition *xin tong xing qing* 心統性情. This phrase is usually translated as “the heart governs/commands nature and the passions.” Notwithstanding the remarks Chan makes in his footnote to this translation (cf. *supra*, n. 31), this does not seem to be correct: if anything rules anything, it is the nature that rules (should rule) the passions; there is not a third entity, the heart, that exists separately from the nature and the passions to govern both of them. What is meant, is that “heart” is the name given to nature and passions unified. It is a re-definition in what might be called existential terms of the ontological definition of the heart as an amalgam of *li* and *qi*. Therefore the translation “the heart *subsumes* nature and passions” should be preferred. Cf. also n. 11. The definition of “heart” as a combination of *daoxin* and *renxin* is more or less on the same line. *Daoxin* being synonymous with “nature,” the only difference with the pair *xing - qing* is that *renxin* has a stronger pejorative nuance than “passions.” Sometimes (cf. e.g. the *Cheng-tzu i-shu* 4, Cheng Yichuan speaking, quoted in the *Santoku-shō*, NST XXVIII, p. 168) it is said that “the heart is originally good.” Since, however, in this case the heart is contrasted with the passions, the word must be understood in the pregnant sense of *daoxin*, = the nature. Finally, the “four beginnings,” too, are sometimes referred to as *xin* (cf. *supra*, n. 49). In these cases I have translated the word as “feelings” or “sense.” I do not think that this usage should be included as one of the meanings of *xin* as a technical term. The fact that Yi T'oegye in the *Ch'ŏnmyŏng tosŏl* did include them, occasioned the protracted discussion between him and Ki Taesung 奇大升 (1527-1572), the contents of which are very lucidly described in Tomoeda Ryūtarō, “Ri Taikei no shi-shichi ronben to ridō-setsu.”

passions had run their course, the heart would return to its original state of mirror-like quiescence.

In order to attain this objective it was considered necessary to fortify one's heart through purifying its *qi*: in other words, Mencius' old recipe of "preserving the heart and nurturing nature" (*cunxin yangxing* 存心養性). In practice this meant concentration exercises, maintaining one's composure, and keeping a constant watch over one's emotions, so that these would not exceed what was proper under the circumstances or fall short of it. Even something reminiscent of *zazen* (*jingzuo* 靜坐 or "sitting in tranquility") was recommended by some. Of course we find the usual warnings to keep up this effort at all times ("Do not relax in private"⁵¹), but on the other hand, it should not be a forced effort. It should come naturally. As Seika himself once said:

If people who have just begun studying try to practise the discipline (*gongfu* 工夫) of "maintaining seriousness" (*zhijing* 持敬), it will be [to them] as if they are binding and gagging their hearts. What the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi intended, however, [when they enjoined this practice,] was that one should concentrate exclusively on preserving one's original heart.⁵²

This is the system of ideas and practices that is alluded to by Seika when he derives his studio-name Sei-sai or his literary name Seika from the phrase *chang xingxing*, for — as we have seen — *chang xingxing* is a method of disciplining the unruly heart, a way to implement "seriousness." Several of his other names, too, e.g. Hokuniku-sanjin or Renpu, contain references to this same complex of ideas.

"Maintaining seriousness," however, was not the only discipline the aspiring Confucian scholar had to practise. Another and perhaps more important task was waiting for him, namely *gewu* 格物. Neo-Confucian philosophers and exegetes never were able to agree on a single interpretation of this term. In orthodox circles one eventually settled

⁵¹ *Daxue*, sixth *zhuan*.

⁵² *Baizou saihitsu*, p. 52. Cf. also Morohashi XII, 42578-94, where we find two quotations from Zhu Xi, describing what he intended with "quiet sitting."

for “the investigation of things,” but many other interpretations were advanced at one time or other.⁵³

Gewu is the first of the Eight Steps of the *Daxue*. Therefore, if we want to ascertain how Seika interpreted *gewu*, the best course is to start with his commentary on the *Daxue*, the *Daigaku yōrayku*. Here Seika, quoting Lin Zhaoen, defines *gewu* as follows:

Gewu - Master Lin says: “This word does not denote things’ [as used in] ‘affairs and things’ (*shiwu*); it is the *wu* that is used in the *Liji* in [the phrase] ‘People change into things.’⁵⁴ And the word *ge* is not the *ge* of ‘to impede,’ ‘to resist’ (*gange* 扞格), but the *ge* that is used in the *Shujing* in [the phrase] ‘To ban out the evil mind.’⁵⁵ The heart has changed into a thing. If one does not call that an evil heart, what then? Therefore, when one bans out this evil heart it is [the same as] ‘banning out a thing.’ *Ge* has the meaning of ‘to remove.’”⁵⁶

Since the old text of the *Daxue* does not have the fifth *zhuan* (written by one of the Cheng brothers and inserted at this place by Zhu Xi who wanted to fill a supposed hiatus in Zengzi’s commentary) in which the concept of *gewu* is explained, Seika does not have occasion to treat it explicitly. He only mentions it, as it were, *en passant*. In connection with “To know where to stop and then ...” (*zhi zhi er hou* 知止而後),⁵⁷ he writes:

From here on [the *Daxue* speaks of] the order in which the effects appear [of the

⁵³ As regards the interpretation of the phrase *gewu*, one generally agreed that the word *wu* should be interpreted as “affairs” (*shi* 事) and not as “things,” but for *ge* a number of different explanations had been proposed. The most important of these various interpretation of *ge* are “to come,” “to make come” (J. *kitaru*; Zheng Xuan), “to oppose” (J. *fusegu*; Sima Guang), “to go to,” “to investigate” (J. *itaru*; the Cheng brothers, Zhu Xi), “to rectify” (J. *tadasu*; Wang Yangming), and “to remove” (J. *saru*; Lin Zhaoen).

⁵⁴ *Liji* 17 (“Yüejì” 樂記), 12. Legge translates: “Now there is no end to the things by which man is affected; and where his likings are not subject to regulation (from within), *he is changed into the nature of things* as they come before him; that is, he stifles the voice of the Heavenly principle within, and gives the utmost indulgence to the desires by which men may be possessed.” (Legge, *The Li Ki* II, p. 96)

⁵⁵ *Shujing* 5 (“Jiongming” 罔命), 26. Legge translates: “But I ... am destitute of goodness and really depend on the officers about me to help my deficiencies, applying the line to my faults and exhibiting my errors, *thus correcting my bad heart* and enabling me to be the successor of my meritorious predecessors.” (Legge, *Shu Ching*, p. 226)

⁵⁶ Ōta I, p. 381; NST XXVIII, p. 44.

⁵⁷ *Daxue, jing*, second paragraph.

discipline] of the heart that those who study, practise. With the six characters “to know” (*zhi* 知), “to settle” (*ding* 定), “to be quiet” (*jing* 靜), “to be at ease” (*an* 安), “to think” (*lü* 慮), and “to obtain” (*de* 得), they can try to what extent their hearts and learning have reached. Well now, if one asks from where one starts in order “to know,” [the answer is that] one begins from *gewu*. The eight [stages that are denoted by the] characters “to remove” (*ge* 格), “to extend” (*zhi* 致), “to make sincere” (*cheng* 誠), “to rectify” (*zheng* 正), “to cultivate” (*xiu* 修), “to regulate” (*qi* 齊), “to govern” (*zhi* 治), and “to pacify” (*ping* 平), can be finished straight away on the basis of *gewu*. At the same time that *gewu* ends [the other seven stages], too, are finished. [The text] continues with “and then ...,” but that is merely a matter of relative order. It cannot possibly be that our hearts are [made ready] in any [of the following] stages, if they are not [through the application of this discipline] completely made ready in the stage of *gewu*.⁵⁸ There are some differences here with the theories of the Confucian scholars of the Song but since it would take too long, I do not write [about that] here.

Strictly speaking [the message of] this work could be summed up in [the third of the Three Principles, “to rest in] the highest good.” But since in that case people who[se talents] are average or below average would find it difficult to start, [the *Daxue* says that] we have to practise fully at [the stage of] *gewu* and clarify our hearts well. When this heart is clear and limpid, not dark and muddy, and when, after that, objects⁵⁹ arise spontaneously in our hearts, if we then persevere for a long time in nurturing this [clear and limpid] heart that we may not lose it, the “complete substance and great functioning (*quanti dayong* 全體大用) will be realised.”⁶⁰ ... From this level upwards it is no good to be taught by others. You have to reach it on your own. You will then have to learn

⁵⁸ Kanaya (*NST* XXVIII, p. 43) explains the phrase “*wa ga kokoro no juyō*” as “to accept them/it into our hearts and make them/it be of use,” but he fails to make clear what it is that one has accepted and uses. In Seika’s system one receives nothing into the heart. Quite the contrary: through *gewu* one removes things from it. The literal meaning of the word *shou-yung* 受用 (J. *juyō*) is “to accept and use,” or, by extension, “to (make to) be of use” (cf. Morohashi II, 3159-174). In Neo-Confucianism it seems to be used as a kind of technical term, in the sense of “to make to be of use,” sc. the heart through the application of an ascetical discipline.

⁵⁹ The Japanese word that I have here translated as “objects,” is *kyōgai* 境界. The meanings of *kyōgai* are “situation,” sc. the situation in which one is placed or finds oneself, and “things that become the object of the working of the six roots (*liu ken*; J. *rokkon* 六根), i.e. our will or senses.” The *Nip-Po jisho* as quoted in the *Kokugo daijiten*, same lemma, explains it as “objects like colours and lights that are visible to the eye, and sounds that are heard by the ear.” Seika’s problem is that the state of mirror-like, passive reflectivity of the heart is by its nature unstable and evanescent. The way to make sure, not that the heart is preserved in this state — that would be impossible — but that it always returns to this state as soon as the external stimuli have vanished, is “to feed the heart well, that we may not lose it.” In terms of the metaphor, the mirror may reflect, but it may not thereby be permanently darkened again. Otherwise the complete substance and the great functioning will not be realised. If this interpretation is correct, it follows that *kyōgai* is to be interpreted, not as “situation,” “state of affairs,” sc. of brightness and limpidity, but as “stimuli.” It seems to me that this interpretation is borne out by the word *oboyuru* that Seika uses here, which means “to experience,” and not “to come about.”

⁶⁰ Cf. *Daxue*, fifth *zhuan*.

[the implications of] the six characters “to know” etc. by yourself. And then, through practising [the discipline of] *gewu*, you will at the same time understand the [meaning of] the eight characters “to remove,” “to extend,” etc.⁶¹

In the second part of the *Daigaku yōryaku*, again the whole complex of *wu* and *ge* comes up for discussion:

“Things” (*wu*) means “dust.” Since a mirror is limpid and clear [from itself], one only needs to polish off a spot of dust in order to see clearly. The limpidity and clarity of a mirror are called “emptiness.” In it (i.e. the mirror. WJB) is “spirituality” (*ling* 靈). It is also called “the highest good.” In the *Zhongyong* it is also called the state of equilibrium when the passions have not yet stirred (*wei fa zhi zhong* 未發之中),⁶² and in the *Lunyu* it is the “one that pervades all.”⁶³

Emptiness and spirituality are in all limpid and clear places of the mirror. If one practises the discipline [of *gewu*] with the [express] purpose of “removing things,” then this discipline itself is also a thing. If in the heart there is only one speck of darkness, all kinds of thoughts arise. If these thoughts would not be there, [the heart] would be naturally empty and spiritual, and clear knowledge would originate; and then the functioning [of the heart in repose to] the myriad things would be effortless and appropriate. To think not to have thought, that is thought. It is not that [the *Daxue*] dislikes thought; it only wants the thoughts to become clear naturally. This is called the “complete substance and great functioning.” ... If one “removes things,” one thereby attains knowledge naturally, without even having the intention of doing so. Knowledge is not attained after one has “removed things.” One must know that, even while one is “removing things,” without any interval, knowledge is being attained. It is the same word *zhi* 至 (“to reach,” “to attain”) as occurs in Confucius’ saying “If I want [to find] benevolence, then benevolence is already there.”⁶⁴ If one removes dust, then that is the same as “to shine forth clearly.”⁶⁵

Seika’s thinking in these quotations is clear and consistent. Given his interpretation of *gewu* and his passive conception of the heart, compared to a clear mirror, it is self-evident that everything will be over, finished and done with, once the heart has been “made clear.” The following stages of the Eight Steps no longer concern

⁶¹ Ōta I, pp. 380-381; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 43-44.

⁶² Cf. *Zhongyong*, first *chang*, first paragraph; Shimada, *Daigaku Chūyō*, pp. 176-178.

⁶³ *Lunyu* IV, 15. Legge translates: “The Master said: ‘Shen, my doctrine is that of all-pervading unity.’ The disciple Tseng replied, ‘Yes’.”

⁶⁴ *Lunyu* VII, 30. Legge translates: “The Master said, ‘Is virtue a thing remote? I wish to be virtuous, and lo! virtue is at hand’.”

⁶⁵ Ōta I, pp. 390-391; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 55-56.

the state of one's heart, but the reaction of the heart to external stimuli that reach it, to the problems with which it is confronted. If only the heart is clear, however, the response will at all times be correct.

Since Seika is rather vague about the origin of the specks of dust that sometimes adhere to the mirror, he can ignore the dichotomy of the heart in a *li* part and a *qi* part. These concepts are to him of secondary concern. We can say that for all practical purposes *xin* was, to him, synonymous with "the heart of the Way."

In the course of his explanation of the Three Principles, however, he does make a distinction between the heart as it rests (classified as the *ti*, the "substance," of the heart) and the heart as it operates (classified as the *yong*, the "function," of the heart). According to Seika, "to illustrate one's illustrious virtue" and "to love the people" are functions, while "the highest good" is the substance of the heart.⁶⁶

This interpretation is startlingly different from that of Zhu Xi. Zhu Xi identifies the illustrious virtue with the nature, and therefore, if anything, it is the illustrious virtue that should be regarded as the substance. In Zhu Xi's interpretation "to renew the people" means that one should teach others in order to help them to illustrate their own illustrious virtue, once one has succeeded in illustrating one's own. "Resting in the highest good" denotes for Zhu Xi the highest degree that one can possibly reach in the exertion of *ming mingde* and *qin min*. Seika, on the other hand, explains the illustrious virtue as the five moral obligations, the *wu lun* 五倫 (i.e. righteousness as between lord and servant, benevolence as between father and son, etc.⁶⁷) and "loving the people" as loving and nurturing the people. In Seika's case "illustrious virtue" means that one must teach the people to fulfil the obligations concomitant to the five universal human relations, and "loving the people," that one must nurture the people in order to enable it to fulfil these obligations.⁶⁸ Seika defines the "highest good" as

⁶⁶ Cf. the beginning of the second part of the *Daigaku yōryaku*: "These three phrases (sc. to illustrate the illustrious virtue, to love the people, and to rest in the highest good. WJB) explain the substance starting from the functions. It is not the order in which one should study." (Ōta I, pp. 385-386; NST XXVIII, p. 52) Seika does not substitute "to renew" 新 (*xin*) for "to love" 親 (*qin*), as the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi would have it. This is an idiosyncrasy of long standing: cf. *Seika mondō* (*Bunshū* 32: I, p. 347; NST XXVIII, p. 200).

⁶⁷ Ōta I, p. 379; p. 385; NST XXVIII; p. 42; p. 51.

⁶⁸ Cf. Ōta I, p. 385; NST XXVIII, p. 51. Cf. Also Kanaya's comments on this point (NST XXVIII, pp.

“the *li* out of which flows the source of the illustrious virtue and of loving the people.”⁶⁹ He also describes it as “the one [and indivisible] good” (*ikko no zen* 一箇ノ善), which has existed from before the separation of Yin and Yang, quoting various passages from the Classics in support of this thesis. Then he continues:

When one asks from which of the three, “illustrious virtue,” “loving the people,” or “the highest good” one should start practising discipline, [my answer is:] since our Confucian learning is a learning of the “complete substance and great functioning,” if the substance of “the highest good” is there, the functions of “illustrious virtue” and of “loving the people,” too, will be there. Through resting in “the highest good” the results of changing and nurturing will spontaneously arise, and thus one “illustrates the illustrious virtue.” [However,] the starting point from which [in their turn] the moral obligations, i.e. “the illustrious virtue,” become clarified is “loving the people.” It is sometimes said that Yao’s merit reached [all within] the Four Seas. This was because he had started from “loving the people.” This may be so, but [he could do this] because he already was a Holy One. There is no point of approach here for an [ordinary] scholar to practise discipline and enter [the Way]. As concerns the discipline of the [ordinary] scholars, they should practise and enter by way of *gewu*.⁷⁰

In other words, a Holy One like Yao is by definition in the possession of “the highest good” or “resting in the highest good.” If he is “above” as a king or an emperor, “the results of changing and nurturing” will indeed “spontaneously arise.” This “changing and nurturing” is done in two stages: the first stage is “nurturing,” i.e. “loving” the people,” and the second stage is “teaching” it, sc. “how to illustrate its illustrious virtue.” Ordinary people, of course, are first confronted with the problem of establishing the substance of “the highest good.” Therefore they must begin with practising *gewu* in order to cleanse their hearts. Then, securely resting in “the highest good,” they can act, and nurture and teach the people.

The topic of *gewu* also cropped up in several discussions between Seika and Razan. The latter reported them in the *Seika mondō*, where we find the following exchanges:

456-460), reported *infra*, n. 112.

⁶⁹ Ōta I, p. 380; *NST* XXVIII, p. 43.

⁷⁰ Ōta I, p. 386; *NST* XXVIII, p. 52

I (= Razan) asked: “[The expressions] ‘the extension of knowledge’ (*zhi zhi* 致知) and ‘the investigation of things’ (*gewu*) were first commented on by Zheng Xuan and later on explained by Sima Guang 司馬光. When we come to the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi they in their turn give explanations [of these phrases] that are very brilliant and clear. But Wang Yangming is [again] of a different opinion. What do you think of that?”⁷¹

The Master said: “It is not easy as yet to tell you that. You must first read more closely and get the taste of it, immerse yourself in it and take your time about it. The important thing is to know it in silence. When you have reached the stage that you penetrate into it suddenly and clearly, then the differences between the Confucian scholars will all be resolved [and they will all] be one.”⁷²

Dōshun (= Razan) once asked the meaning of “the investigation of things.” Master Seika answered: “The Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi explained it as ‘to investigate principle exhaustively’ (*qiongli* 窮理). Let us take it from there. What is the cause that heaven and earth are heaven and earth? What is above and consists of piled-up *qi* is heaven; what is below and is massive form is earth. What makes fire to be fire and water to be water? Though one is a thousand, ten thousand miles or more away, if there is something that blazes and flares up, it is surely fire, even if it is not called fire. Though a thousand, ten thousand or more years ago, if there was something that was moist and went down, that was surely water, even if it was not named water. With cold, heat, day, and night it is the same. Every plant and every tree, the smallest birds and insects, each has its *li*. Let alone man! If *à propos* of the human body we enumerate [those *li* that man possesses], then we call [the *li* of] the eye sight and clearness, [those of] the ear hearing and acuteness, [those of] the mouth speech and reverence, and [those of] the heart thought and sagacity.⁷³ Therefore it is said: ‘Man is the [most] spiritual (*ling*) [part] of heaven and earth,’⁷⁴ and ‘Man is [made of] the [most] refined [parts] of the five elements.’⁷⁵ That one day suddenly one penetrates into this heart, into these *li* and understands them clearly, that one calls ‘the investigation of things.’”

I (= Razan) said: “Things’ (*wu* 物) means ‘affairs’ (*shi* 事). Now, if there is a ‘thing,’ there is also an ‘affair.’ When one talks of ‘affairs,’ however, one [is

⁷¹ Cf. *supra*, n. 53.

⁷² NST XXVIII, p. 201; *Bunshū* 32 (I, p. 348).

⁷³ Note that of each of the organs two qualities are mentioned, which in each case can be classified as “a *li* that makes things what they are” (*suoyi ran zhi li* 所以然之理: “An ear is an ear because it is a thing that hears”), and “a *li* that shows how things are to be” (*suo dang ran zhi li* 所當然之理: “An ear should hear acutely”).

⁷⁴ *Shujing* 4 (“*Taishi*” 泰誓). Legge, *Shu Ching*, p. 113, translates: “Heaven and earth is the parent of all creatures; and of all creatures man is the most highly endowed.”

⁷⁵ *Liji* 7 (“*Li yun*” 禮運), 3. Legge, *The Li Ki*, p. 381, translates: “The finest subtle matter of the five elements.”

talking about] something empty, and when one talks about ‘things,’ one [talks about] something solid. Father and son, lord and servant are all ‘things.’ The existence of parental love or of righteousness are ‘affairs.’ *Li* is what makes them such (i.e. makes love, love, and fathers, fathers. WJB). Proceeding analogically in all similar cases and thus reaching the ultimate secrets, that is to investigate exhaustively the fullness of the heart. Does not what one calls ‘*gewu*’ mean, ‘to go to things’ (*mono ni itaru*)?” Seika said: “Yes.”⁷⁶

Again I (= Razan) asked: “In the *Shuohua*⁷⁷ it says ‘to investigate principle exhaustively’ (*qiongli* 窮理),⁷⁸ and in the *Daxue* it says ‘to go to things’ (*gewu*). Why do they phrase it differently?”

[Seika] said: “With their thousands of words and myriads of utterances the Holy Ones and Sages wanted to achieve that the people could acknowledge the truth. What they show is not the same, but what they enter into, is. Moreover, the men of former times all had their own point of entry. Like Zhou [Dunyi]’s ‘supremacy of quiescence’ (*zhujing* 主靜), the ‘maintainance of seriousness’ (*zhijing* 持敬) of the Cheng, Zhu Xi’s ‘exhaustive investigation of principle’ (*qiongli*), the ‘ease’ (*yijian* 易簡) of [Lu] Xiangshan, [Chen] Bai-sha’s 陳白沙 ‘tranquil and complete’ (*jingyuan* 靜圓), and [Wang] Yangming’s ‘intuitive knowledge’ (*liangzhi* 良知). Their words may seem to differ, but what they enter into, is the same.”

I said: “If one talks only of *li* and not of ‘things,’ one gallops through a void, and if one talks of ‘things’ and not of *li*, one remains stuck in the phenomenal world.⁷⁹ This phenomenal world has form; the *li* have no form. Loyalty and filial piety cannot unilaterally be discarded, depending on whether one’s lord or father still lives or has died. ‘Things’ and *li* are naturally [one]; the Way and the phenomenal world [in which the *li* are embedded] are not two. This one calls ‘going to the things and investigating their principles’ (*gewu qiongli*).” Seika said: “So it is.”⁸⁰

The Master (= Seika) once asked: “What is the most important point of the *Daxue*?” Dōshun answered: “To make sincere one’s will (*chengyi* 誠意)?” [Seika] said: “Although ‘to make sincere one’s will’ is an important point of the *Daxue*, nevertheless amongst those who study ‘to go to the things and exhaustively investigate their principles’ is considered to come first. This is the most urgent [task].”⁸¹

⁷⁶ NST XXVIII, pp. 203-204; *Bunshū* 32 (I, p. 349).

⁷⁷ The *Shuo hua* 說卦 is the fifth appendix of the *Yijing*.

⁷⁸ Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 442, translates: “They (thus) made an exhaustive discrimination of what was right, and effected the complete development of (every) nature, till they arrived.”

⁷⁹ The term here translated as “phenomenal world” is *qi* 器 (J. *utsuwa*: utensils, vessels, receptacles). It here refers to the individual things that consist of *qi* (“material force”), which are called “receptacles” because *li* are embedded in them.

⁸⁰ NST XXVIII, p. 204; *Bunshū* 32 (I, p. 349).

⁸¹ Ibid.; *ibid*.

The first quotation is from the first part of the *Seika mondō*, dating from 1604. Razan actually asks here for Seika's condemnation of Wang Yangming. Even for the young Razan the various possible interpretations of the phrase *gewu* can hardly have been a problem. In fact, in his question to Seika he does not think it necessary to detail them. Moreover, when he says that "The explanation of the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi was clear and brilliant," he must be doing so on purpose, in order to make it more difficult for Seika to stick up for Wang Yangming. Seika, however, refuses to condemn. He blandly tells Razan that his reading up till now has been shallow, that ultimately all Confucians are one, that if he would only read enough and think enough, he would eventually understand.⁸²

The other quotations are all from the second part of the *Seika mondō*. Since Razan is here referred to as "Dōshun," they must date from the second half of 1607 or later. Razan presumably has thought a lot but not yet understood, for again he seems to be asking the same question: What is the meaning of *gewu*? Seika willingly obliges with the orthodox definition: *Gewu* means *qiongli*, the "exhaustive investigation of principle." *Li* he defines extensively, with the help of a few examples and with rhetorical flourishes reminiscent of Lu Xiangshan.⁸³ The conclusion, however, that he reaches at the end of the paragraph, is impeccably orthodox.⁸⁴

Now it appears that Razan had other things on his mind when he asked the question. He starts a monologue on the difference between *wu* and *shi*, "things" and "affairs," to which the whole of the second section, too, is devoted. He has evidently been struck by the fact that "the investigation of *things*" is explained as "exhaustively

⁸² Razan had earlier used the same gambit, and at that time, too, Seika had refused it. Cf. Razan's letter to Seika (*Bunshū* 2: I, pp. 13-14) and Seika's reply (*Ōta* I, pp. 138-139; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 98-99). Cf. also Ch. I, p. 57.

⁸³ In the first part of the *Seika mondō* he used the same manner of definition, with even more rhetorical emphasis on the theme of *quod ubique quod semper* (*Bunshū* 32: I, p. 348; *NST* XXVIII, p. 202).

⁸⁴ The argument of the famous fifth *zhuan* of the *Daxue*, where the phrase "one morning to understand clearly" (*yidan huoran guantong huan* 一旦豁然貫通焉) occurs, is as follows: the hearts of all men are alike in that they have knowledge; all things are alike in that they have *li*. To the extent that a man does not yet fully know all *li* (or one *li* fully), his knowledge is incomplete. For this reason those who study should "go to the things of the world" and, departing from those *li* that they already know, study more and more things and try to understand their *li* to the full. If one keeps at it long enough, "one morning one will clearly understand" the *li*. Cf. Shimada, *Daigaku chūyō*, pp. 77-80.

investigating *principle*.” Seika, who may not have understood the question, answers with his usual assertion that it all comes to the same thing in the end, but Razan refuses to be sidetracked. The solution he proposes is that if there is talk of both “investigating *things*” and “exhausting *principle*,” one should do both. In the first section he refused in the same way to substitute “affairs” for “things.” He seems to regard *wu* as including both “things” and “affairs,” and apparently reasons as follows: Both “affairs” and “things” have their *li*; no “affairs” exist without “things,” nor “things” without “affairs,” nor “things” (now including “affairs”) without *li*, and *vice versa*; therefore, to study only the *li* and to neglect the study of “things” is wrong. Seika acquiesces.

The third section of the *Seika mondō*⁸⁵ starts with an innocuous question by Seika. Perhaps too innocuous. Razan suspects something, and consequently his answer is rather far-fetched. “To make sincere one’s will” (*chengyi*) was the main message of the *Daxue* according to Wang Yangming.⁸⁶ As Seika correctly points out, according to Zhu Xi it was the “investigation of things” that was fundamental. *Chengyi* was secondary: the “beginning of the cultivation of oneself” (*zi xiu zhi shou* 自修之首),⁸⁷ the link between theoretical knowledge and practical action.

Of course, Razan did have several indications that *chengyi* would be the answer that Seika would want to hear. For instance, one of Seika’s literary names, Kōhan-ka 廣胖窩, derived from the sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue* where *chengyi* is explained,⁸⁸ and

⁸⁵ For my comments, cf. Shimada, *Daigaku Chūyō*, pp. 87-95.

⁸⁶ The possible influence exerted on Seika by Wang Yangming is a moot point. I find it unlikely that Seika was seriously influenced by him. The evidence is very inconclusive. When, for example, Kanaya says (*NST* XXVIII, pp. 455-456) that the thesis that “words and actions are one” 言行一也 (*yanxing yi ye*; J. *genkō ichi nari*), which Seika expounds in the *Kokon ian jo*, is close to Yangming’s tenet that “knowledge and action are one” 知行合一 (*zhixing he yi*; J. *chikō gōitsu*) and suggests that the latter influenced the former, he does not take into account that Seika (a) knowingly uses a different term, (b) takes his text from the *Xiaoxue* 小學 and not from the *Daxue*, and (c) asserts in his own explanation the absolute supremacy of acting over words, which is something quite different from what Yangming ever intended: “Methinks, words and actions are not two. Even when one studies empty words, if [with these words] one rules oneself and others and applies them to things, then this is practical action. They are not empty words. Even when one studies practical action, if one speaks [of] it only with one’s mouth but does not practise it with one’s body, then again they are empty words; it is not practical action.” (Ōta I, p. 106; *NST* XXVIII, p. 82)

⁸⁷ Quotation from Zhu Xi’s commentary to the first paragraph of the sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue*.

⁸⁸ The studio name Kōhan-ka was given to Seika by Kang Hang. The fact, however, that it was applied to

Seika preferred the old text of the *Daxue* to the new one, which meant that he interpreted the first six sections of the *zhuan* (in the new redaction of the *Daxue*) as an explanation of precisely this concept of *chengyi*.⁸⁹ As a self-confessed follower of Zhu Xi, Razan must have known better. But by trying to give Seika the answer that he thought Seika would want to hear, he gave Seika a chance to turn the table on him. In the last two lines of this section Razan says: “The discipline (= *gewu*) cannot be dispensed with [if one wants to make one’s will sincere], and this sequence [of first practising *gewu* and then *chengyi*] must not be brought into disorder.”⁹⁰ He must have been making sure that Seika meant what he said in the orthodox sense. Seika says he did.

These evident differences between the *Daigaku yōryaku* and the *Seika mondō* leave us with a problem to settle, namely that of the internal consistency of Seika’s thought. We are confronted with this problem not only when we compare the *Seika mondō* with the *Daigaku yōryaku*. In Seika’s own works, too, passages can be found that are at variance with the opinions he expressed in this last work. We will quote some of these here by way of illustration:

From fifteen onwards they all enter the *Daxue* where they are taught the Way of investigating principle (*sic! ri o kiwame*), rectifying their hearts, cultivating themselves and ruling others.⁹¹

The ruler of the heart is here and therefore it is utterly quiet, [even] in movement. With [the coming of] the passions the five fires flare up, but when [the heart] returns to its nature, the same ashes grow cold.⁹²

Well now, reading books is like polishing a mirror. One wipes off the dust and makes the form shine forth; one investigates principle and exhausts one’s

him shows, that Seika, too, attached quite some importance to this concept of *chengyi*. Cf. *supra*, ch. I, n. 45.

⁸⁹ The first six *zhuan*, which in the edition of Zhu Xi explain the Three Principles, *benmo* 本末, *gewu* and *chengyi*, in the old text of the *Daxue* are all considered as explanations of *chengyi*.

⁹⁰ Quotation from Zhu Xi’s commentary to the summing-up of the sixth *zhuan*.

⁹¹ Ōta I, p. 245.

⁹² “Shusei-shitsu mei” 主静室銘, written for the physician Seiun 栖芸, about whom no details are known. Text in Ōta I, p. 118; ZZGR XIII, p. 101; NST XXVIII, p. 86.

nature. Though what one does is the same, the results may be different. Some [mirrors] are dark and some are clear; some [people] are mad and others holy. How could this thing (i.e. the book rest that is the subject of this inscription. WJB) be [here] in vain? The [most important thing when one is] reading books is [that one reads them] in seriousness.⁹³

Are you [keeping your parents'] (i.e. your own. WJB) body in reverence? Is your dwelling stately? Do you serve your lord loyally? Do you as an official serve reverently? Are you trusting with your friends? Are you brave in war? Do you cut down trees and kill birds and beasts in the proper season? The duty between lord and servant, the order between old and young, and the distance between man and wife, all of the hundred actions are extensions of filial piety. Are you capable of exhausting [this filial piety]?

That [Razan] praises your filial piety is because he thinks that you are [very filial and therefore] different. I alone do not think so. Suppose that you had lived in a [more] flourishing age. The others would not have noticed your small filial piety, but would have expected you to [practise] the whole of filial piety in its full meaning. ... The Classics say: "Their parents have borne them complete."⁹⁴ They not only give birth to their form, they also completely [transmit] the nature that Heaven bestows. And the children should keep [this nature] whole and return to it. Filial piety in its full sense means to realise completely in one's body the *li* that at one's birth were given by the heavenly mandate, and to return to them. Heaven and man are one *li*. That with which one serves one's parents is one [and the same] as that with which one serves Heaven.⁹⁵

In the first quotation Seika interprets *Daxue* as "School for Grown-ups" and *gewu* as "the investigation of things." In the second one, he makes the usual distinction between nature (*xing*) and the passions (*qing*). In the third, he rather abruptly juxtaposes the metaphor of cleaning the mirror with, again, the orthodox definition of *gewu* as *qiongli*, and in the last quotation, he enlarges the meaning of filial piety as if he were trying to pre-empt Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹.

Generally speaking, we should not attach too much importance to these and similar examples. These quotations are all from short pieces, written for special

⁹³ "Kian mei" 欽案銘: Ōta I, p. 119; ZZGR XIII, p. 101.

⁹⁴ *Liji* 24 ("Jiyi"), 36. Legge, *The Li Ki*, p. 229, translates: "His parents give birth to his person all complete, and to return it to them all complete may be called filial duty."

⁹⁵ "[Poems] following the rhymes of Kan Gendō's elegies for his mother. With preface": Ōta I, p. 76, ZZGR XIII, pp. 77-78. The piece is dated Keichō 13 (1608). Cf. Kanaya, "Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku shisō," *NST* XXVIII, pp. 461-462.

occasions. The writer therefore might be allowed some freedom in his choice of topics, tropes and arguments. This choice, moreover, is of necessity influenced by the amount of knowledge that the recipient could be supposed to have of Confucian writings and doctrine. It is probably impossible, and certainly not very useful, to interpret writings of this kind as instances of a systematically developed philosophy. Considerations of doctrinal consistency would have been of only secondary importance to the writer.

With this we do not mean to say that it would not be more satisfactory if we could interpret these variations of opinion as stages of Seika's development as a thinker, but only that, if the material shows some inconsistencies, his thought should preferably be reconstructed from the longer writings, written with the express purpose of expounding his doctrines.

In Seika's case it happens to be very difficult to discern stages of development. The most one can say is that nothing he wrote until the *Daigaku yōryaku* is incompatible with orthodox Neo-Confucianism, but that the *Daigaku yōryaku* itself is quite startlingly different.

The most important documents of the 1590's, e.g. his prose compositions *Shikeigayū kai* 四景我有解⁹⁶ and *Kokon ian jo* 古今醫案序 as well as his prefaces to some poems,⁹⁷ do not show anything more tangible than a certain familiarity with the Confucian Classics, but already in 1599 we find Kang Hang commenting on Seika's literary names, and in 1604 he is taken to task by Razan for some unorthodox opinions he was apparently known to have. Nevertheless, the *Suntetsu-roku* and the answers to Go-Yōzei's questions seem to be blameless on this score, as are Seika's answers in the second part of the *Seika mondō*. Then suddenly we are confronted with the *Daigaku yōryaku*.

Another curious inconsistency is the following: generally Seika defended himself against charges of heterodoxy by saying that all Confucianism was really identical; that the approaches might be different but that ultimately all Confucians

⁹⁶ Text in Ōta I, pp. 102-103; ZZGR XIII, pp. 90-92; NST XXVIII, pp. 80-82.

⁹⁷ See e.g. Ōta I, p. 46; ZZGR XIII, p. 61: "I by nature do not like Buddhism." Since Kingo (= Kobayakawa Hideaki) is mentioned in the same preface, it must have been written between 1592 and 1600. Cf. also Ōta I, pp. 45-46; ZZGR XIII, p. 61: praise of music in Confucian terms ("Preface and poems written for

would arrive at the same place; that differences were only seeming and superficial.⁹⁸ In the *Daigaku yōryaku*, however, Seika quite sharply distinguishes his own beliefs from those of other Confucian scholars, and positively states that he himself — and Lin Zhaoen — are right and all the others, wrong:

In my opinion, “[to illustrate] the illustrious virtue” means “to teach,” while “to love the people” means “to nurture the people.” Therefore, it must mean “to love, to feed, and to bring up.” It is because of [this opinion] that I will be “condemned by later generations and known to them.”⁹⁹

This remark also gives us leave to regard the *Daigaku yōryaku* as the authoritative statement of Seika’s philosophy.

How far back can the beginnings of this philosophy be projected? If as the two defining characteristics of Seika’s thought we take his deviating interpretation of the Three Principles and the stress he places on disciplining, cleansing the heart, they can be traced back quite far. Already in the *Seisai-ki* of 1599 Seika’s thought is described as *xinfa* 心法, and in the first letters they exchanged in 1604 Seika and Razan already differed on the definition of the Three Principles. At that occasion Razan rendered Seika’s ideas as follows:

Again you say: “... These [Three Principles] are not three. It is quite possible to call them the ‘Two Principles,’ the ‘highest good’ belonging to the other two.” I do not think that it is so. In this way you may as well call them the “One Cord.” Why call them two? If each man would illustrate only his own illustrious virtue, then nothing would come of “renewing [the people].” You would have it yourself but others would not. Therefore one extends [the illustrious virtue] and renews [the people] and makes it rest in the highest good. All men and all things do have a highest good. Why restrict it to these “Two [Cords]”? Again, what do you mean with “to belong to”? If you compare the five constant virtues with the five elements, [you will notice that] “trust” and “earth” are empty

Akamatsu Hiromichi”).

⁹⁸ Cf. for this point *supra*, Ch. I B, the section about Hayashi Razan.

⁹⁹ Ōta I, p. 385; *NST* XXVIII, p. 51. The phrase “To be known to and condemned by later generations” refers to the words that, according to Mencius, Confucius spoke when he had completed the *Ch’un-qiū* (cf. *Mengzi* III B, 9).

positions and do not have a fixed place. ... If you do not call them the Three Principles but speak of the “Two Principles,” then [for the same reason] it would also be possible to speak, not of the five elements or the five constant virtues, but of the four elements or the four constant virtues. Or am I wrong?¹⁰⁰

According to Seika, however, Razan has misunderstood what he had been trying to say:

The second matter was [that of] the Three Principles of the *Daxue*. Although the last time I formulated it rather loosely, yet it does not mean that I do not have it from somewhere (i.e. I do have some authorities, too. WJB). Why is it that what you are saying now and what I said previously is broken apart and does not fit together (i.e. that we seem to be talking about different problems. WJB)? Have I not expressed myself clearly and “have not my words exhausted my intention?”¹⁰¹ Or is it that you did not listen well and have not realized what I was saying? At a future meeting we must certainly speak about this.¹⁰²

If Razan’s words were intended as an account of ideas similar to those expressed in the *Daigaku yōryaku*, Seika was certainly justified in repudiating them. Seika defined the relation between the first two and the third of the Three Principles as a relation between substance and function, which is something quite different from the relation between “earth” and the other four elements, or of “trust” to the other four constant virtues.¹⁰³

There are, however, two factors that make us hesitate to place the *terminus ante quem* as far back as 1604. First, the *Daigaku yōryaku* was written under the inspiration of Lin Zhaoen, and the first time Seika’s interest in him is mentioned — in a passage in the *Gyōjō* that because of its position must be relating events of 1617 or after¹⁰⁴ — is considerably later.¹⁰⁵ Second, the *Daigaku yōryaku* can be divided into two separate parts: it would be nice if — for the sake of continuity — we could place

¹⁰⁰ *Bunshū* 2 (I, p. 14).

¹⁰¹ Quotation from the *Yijing*, “Great Appendix,” Pt. 1. Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 377, translates: “The written characters are not the full exponent of speech, and speech is not the full expression of ideas.”

¹⁰² Ōta I, pp. 139-140; *NST* XXVIII, p. 100. Cf. Kanaya’s comments in the additional notes to this passage (*NST* XXVIII, p. 369).

¹⁰³ For the nature of this last relation, cf. *Shunkan-shō*, *NST* XXVIII, p. 146, and notes.

¹⁰⁴ The *Gyōjō* places it after Kassho’s printing of the works of Bai Juyi, which, to judge by Razan’s “*Hakushi bunshū no batsu*” (*Bunshū* 54: II, 191), was completed by the end of 1617 (Genna 4).

the writing of the first part a few years earlier than the completion of the second. It is precisely the first part, however, that contains a kind of dedication that tallies with the account Razan gives in the *Gyōjō* of the circumstances under which the *Daigaku yōryaku* was composed:

In Genna 5, the fifth month of summer (June/July 1619) the *shōgun* left Edo and entered the capital. All territorial lords and all dignitaries, high and low, came with him. Hosokawa Tadatoshi (1586-1641), Lord of Etchū, had heard of the Master's discourses and dearly wanted to meet him. Tadatoshi was on good terms with Asano *uneme-no-kami* Nagashige, the younger brother of [Asano] Yoshinaga. Together [Tadatoshi and Nagashige] met the Master, and Tadatoshi asked him to expound the *Daxue*. The Master made for them a digest of the various theories and lectured to them.¹⁰⁶

If the dedication refers to this occasion and the second part was written after the completion of the first, the whole of the *Daigaku yōryaku* must have been composed between Genna 5/5/27 (July 8, 1619), when Hidetada arrived in Fushimi, and Genna 5/9/12 (October 19), when Seika died. Though improbable, this is of course not impossible.

This leaves us with a number of equally possible hypotheses, none of which can be proven. It would therefore seem best to disregard the changes of mind that Seika possibly experienced and to interpret all material in the light of the opinions that he expresses in the *Daigaku yōryaku*, as we have done. We could state this differently and say that Seika probably had evolved ideas of his own which were rather like those of Lin Zhaoen (however, who were in that case the authorities he refers to in his first letter to Razan?), so that he was able to understand and assimilate Zhaoen's ideas very quickly when he finally came across his works.¹⁰⁷

That the ideas of Lin Zhaoen appealed so much to Seika may have had any

¹⁰⁵ Ōta I, p. 11; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 195-196

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*; *ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ In the absence of copies of the works of Lin Zhaoen that have colophons or *ex libris* seals of Seika, the question how he had come to know of Lin Zhaoen cannot be answered. In the Naikaku Bunko there are four copies of the *Lin Zi quanji* 林子全集, the Collected Works of Lin Zhaoen, all of which are Ming editions, and one of which once was part of the library of Hayashi Razan (cf. *Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku*, p. 262).

number of personal reasons. In the *Daigaku yōryaku*, however, Seika alleges more objective reasons, too. Lin Zhaoen has his own quotations from the Classics to bear out his interpretations of *ge* and *wu*, that are certainly not less to the point than those of the other scholars who held different opinions. Moreover, his defence of the rearrangement and reinterpretation of the Three Principles is based on nothing less than an inconsistency in the commentaries of Zhu Xi himself:

In the commentary [of Zhu Xi on the *Daxue*] it is said that “To illustrate one’s illustrious virtue in the empire means that one makes all people in the empire have something with which they can illustrate their own illustrious virtue.” Viewed in the light of these three commentaries the meaning of “illustrious virtue” is [the same as that of] “all-pervading unity.”¹⁰⁸ If one should make all people in the empire have something with which to illustrate their illustrious virtue, that means that one wants to make the [same] people [of whom Confucius has said] that “you cannot make them know,”¹⁰⁹ “say ‘yes’ to the one that pervades all,”¹¹⁰ and let them thus achieve their original substance that is “empty, spiritual, and unobscured.” This can certainly not be so.¹¹¹

2. Conclusions

From the materials that we have introduced above several conclusions and inferences can be drawn. In the first place, Seika’s brand of Confucianism with its heavy influences of Lin Zhaoen, its deviating interpretation of *gewu* and the Three Principles, and its stress on the discipline of the heart shows many differences with orthodox Neo-Confucianism. Amongst other things this rather weakens the whole Korean proposition.

Secondly, Seika’s Confucianism as it appears in the *Suntetsu-roku* and the *Daigaku yōryaku* is — Kanaya Osamu rightly stresses this — practical.¹¹² The word

¹⁰⁸ *Lunyu* IV, 15. Cf. *supra*, n. 63.

¹⁰⁹ *Lunyu* VIII, 9. Legge translates: “The people may be made to follow a path of action, but they may not be made to understand.” Zhu Xi explains this passage as follows: “The people can be made to follow what they should do according to the *li*, but they cannot be made to understand [why] it is so.”

¹¹⁰ Cf. *supra*, n. 63.

¹¹¹ Ōta I, p. 382; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 45-46.

¹¹² Cf. *NST* XXVIII, pp. 455-460. Here Kanaya says that the motive that had originally turned Seika into

“practical,” however, should be used with some caution. In view of the fact that both works were written for *daimyō* one would expect the advice they contain to be practical and appropriate guidelines for governing. Seika claims as much in the *Daigaku yōryaku*. However, if one reads the texts, one soon notices that they cannot be called “practical” in our sense of the word.

The “practical” character of these texts is not so much due to Seika’s efforts, as that it is an intrinsic quality of Confucianism as such. Seika did not select certain aspects of Confucian doctrine that in his opinion were applicable to the contemporary situation in Japan and then proceeded to formulate Confucian solutions to practical problems. He reasoned the other way round. By definition Confucianism was a practical learning 實學 (*shixue*; J. *jitsugaku*) and, since its psychological and economical assumptions and the resulting model of the social order were universal, it could be applied always and everywhere. Therefore it was not necessary to take the historical situation into account and to formulate specific policies in response to a specific situation. It was sufficient to expound the universal doctrine. This is, in fact, what Seika is doing. Of course he does so in easy lessons, for most of his pupils were not well read in the Confucian Classics. They were laymen, interested in what was to them an exciting new field of intellectual endeavour. (Such an attitude on the part of Seika’s pupils would also explain the fact that texts like these were printed and not kept under lock and key as secret family instructions.)

It is mainly an accident of history that is responsible for this misconception of the practical character of Confucianism. Seika wrote the *Suntetsu-roku* and the *Daigaku yōryaku* for *daimyō*, and since a good part of Confucian literature is concerned with the art of government and the *Daxue* emphatically is a “School for Rulers,” one easily supposes that *daimyō* like Asano Yoshinaga or Hosokawa Tadatoshi were interested in their capacity as *daimyō*. If one takes a look, however, at for instance the

the direction of Confucianism, was “his interest in reality.” If we read the rest of the chapter, however, *jitsugaku* for Seika turns out to have meant that “Learning should be practised,” that it should not remain empty words. That Seika insisted on this, is nothing out of the ordinary. According to Kanaya, his most original contributions in this connection were that he laid a greater emphasis than was usually done on the importance of “feeding the people” before teaching it, and that he was willing to consider “punishments” as a positive aid to “teaching.”

Ten Sections written for Ex-Emperor Go-Yōzei, one cannot but wonder what use he could possibly have had for advice like the following:

A ruler looks whether his servants are wise. Of those who are, he raises the rank and increases the salary; those who are not, he keeps down in rank and uses for what they are suited for.¹¹³

Countries have different sizes. The large countries “employ” the small ones and the small countries “serve” the large ones. This is a principle (*li*) that certainly is so.¹¹⁴

Although the situations in which the various recipients of Seika’s advice find themselves are quite different, the tenor and the tone of the several works remain the same. This needs some sort of explanation.

Another historical coincidence is the fact that some Confucian preconceptions, especially the fundamental importance accorded to agriculture and the concomitant stress on the necessity of thrift, and the stratified and feudal character of society, were common to both China (as far as the last aspect is concerned, only to the China of the Zhou dynasty) and Japan.

The importance of agriculture, however, was one of the basic assumptions of all East Asian civilizations at all times, and the division of society into the four groups of *shi*, farmers, artisans, and merchants was a rhetorical way of expressing the inescapable fact that not all people are equal, the actual divisions into classes, castes and occupational groups being quite different at various times and in the various countries.¹¹⁵ Consequently, the one similarity has nothing to do with the influence of

¹¹³ Ōta I, p. 241.

¹¹⁴ Ōta I, p. 247.

¹¹⁵ The stratification and feudalization of society is often cited as one of the factors that contributed to the adoption of Confucianism, and it is true that, during the Edo period, many Japanese were wont to describe their society as consisting of the four classes mentioned above. (The *shi*, however, were the warriors, not the gentry or the literati, as in China.) Seika does so (see *Daigaku yōryaku*: Ōta I, p. 379; NST XXVIII, p. 42). But different models were equally possible. Nakae Tōju, who evidently prefers that of the *Xiaoxūe*, in his *Okina mondō* distinguishes between the emperor, the feudal lords (*shokō*, = *daimyō*), the high dignitaries (*kei taifu* 卿大夫, = the *kuge* and the high ranking *bushi* 武士 like *karō* 家老 etc.), the *bushi* of lower ranks (*shi*, = *samurai*), and the people (*shojin* 庶人, = farmers, artisans and merchants): op. cit., ZZGR X, p. 107; NST XXIX, p. 27 sqq. It is far from perfect: the *shōgun* has been omitted, the *kuge* and high ranking *bushi* are lumped together, and the important distinction between

Confucianism, and the other is merely verbal.

The only way out of these inconsistencies would be to understand the “practical” character to which Confucianism lays claim in the sense that in Confucianism is given to this word “practical,” i.e. “concerned with human affairs, concerned with the things of this world, which is thought to have real, objective existence.”

This does not mean that Seika had no eye for reality: numerous passages in his letters alone show that he knew what was going on, and with his connections he must have had some inkling of the practical problems with which politicians and rulers had to deal. I only mean to say that it was Seika’s intention to explain Confucianism as such, and that all references to real situations (and a few of those can be found in the *Suntetsu-roku* and the *Daigaku yōryaku*) are merely in the nature of illustrations.¹¹⁶ The very fact that it was Confucianism guaranteed the practical character and applicability of his teachings.

As regards the doctrinal aspects, it can be said that the central concept of his doctrine is the heart (*xin*), rather than *li* or “nature” (*xing*). This is suggested both by the descriptions of Kang Hang and Hayashi Razan,¹¹⁷ and by the sections of the *Daigaku yōryaku* translated above. Because Seika stresses the unitary aspects of the concept “heart,” he escapes the usual dichotomies between *li* and *qi* etc. that are characteristic of Zhu Xi and of orthodox Neo-Confucianism in general. The importance of these concepts is correspondingly small.

nōmin 農民 and *chōnin* 町人, farmers and citizens, is not made, but as a description of the classes into which Japanese society was divided at the time, it is nearer to the truth than the usual *shi-nō-kō-shō* 士農工商 model.

¹¹⁶ E.g. *Daigaku yōryaku* (Ōta I, p. 411; NST XXVIII, pp. 72-73), where the Chinese word *wangren* 亡人 (“lost people”), that is used in the *Daxue*, is explained as “What is nowadays called *rōnin* (masterless samurai) and such”; *ibid.* (Ōta I, p. 417; NST XXVIII, p. 77) a passage where a reference is made to the unsettled conditions Japan had experienced in recent times.

¹¹⁷ In his second letter to Seika, Razan calls Seika’s Confucianism *shingaku* (*Bunshū* 2: I, p. 16). The use of this term does not, as yet, indicate partisanship of Wang Yangming. Rather, in the seventeenth century *shingaku*, the “Study of the Heart,” was used as a generic name for Confucianism as such, emphatically including that of Zhu Xi. Cf. the discussion in Ishikawa Ken, *Sekimon-shingaku shi no kenkyū*, pp. 30-35. Until well into the eighteenth century Japanese Confucians, e.g. Kaibara Ekken in his *Shingaku-ben*, quoted by Ishikawa, *op. cit.* p. 31, claimed that the real *shingaku* was that of Zhu Xi.

Li (“principle”) is used by Seika as an easy means to define, rhetorically, the universal applicability of Confucianism:

The existence of *li* [is universal] like [that of] heaven that covers all or like [that of] the earth that bears everything. In this country the *li* are what they are, and in Korea, and in Annam, and in China, too, they are [the same]. To the east of the Eastern Sea and to the west of the Western Sea these words apply and these *li* are the same. In north and south, too, this is the case. Are they not most fair, most great, most correct and most bright? If there are people who make [these *li*] their private property (i.e. restrict their applicability to themselves. WJB), I will not believe them.

Seika commented on this, saying: “This is what Lu Xiangshan meant with ‘To regard these *li* as being the same and to regard these hearts as being the same.’ It is truly as [he says]. If they were not the same, they would not be *li*. If between two things there exists even a little selfishness, they will eventually be cut apart and separated. There are people who are selfish knowingly and those who are selfish unwittingly. Those who are so unwittingly can through study become [unselfish and] fair; those who are so wittingly are really selfish.”¹¹⁸

Although every blade of grass and every tree was supposed to have its own “principle,” the *li par excellence* were the Five Constant Virtues 五常 of Benevolence, Righteousness, etc. and the other principles of social organization. What Seika is saying here is, therefore, that man is alike everywhere to the extent that he is endowed with the same nature, and that the Five Human Relations of father and son, lord and servant, etc. are identical always and everywhere, and exist as the very nature of man and society; if somebody tries to restrict the applicability of these categories only to himself, his group, or his own nation, he must be mistaken.

Seika knows of course that in the ordinary orthodox interpretation a wider meaning is attached to this concept of *li*, and that this is linked up with the most important practice of the “investigation of things,”¹¹⁹ but since *gewu* to him does not mean “to exhaust the *li*,” he has less use for the concept than most orthodox Confucians. And if he had little use for *li*, he had even less for *qi*, a concept he never mentions at all.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ *Seika mondō: Bunshū* 32 (I, p. 348); NST XXVIII, p. 202.

¹¹⁹ Other examples can be found in the first section of the *Goji no nan* and in the *Seika mondō*.

¹²⁰ See Appendix I: “On *Qi*,” at the end of this chapter.

Another dichotomy that is irrelevant to Seika is the opposition between what may be termed “knowledge” and “action.” The problem is in its most trivial form contained in the question: “Why do people sometimes do bad things, even though they know that they should not?”¹²¹ As a dogmatic problem, however, it is more complicated. It ultimately concerns the nature of the relation obtaining between the first till fourth stage of the Eight Steps of the *Daxue* (“the investigation of things” etc., which are concerned with the right knowledge) and the fifth and following stages (“the cultivation of the body” etc., which are concerned with correct action).

Zhu Xi never gave a satisfactory solution to this problem. He prescribed two different ascetical practices, namely “to exhaust the *li*” in order to know what one should do, and “seriousness” in order to discipline one’s heart and body, thus enabling oneself to practise what one had come to recognize as right. It had been at this point that Wang Yangming had rebelled: the investigation of things, at least in Zhu Xi’s definition of the term, was impossible and unnecessary; *gewu* was not an intellectual, contemplative activity but the “rectification of things” — “things” for the purpose being defined as “the first stirrings of our will.” It directly concerned man’s behaviour. If *gewu* already is a kind of discipline that is concerned with our behaviour on the same footing as the other stages of self-cultivation enumerated in the Eight Steps, the fundamental unity of knowledge and action is proven.

Seika and Lin Zhaoen also rebelled against this part of Zhu Xi’s doctrine. Nevertheless, it seems to me that there are appreciable differences between Seika’s reasoning and that of Wang Yangming.¹²²

The Japanese glosses of *gewu* that are associated with the interpretation of Yangming and Seika are respectively *mono o tadasu* 正物 (to rectify things) and *mono o saru* 去物 (to remove things). The underlying conceptions differ correspondingly. According to Yangming the way to “extend one’s knowledge” (*zhi zhi* 致知), i.e. to

¹²¹ This is the level on which Seika poses the problem in the *Suntetsu-roku*: “If one knows, one will probably also practise it. If one does not know, even if one’s native talents are good, how should one practise it? First one must know.” (Ōta I, p. 320; NST XXVIII, p. 11)

¹²² As regards the relation between Seika and Wang Yangming and the possible influences exerted by the latter on Seika, cf. Kanaya, “Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku shisō,” NST XXVIII, pp. 462-463. Cf. also *supra*, n. 86.

realise completely the innate intuitive knowledge (*liangzhi* 良知), is to “rectify things,” i.e. make correct one’s will (*yi* 意).¹²³ In Seika’s case *gewu* is the way to make clear the mind by wiping off “things,” i.e. the passions, greed, partiality, preconceptions, etc. that distort clear perception by the heart. To Yangming, knowledge and action are one, because the *liangzhi* can only be apprehended when in action: the will can only be rectified when it exists, i.e. when the heart is in operation, reacting to something, willing something. In Seika’s interpretation, however, action will take care of itself, if only the heart’s perception is clear and unclouded.¹²⁴ So it is along quite different roads that Seika and Yangming arrive at similar conclusions, namely that there is no need for two different forms of discipline, one for “knowledge” and one for “acting,” that must be practised separately.

How in Seika’s mind the two methods of *gewu* and seriousness are on the same line and shade off into one another, is also shown clearly in the next quotation. (As we have seen, Seika quite rightly was of the opinion that seriousness was a way of “preserving the original heart.” In the *Daigaku yōryaku* he quotes Cheng Yichuan’s famous definition that “[The heart] makes unity its rule and does not go forth” 主一而無適.¹²⁵ Note, however, how in the following quotation his imagery alternates between the

¹²³ For my rendering of the ideas of Wang Yangming, cf. Shimada, *Daigaku Chūyō*, pp. 84-85. Yangming’s interpretation of *gewu* gave rise to the criticism that we also find quoted by Razan in the *Daigaku genkai*, namely that in this way *gewu*, (*chengyi*), and *zhengxin* all would come down to the same: “The *wu* of *gewu* are the things (*shì*) that are in the will (*yi*). When one rectifies (*zheng*) these ‘things,’ exerting one’s intuitive knowledge (*liangzhi*), one does good and one does not do evil; since this [doing good and not doing evil] is sincere, it says [in the *Daxue*] that the will is sincere. However, already Xu Bidong 徐筆洞 has criticised this, saying that when [the *Daxue* explicitly says that] one should rectify (*zheng*) one’s heart and one yet interprets *ge* as ‘to rectify,’ it is a duplication: if one says [that *gewu* means] to rectify the *wu*, i.e. the will (*yi*), it is in no respect different from ‘to rectify the heart’ (*zhengxin*).” (*Daigaku genkai* II, ad *gewu*)

¹²⁴ Cf. Razan’s criticism in the *Daigaku Dōshun shō*, which, though its target is not mentioned by name, is aimed at Lin Zhaoen and Seika. (*Mono o sutsu* 捨物 is another reading of *gewu* that is associated with Lin Zhaoen’s interpretation.) It runs as follows: “In recent times a different theory has arisen. It[s] proponents] make us read *gewu* as *mono o sutsu* (‘to throw away things’). Since *ge* (*todomu*, *sashioku*) and [this] *ge* are interchangeable, they read it [also] as *sashioku*. *Sashioku* means ‘to leave alone.’ Things and affairs are extremely many and various. [Yet they want us] to leave them as they are, disregarded and discarded, and thus [they want us] to realise the [original] spirituality and brightness of our hearts. They say that *gewu zhi zhi* is that we reach the spirituality and wisdom of our hearts because, having discarded the myriad affairs, we let our hearts not be worried by them.” (*Daigaku Dōshun shō*, p. 14a)

¹²⁵ Ōta I, p. 386; NST XXVIII, p. 52

heart that, as a fire-cracker or a horde of monkeys, is shooting off into all directions and must be collected again, concentrated into one, and his image of the mirror.)

If one has truly come to know one's own highest good to the full and [at that point] rests in seriousness (*zhijing*), then one's [heart] will be settled (*ding* 定) naturally, without waiting.

As regards "to settle" - When one rests in the one point that is the highest good and the heart is at rest and does not shift, one should know that it is settled. Then, as [Cheng] Mingdao says in his *Dingxing shu*,¹²⁶ [the heart] is "settled when one moves and also when one is quiet." Therefore, [whether one finds oneself] in [the press of] the court or of the market, in the midst of a hundred, a thousand or ten thousand troops or in the middle of the mountains, if one has truly realised the principle of the good that is in one's heart and rests in it in seriousness, [the heart] will of itself shine forth clearly and not be swept away by things or incidents. Even in movement it is settled and quiet.

As regards "[the object of pursuit] being determined, a calm unperturbedness may be attained to"¹²⁷ — if, as we have said above, all affairs have been settled in one place and the heart is at rest, it will be quiet in the heart. In this case it applies again that if my heart is clear, it will not be moved because of things (*wu*), and therefore will become quiet whether in [the press] of court, the market, or in the middle of the mountains.

As regards "To that calmness there will succeed a tranquil repose" — if in our hearts there is ease, and if they are clear, without one clouded spot, tranquil repose will come naturally, without waiting."¹²⁸

Because of his refusal (e.g. in his correspondence with Razan) to confine himself to one school of Neo-Confucianism — concretely: to reject Lu Xiangshan and Wang Yangming in favour of Zhu Xi — Seika's philosophy is often described as eclectic.

It is true that if we check Seika's reliability on various articles of doctrine with the help of a simplified digest of orthodox Neo-Confucianism, he is found to be at fault on many points. These charges of eclecticism seem all the more convincing because Seika often expresses himself through the medium of orthodoxy, especially in arguments that to him are of secondary importance, or when he is interviewed by Razan. However, if he is approached as a thinker *sui generis*, his thought appears to be far from eclectic and on the whole quite consistent.

¹²⁶ Cf. *Mingdao wenji* 3, "Da Heng Qu Xiansheng ding xing shu" 答橫渠先生定性書.

¹²⁷ *Daxue, jing*, second paragraph; the translation is Legge's.

¹²⁸ Ōta I, p. 387; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 52-53.

B. Hayashi Razan

If Seika only left a small *œuvre*, Razan's writings are voluminous. His Collected Literary Works number 150 fascicles, seventy-five each for prose and poetry.¹²⁹ The "List of works edited or written" (*Henchosho-moku* 編著書目) by Razan adds another 147 titles¹³⁰ and notwithstanding the much-lamented great fire of 1657, which annihilated Razan's library and destroyed the old man's life, still very much is left.

All the works that are included in the *Razan Rin-sensei bunshū* and *Shishū* are in Chinese. The for our purposes most important part naturally is the *Bunshū*, in which, amongst other writings, the letters (*sho* 書), inscriptions (*ki* 記), essays (*ron* 論), conversations (*mondō* 問答), and commonplace-books (*zuihitsu* 隨筆) are collected.

The works that are not included in the *Bunshū* and *Shishū* can be classified roughly as historical works, literary compilations, annotated editions or translations of Chinese and Japanese classics, introductions to Confucianism and Shinto, reference works, etc. Part of these works was printed, but many circulated only as manuscripts.

For the study of Razan's thought¹³¹ the most important sources are his philosophical writings in Japanese (the *Shunkan-shō*, *Santoku-shō* and the *Shintō denju* 神道傳授,¹³² his annotated editions of Chinese classics (e.g. the *Daigaku genkai*, *Rongo Wa-ji kai*, and the *Rōshi Kensai kōgi* 老子麤齋口義), his editions of Confucian primers

¹²⁹ The *Razan Rin-sensei Bunshū* and *Shishū* were compiled after Razan's death by his sons Gahō and Tokkōsai. They were first published in 1662, but Gahō's postface is dated 1659, a mere two years after Razan's death.

¹³⁰ *Henchosho-moku* in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 4 (pp. 56-65).

¹³¹ Modern studies are Inoue Tetsujirō, *Shushigakuha*, pp. 49-94; Abe Yoshio, *Chōsen*, pp. 185-211; Imanaka Kanji, *Seiritsu*, pp. 271-363; Ishida Ichirō, "Tokugawa hōken shakai to Shushi-gakuha no shisō"; id., "Zenki bakuhan taisei no ideorogii"; id., "Razan no shisō"; id., "Hayashi Razan: Muromachi-jidai ni okeru Zen-Ju no itchi to Fujiwara Seika Hayashi Razan no shisō." The only study in a western language is J.B. Duthu, "Hayashi Razan, un Confucian du XVIIe siècle."

¹³² *Shunkan-shō* in *ZZGR* X, pp. 42-65; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 115-149. *Santoku-shō* in *ZZGR* X, pp. 66-90; *NST* XXVIII, pp. 151-186. Part of the *Santoku-shō*, the "*Ri-ki no ben*," has been translated by L. Brüll, "Prinzip (*ri*) und Materie (*ki*) - Ein Beitrag zur Metaphysik des Hayashi Razan." *Shintō denju* in *NST* XXXIX, pp.

like the *Seiri jigi genkai* 性理字義諺解, and a number of collections of quotations from the Chinese classics with a commentary in Japanese, on the same pattern as Seika's *Suntetsu-roku* (the *Keisho yōgo*, the *Keisho yōgo kai* 經書要語解, the *Yōki chigen kai* 養氣知言解, and the *Shigen-shō* 卮言抄), and his collection of essays in Neo-Confucian casuistry, the *Jumon shimon roku* 儒門思問錄. Apart from these, the essays etc. in the *Bunshū* must, of course, also be taken into account.

1. The Doctrine

We will start our inquiry from what is perhaps an unusual angle, namely from the Shinto writings of Razan.¹³³ It seems to me that one will fail to arrive at a balanced understanding of Razan's "thought," if one studies his Confucian writings without taking his Shinto ones into account. The mere fact that he occupied himself with Shinto studies, and also the contents of these studies, offer valuable indications regarding the interpretation of his philosophy and his intellectual pedigree. Especially if one wants to attempt a comparison of Seika and Razan *as thinkers*, which is what we are doing

11-57; *Shintō sōsetsu*, pp. 14-46.

¹³³ The bibliographical interrelations of Razan's Shinto writings are rather complicated. In the *Henchosho-moku* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 4, p. 63) a *Shintō denju shō* is mentioned that consisted of "one hundred and several tens of sections." All manuscripts, however, that I have seen, and also the edition in the *NST* XXXIX, have eighty-eight or eighty-seven sections. Originally Razan seems to have written every section on a separate slip of paper (cf. Taira Shigemichi, "Kinsei no Shintō shisō," *NST* XXXIX, p. 518). Since the contents of the several manuscripts of the *Shintō denju* are identical, they will go back to one common ancestor that Razan compiled on the basis of this larger *Shintō denju shō*. In that case the *Shintō hiden setchū zokkai* 神道秘傳折衷俗解 (not listed in the *Henchosho-moku*; hereafter cited as "*Zokkai*"), which in many places has the same contents and even uses the same wording as the *Shintō denju*, might well be a separate, partial recension of the same *Shintō denju shō*. The original version of the *Shintō denju* as we know it stems from Razan, as is borne out by the *okugaki* 奥書 that appear in the various extant manuscripts, e.g. the first *okugaki* of the manuscript in the possession of Kyōto University, which runs as follows: "The foregoing volume [contains] the secrets of the ultimate truths (*ōgi* 奥義) of Shinto. Requested by the Lord of Wakasa, Minor Captain of the Left, Minamoto no *ason* Sakai [Tadakatsu], I have made a clear copy and offer it to him. I hope that no others will see it. In the Shōhō era, *Minbu-kyō hōin* Hayashi Dōshun." The *Shintō denju ōgi shō* (manuscript in the possession of the Mukyūkai, Tōkyō), which in the *Kokusho sōmokuroku* is listed as a separate work, is just another copy of the *Shintō denju*. The text is identical with the above mentioned manuscripts and the colophon, too, reappears in a somewhat abbreviated form. The other colophons show that this text is a copy made in Bunka 2 (1805) of a copy made in Shōtoku 4 (1714).

here, Razan's Shinto theology offers various useful keys.

The kind of Shinto Razan propagates in his Shinto writings is the so-called *Ritōshinchi shintō* 理當心地神道. He developed it himself, under the influence of the medieval Shinto of the Yoshida 吉田 and of Neo-Confucianism (both directly and indirectly: Neo-Confucian influences were already present in Yoshida Shinto). He defines *Ritōshinchi shintō* as follows:

The kind of Shinto that is known at court is called *Ritōshinchi shintō*. This is [the same as] the Kingly Way. The Kingly Way and the Way of the Gods are originally the same. The heart of man is the place where the gods dwell. The fact that this heart is endowed with all kinds of *li*, is [what is] meant with [the term] *ri tō* ("the *li* are present in". WJB). When Amaterasu Ōmikami gave her imperial grandson Ninigi no Mikoto the three regalia and sent him down from heaven she instructed him [as follows], saying: "The Land of the Abundant Ears of the Reed Plains is the country where my children and grandchildren will be rulers. [You,] imperial grandson, must go [down] and rule over it. The flourishing of the imperial succession will be eternal like heaven and earth." ... When one compares the three regalia (i.e. respectively the mirror, the jewel, and the sword. WJB) with [the three virtues of] wisdom 智, benevolence 仁, and courage 勇, [one will see that none of them] is outside of the heart, [just like] there are no gods outside of the heart. The instruction that Amaterasu Ōmikami imparted to her grandson was that, if he ruled over Japan with these three virtues, the imperial throne would last forever, coeval with heaven and earth, and his progeny would live for ten thousand generations.

If we pursue this meaning [further] and extend it, how then could the [instruction of] "holding fast to the Mean (*zhi zhong* 執中) which Yao, Shun and Yu gave [to one another] when they passed on the empire, be any different?¹³⁴ That the three virtues are well in accord with the *li*, that is the Mean. Nothing would prevent us from calling this also "the *li* are present in the heart (*ri tō shinchi*).". Therefore, we have said that the Way of the Gods is the Kingly Way. ... In the *Zhou Yi* 周易 the hexagram *guan* 觀 is explained as the Holy Ones who "in accordance with the spirit-like way laid down their instructions, and all

¹³⁴ The *locus classicus* is *Shujing* 1, 3 ("Da Yu mo"). Legge, *Shu Ching*, p. 23, translates this passage of the instructions of Shun to Yu on the occasion of his abdication in the latter's favour as follows: "The mind of man is restless, prone to err; its affinity for the right way is small. Be discriminating, be undivided in the pursuit of what is right that you may sincerely hold fast to the Mean." In *Lunyu* XX, 1, the same words "hold fast to the Mean" are used, but now they are laid in the mouth of Yao who is instructing Shun." Cf. also Razan's explication of the term in a Confucian context, in *Santoku-shō*, "Ri-Ki no ben," *NST* XXVIII, pp. 169-170.

under heaven yield submission to them.”¹³⁵ Is this not the Kingly Way? Let alone: the Way of the Holy Ones?

After the [power of the imperial] court had declined and the Kingly Laws had been abolished, ... how could one know that the Way of the Gods [in reality] was the Kingly Law? How could one understand the deep meaning of the three regalia? ... Eventually, one did not even know this name *Ri tō shinchi*. But I have heard that this [term] *Ritōshinchi Shintō* is mentioned in the records of the Ōe 大江.¹³⁶

Ritōshinchi Shintō - this [term] means that the Way of the Gods is the Kingly Way. Outside of the heart there are no separate gods or separate *li*. The purity and brightness of the heart is the radiance of the gods. The correctness of one's behaviour is the appearance of the gods. The conduct of government is the virtue of the gods. The ruling of the country is the power of the gods. This is what the Sun Goddess has transmitted, what since Emperor Jinmu generation after generation the emperors themselves have known and what, when they were young, the great Ministers of the Left and the Right, the imperial regents (*sesshō*, *kanpaku*) etc. have reverently imparted to them. In recent times people who [claim to] know this Way are not to be trusted.¹³⁷

As far as metaphysics are concerned, the operative words in these two definitions are “heart,” “god(s),” and “*li*.” We will here first concern ourselves with the meaning that Razan in this Shinto context attached to these Neo-Confucian terms. It is true that these terms had been introduced into Shinto theology already by the end of the Kamakura period. Contrary to all previous Shinto theologians, however, Razan was at the same time an orthodox Neo-Confucian. We may suppose that he had some consideration for consistency in the use of these key terms.

For this reason I will set out Razan's Shinto thought against the background of orthodox Neo-Confucianism. If Razan is seen to deviate, I will assume that this is due to pre-existent elements in Shinto theology, but I will not try to pin down the precise origin of such deviations. I will rather try to determine whether any traces of such pre-existent ideas of apparent Shinto origin can be found in his Neo-Confucian

¹³⁵ Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 230. Cf. Honda, *Eki*, pp. 161-162.

¹³⁶ *Zokkai*, pp. 14b-16a. This reference and all following references are to the manuscript copy of this work in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko. The manuscript is not dated and has no signatures or colophons.

¹³⁷ *Shintō denju* 18 (NST XXXIX, pp. 18-19).

writings.¹³⁸ A consequence of this approach is that I will construct Razan's Shinto thought as if it were original and all of one piece, and not — as may well have been the case — a rendering of an existing body of lore, in which he could allow himself only occasional flashes of originality.

In order to be able to apply the cosmological schemes of Neo-Confucianism to Shinto Razan had to re-interpret to some extent the Japanese creation myths. Since the to him most authoritative description of the Age of the Gods was given in the *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 and since according to the *Nihon shoki* the first god from whom the other gods were descended had been Kunitokotachi no Mikoto, the way in which Razan defines this god will offer the key to the rest of his (re)interpretations. Razan gives the following definitions:

What in the books of Zhuangzi and Liezi is called the “Great Beginning” (*taichu* 太初) is the beginning of *qi*. This we can also say of this god (i.e. Kunitokotachi no Mikoto. WJB). The fact that he undergoes thousands of changes and transformation and becomes all various gods, is *the [same] principle (li) according to which* the one *qi* divides into Yin and Yang, and Yin and Yang divide and become the five elements, and the five elements, bringing forth and destroying each other, create the myriad things.¹³⁹

Kunitokotachi no Mikoto is the origin of all gods. He is one, without form, but he has spirituality (*ling* 靈). Men, too, have all received the *qi* of this god. All beginnings of the myriad things are also based on this god.¹⁴⁰

In these two quotations Kunitokotachi no Mikoto seems to be identified with *qi*, but on the other hand we find:

¹³⁸ The opposite approach we find in the very interesting article by Takahashi Miyuki, “Hayashi Razan no Shintō shisō.” In this article Takahashi traces Neo-Confucian influences in Razan's Shinto writings. Cf. esp. her comparison of Yoshida Shinto as it appears in Kiyohara Nobukata's *Nihon Shoki shō*, which she describes as a-moral, with the *Ritōshinchi shintō* of Razan, in which the norms of Confucian ethics occupy a central position (Takahashi, op. cit., *Kikan Nihon shisōshi* V, pp. 117-120). In this study Takahashi also explores the concepts of “god” and “heart” in Razan's Shinto writings. In this respect Takahashi's approach and interests parallel my own. Especially her chapter “Shin-kannen to ri-ki ron no kankei” (op. cit., pp. 109-115) should be read in conjunction with my own *exposé*.

¹³⁹ *Zokkai*, pp. 4b-5a.

¹⁴⁰ *Shintō denju* 33 (NST XXXIX, p. 26). Cf. also *Shintō denju* 4 (ibid., p. 33).

Kunitokotoachi no Mikoto or, as some say, Amanominakanushi no Mikoto — a man of old (i.e. Inbe no Masamichi 忌部正通, fl. ca 1365. WJB) said in his [(*Nihon shoki*) *jindai*] *kuketsu* 日本書紀神代口訣: “The eight hundred myriad gods are one god and the one god is the eight hundred myriad gods.” Methinks, the myriad things come forth out of the five elements, and the five elements are one in Yin and Yang, Ying and Yang are [one in] the Supreme Ultimate 大極, and the Supreme Ultimate originally is the Ultimate of Non-Being (*wuji* 無極). Hereby we can know the secret truth (*ōgi*) about this god.¹⁴¹

The god that existed when heaven and earth divided is called Kunitokotachi no Mikoto. He is the first of the seven generations of heavenly gods. This god divided and became the general body (*sōtai* 總體) of all gods in the same way as, for example, *the moon up in heaven is but one orb, but casts its reflection on all waters*. Nevertheless, the moon has not come down, nor have the waters gone up. The original nature of the moon naturally is fundamentally one, but its appearances are manifold. That the human heart, though fundamentally one, pervades into all things is also [because of] Kunitokotachi no Mikoto.¹⁴²

Here Razan apparently interprets Kunitokotachi no Mikoto as *li*, as his use of the metaphor that is customarily employed to explain the concept of *li yi fenshu* 理一分殊 indicates.

It is possible, in view of the last two quotations, to identify Kunitokotachi no Mikoto with Zhou Dunyi's (and Zhu Xi's) *taiji*, the Supreme Ultimate, that is the origin of *qi* but itself *li*.¹⁴³ That Razan knew this dual character of *taiji* is demonstrated clearly in, of all things, his explanation of Zhang Zai's famous Western Inscription (*Ximing* 西銘):

The Supreme Ultimate brings forth Yin and Yang; Yin and Yang produce the five elements and [these], changing and transforming, generating and destroying [each other], bring forth the myriad things. The supreme Ultimate is *li*; Yin and

¹⁴¹ This passage is from Razan's *Zuihitsu* (*Bunshū* 69: II, p. 419). According to Gahō, the entries in this chapter were written during the Kan'ei era (1624-1643).

¹⁴² *Shintō denju* 3 (*NST* XXXIX, p. 13). Cf. also Taira Shigemichi's headnote to this passage.

¹⁴³ Cf. *Xingli jingyi* 1.4a: “The Supreme Ultimate brings forth Yin and Yang. *Li* brings forth *qi*. When Yin and Yang have been brought forth, the Supreme Ultimate is within them. This means that *li* [which, on the one hand brings forth the *qi*,] is on the other hand present in the inside of the *qi*.” About the complications of Zhu Xi's dualist metaphysics of *li* and *qi*, and especially about the relation of the latter to *taiji* and *wuji*, cf. Yasuda Jirō, *Chūgoku kinsei shisō kenkyū*, pp. 8-16.

Yang are *qi*. Therefore Yin and Yang are the Way. The five elements are one in Yin and Yang. Yin and Yang are one in the Supreme Ultimate. Since [all] men and things come forth from heaven and earth, their *li* are one. Whether it is me or the people or things or brothers, Holy Ones and Sages or evil men, filial children or seditious brigands, rich or poor - these are [all mere] particularizations. Therefore former Confucians evaluated the Western Inscription as [containing the theory that] *li* is one, but particularized in the various things (*li yi fenshu*).¹⁴⁴

It is not only Kunitokotachi no Mikoto, however, who is identified with both *li* and *qi*. In his description of other gods or of the gods in general Razan also uses both identifications. For instance, when speaking of the longevity of the gods, Razan identifies them with *qi*:

Things that have no form and no colour will never be destroyed. Since they never had a beginning, they will never have an end. They appeared before heaven and earth and will always remain, even after heaven and earth [have ceased to exist]. That [the gods] ruled for several tens of thousands of years, must have been said in order to express this aspect of the eternity [of the gods]. *Even if it has no form, what exists is the qi, and referring to the spiritual part (ling) of the qi, one calls it "gods."*¹⁴⁵

In other passages, however, they seem to be identified rather with *li*:

The gods are the origin of heaven and earth and the substance (*ti* 體) of the myriad things. If there were no gods, heaven and earth would perish and the myriad things would not be created. In the human body [the gods] are the mandate (*ming* 命, usually identified with *li*. WJB), they are the *hun* 魂 soul (one of the two human souls, usually identified with Yang. WJB). The five elements are in them and they are undivided. They include the myriad things and make them into one. Because this origin is there, man is born and things

¹⁴⁴ "Seimei-kō kai" 講解 (*Bunshū* 30: I, pp. 335-337). In other places, too, Razan gives a dualistic interpretation of Zhang Zai's monism. Cf. e.g. his commentary to Zhang Zai's dictum "The nature (of men and things) is in the unity of the Great Vacuity and material force. And the mind is in the unity of nature and consciousness" (*Zhangzi quanshu* 2.3b; translation by Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 504). In this commentary Razan writes: "This 'Vacuity' is said of the *li*, because *li* has no form. Through combining *li* and *qi* men and things come into existence. Receiving [this *li*] they have this nature. ... Nature comes from *li*, but does not separate itself from the *qi*. Consciousness (*zhijue* 知覺) comes from the *qi*, but does not separate itself from the *li*. Through combining nature and consciousness they have this heart." (*Seiri jigi genkai* 2.8b-9a)

¹⁴⁵ *Zokkai*, p. 8b. Cf. *Shintō denju* 60 (*NST* XXXIX, p. 42).

are created. If this basis would not be there, man and things would not be created. They seem to be empty, but they are not [empty]. They are void and spiritual (*xuling* 虚靈). These one calls the gods that have no colour or form. *These one calls the li of no beginning or end.* There are beginning and end, and there are the gods of the permanent Way, [unaltered] now or formerly. Therefore they are able to let the myriad things begin and end. This is the secret doctrine of Shinto.¹⁴⁶

In the last section of the *Shintō denju* another suggestive identification occurs. There the god Amanominakanushi no Mikoto is described in the following terms:

The Plain of High Heaven is “heaven” (*tian* 天); it is *li*; it is the great void (*daxu* 大虛) (*sic*). In a place without from spontaneously there are gods, and a place where *li* is, is the place where the gods dwell. In the *Nihongi* the god who dwells in the Plain of High Heaven is called Amanominakanushi.¹⁴⁷ This god, too, is not outside [this] one heart [of mine].¹⁴⁸

Nobody will deny that Neo-Confucian influences are present in the foregoing quotations. The question is, which of the various philosophical systems and cosmological schemes evolved by Neo-Confucian philosophers Razan has taken as his model. Two possibilities present themselves. The first is the dualist cosmological scheme of Zhu Xi as set forth in the *Taijitu shuo* 太極圖說. It comes to mind because of Razan’s oft-repeated declarations of Confucian orthodoxy, and is suggested here by part of the vocabulary he uses. We have tried it on for size just now, in our provisional identification of Kunitokotachi no Mikoto with the Supreme Ultimate. The other possibility is the monist scheme of Zhang Zai as set forth in the *Zhengmeng* 正蒙. This is suggested by the equation of Amanominakanushi with *taixu*, the great void of Zhang Zai’s metaphysics.

¹⁴⁶ *Shintō denju* 66 (NST XXXIX, p. 44).

¹⁴⁷ Amanominakanushi is the first god mentioned in the creation myths of the *Kojiki* 古事記. His position in the *Nihon shoki*, which is Razan’s major source, is considerably less important (cf. Aston, *Nihongi* I, p. 5; Chamberlain, *Translation of the Ko-ji-ki*, p. 17; Shimonaka Yasaburō, comp., *Shintō daijiten* I, p. 55, lemma “Amanominakanushi no kami”). In both the *Kojiki* and the *Nihon shoki*, however, Amanominakanushi appears with the same tag: “The God who was produced in the Plain of High Heaven.”

In view of the dual nature which the Supreme Ultimate and consequently Kunitokotachi no Mikoto possess, Razan could choose to identify the gods either with *li* or with *qi*. Here Razan starts to equivocate. The first course is fraught with difficulties, for *shen* 神 (gods) or *shengui* 神鬼 (the two kinds of gods c.q. spirits, identified with respectively Yang and Yin) are in Neo-Confucian philosophy always defined as kinds or modes of *qi*. The traditional adjective, also used by Razan to qualify the kind of *qi* that is the gods, is *ling* 靈. (*Ling* we have here consistently translated as “spiritual”; cf. Appendix II: On *ling*, at the end of this chapter.)

Did Razan then follow the second course, and identify the gods with *qi*? Sometimes he seems to do just that. We have already come across this tendency in several of the foregoing quotations. The following passage in which the relation between the gods and the heart is ascribed to the unity of the *qi* of the gods and that of the heart furnishes another example:

The *qi* of heaven envelops the earth and penetrates within it. That within the human heart there is a god (*shenling* 神靈), that is heaven. That outside the human body there is emptiness, that is also heaven. Man is within heaven, and heaven is also within the human heart. This is the principle (*li*) of “heaven and man are one body.”¹⁴⁹

Generally speaking it is possible to formulate a consistent case on the basis of an identification of the “gods” with *qi*. It would have to be something along the lines of the monist, materialistic scheme of Zhang Zai. According to Tsai, the *taixu* is *qi* and all created things, too, are *qi*, floating around within the *taixu* as ice floes float on the water.¹⁵⁰ Terms like *li* and *xing* he interprets as mere innate tendencies of *qi*,¹⁵¹ and

¹⁴⁸ *Shintō denju* 89 (NST XXXIX, p. 57).

¹⁴⁹ *Zokkai*, p. 22a.

¹⁵⁰ *Zhangzi quanshu* 2.3a (cf. Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 503): “The *qi*’s gathering and dispersing itself within the *taixu* is like the ice’s coagulating and melting in the water.”

¹⁵¹ *Zhangzi quanshu* 2.2a: “The *qi* of heaven and earth gathers and disperses itself, repulses and attracts in a hundred ways. As *li*, however, is has a sequence and is not disorderly.” (Cf. also Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 501) Ibid., 1.2a: “Therefore that which fills the universe I regard as my body, and that which directs the universe I consider as my nature.” (Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 497) “That which directs the universe” etc. is explained ibid. as follows: “*Qian* 乾 (the first hexagram, = heaven. WJB) is

the concepts *shen* and *gui* he treats as referring to the spontaneous activity that the two *qi*, i.e. Yin and Yang, display in “expanding and retracting.”

Not only in the philosophy of Zhang Zai, but in all orthodox Neo-Confucianism “gods” is a dualist concept; the “gods” are divided into *gui* and *shen*. The two standard definitions are “the traces of the creative process” (*zaohua zhi ji* 造化之迹) and “the innate capacities of the two *qi*” (*er qi zhi liangneng* 二氣之良能). These definitions, given respectively by Cheng Yichuan and Zhang Zai, Razan explains as follows in his *Seiri jigi genkai*:

“The traces of the creative process” refers to the fact that, when Yin and Yang flow around, [these *gui* and *shen*] appear and can be seen between heaven and earth. The subtlety [of Yin and Yang] cannot be seen, but the coming and going, the expansion and retraction of one [of the] *qi*, which is what is meant with “traces of the creative process” can be seen. Outwardly they appear as the sun and the moon, as day and night, wind and rain, hoarfrost and dew, etc.; things like these are the traces of the *gui* and *shen*.

“Innate capacities” refers to the fact that the expansion and retraction, the coming and going of the two *qi* are [what they (i.e. the *gui* and *shen*. WJB)] are by their nature [most] eminently able [to do]. The two *qi* are Yin and Yang. The “innate capacities” are their spiritual place (*lingchu* 靈處). ... Generally *gui* and *shen* refer to the fact that the two *qi* Yin and Yang are well able to retract and to expand, to come and to go. The *shen* are the spiritual part (*ling*) of Yang, the *gui* of Yin.¹⁵²

Although there are many similarities, yet we cannot say that Razan was simply applying the system of Zhang Zai. For one thing, the dual character of the gods (i.e. *shen* versus *gui*, Yang versus Yin) is much less pronounced in Razan’s thought than it should be according to the system of Zhang Zai. In *Shintō denju* 87, where Razan joins issue with the Buddhists in regard to the interpretation of the concept of the “three worlds,” he does not make the usual distinction between *shen* (= Yang, = beginning) and *gui* (= Yin, = end) but, initially at least, he interprets the gods (*kami*) as the dark, quiescent, permanent aspect of nature and contrasts them with the things that

vigorous and *kun* 坤 (the second hexagram, = earth. WJB) is yielding. This determination (*zhi* 志) of heaven and earth is what directs the *qi* and what human beings acquire to make it their nature.”

¹⁵² *Seiri jigi genkai* 7.1a-b.

“exist.”¹⁵³ The second and main argument is, of course, the great importance that Razan says he attaches to the concept of *li*. The name that he chose for his own variety of Shinto will suffice to prove this.¹⁵⁴

The nature of the difficulties in which Razan found himself involved is obvious. Note, e.g., the inconsistencies in the following quotation, where the gods are said to be the origin of their own existence:

Although the gods have no form, there is spirituality: [this is] the reason why the *qi* operates. When the single *qi* has not yet taken on a form (“budded”),¹⁵⁵ and also when it has, this *li* is there from the beginning, without sound and without smell, without beginning and without end. The reason that generates the *qi* and the gods is *li*. [The *li*] is true, and the origin of all things. Heterodox schools do not know this *li*.¹⁵⁶

In one of the foregoing quotations, where he also tried to interpret the gods as *li*, Razan had to construct an opposition between “the gods of the permanent Way” which he describes as “the *li* of no beginning or end,” and the myriad things which do have a beginning and end, and should be classified as *qi*. However, this clashes directly with other parts of his Shinto writings, where this same distinction is described in terms of a difference between the permanence of *qi* as such and the evanescence of the various forms it takes on during the process of creation, as it is by Zhang Zai.

Of course, Razan knew the meaning of the concept *li*, but the identity that according to him should exist between the gods and the *li* is tenuous — untenable, in

¹⁵³ *Shintō denju* 87 (NST XXXIX, pp. 55-56).

¹⁵⁴ A third argument that might be brought to bear is, that Razan uses a different vocabulary from Zhang Zai. Esp. the term *ling*, which Razan uses so profusely, Zai never uses at all. This is, I think, related to the fact that to Zai the concept of “heart” is of much less importance than to Razan. Cf. also the appendix at the end of this chapter.

¹⁵⁵ That *ikki* 一氣 should mean *qi* in its chaos-like, undivided state emerges clearly from another passage in the *Shintō denju*. Since this passage is also of relevance to the rest of this quotation, I will here translate part of it: “When they have not yet divided, Yin and Yang are called ‘chaos.’ It is one [single] *qi*. When the one *qi* divides, it becomes [Yin and] Yang. (The Yang god is called Izanagi; the Yin god is called Izanami.) These two gods, intermingling, bring forth the myriad things.” (*Shintō denju* 10, NST XXXIX, p. 15)

¹⁵⁶ *Shintō denju* 35 (NST XXXIX, p. 28). The first half of the quotation strongly suggests that the *shen*, which are *ling* and cause the *qi* to operate, are identical with the *li*. This is also the interpretation that Taira Shigemichi gives in the headnote to this passage. When it is said, however, that the *li*, in its turn, brings forth the *qi* and the gods, we see that this interpretation leads to a contradiction.

fact — and the identification is not consistently maintained even by Razan himself.

That he meant *li* to be taken in its ordinary meaning is shown by the following quotation:

The Way of the gods is *li*. The myriad things do not exist outside the *li*. The *li* is what is true in nature. In some theories, however, (i.e. in Buddhism. WJB) one speaks of clinging to the *li* as “the hindrance of the *li*,” and even considers this as a hindrance to the heart.¹⁵⁷ [According to them, *li*] should merely be understood as the causal relation [which] in this world [makes] the flowers open and fall and the seasons follow one another. This theory sounds very elevated, but [in fact its proponents] do not know the fundamental *li*. Therefore, they consider it as a hindrance. If one thinks, however, that the [*li*] stops with man, the myriad things and the advent of the seasons, [one does not know] the real meaning of Shinto. To say that “to cling to the *li* is a hindrance,” is within the *li*, and to say that “[*li*] is the causal relation [that makes] the seasons follow one upon the other,” is also within the *li*. They have misunderstood a *li* [that is in itself] correct (*zheng li*), and regard [this misapprehension] as *li*. How could [all] changes that have occurred between former times and now or the advent of the seasons be outside the immutable *li*? To know the *li* we regard as [knowing] the Way of the Gods.

The most likely conclusion seems to us that Razan started out with Zhu Xi’s dualist cosmological scheme but could not remain true to it when he tried to apply it to Shinto. The reason why he could not do this was that he had to take the gods as the underlying, unifying principle of creation, but that, notoriously, these gods are *qi*.¹⁵⁸ When it comes to the definition of the concept “heart,” Razan again confronts the same difficulty, namely how to maintain a duality in Neo-Confucian terms between the heart and the gods:

The gods (*kami*) are the spirituality of heaven and earth. The heart (*kokoro*) is the dwelling place of the gods (*shinmei*). Dwelling means house. If we make a comparison, this body is like a house, the heart is like the master of the house, and the gods are like the soul (*tamashii*) of the master.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ This idea of the Buddhists is also described and criticized by Cheng Yichuan: cf. *I-shu* 18:11a, and the translation in Chan, *Chinese Philosophy*, p. 565 (nr. 54).

¹⁵⁸ Quotation in *Shintō denju* 67 (NST XXXIX, p. 45). Cf. Gernet, *Chine et Christianisme*, p. 277, “les esprits et les dieux ne sont qu’une forme plus déliée et plus subtile de l’énergie universelle qui ... est à l’origine de toutes les choses du monde.”

¹⁵⁹ For a similar passage cf. *Shintō denju* 37 (NST XXXIX, p. 29), where this relationship of the gods to

All myriad things that have a form will disappear. The gods do not have a form. Where our eyes cannot see them, densely they fill heaven and earth and are always present.

When one does good one is in accord with the Way of Heaven (*tiandao* 天道), because one is [then] following the gods in one's heart. When one does evil one receives punishment, because one [then] goes counter to the gods in one's heart. This is because the gods and the gods in our hearts are originally the same principle (*li*).¹⁶⁰

The purity of the heart [exists] because the gods are there. It is like the purity and brightness of a mirror. Because one purifies [one's heart] more and more, one removes the impurity (*nigori*) from the mirror (*kagami*): in this way the gods have come to be called *kami*.¹⁶¹

In Neo-Confucianism the comparison of the heart to the master of a house is standard, but the comparison of the god(s) dwelling in the heart to the soul of the master, is not. Transposed into Neo-Confucian terms, the comparison should mean that the god(s) correspond to human nature (*xing*), i.e. the *li* that are bestowed in the heart. As a matter of fact, in a parallel passage, Razan says that following:

The gods are the spirituality of the heart. Even though the heart has no form, that what it has by birth is called “spirituality,” or “subtlety.” However, [in Buddhism, someone who] expels this spirituality is considered to be a Buddha! They say that, notwithstanding this spirituality or this subtlety, the heart originally is nothingness (*wu*), that in [the act of] hearing or seeing [things] are

the heart is explained with help of the Shinto concept of *himorogi* 神籬 (“sanctuary”).

¹⁶⁰ That Razan understood this punishment or reward to be the outcome of an automatic process, not dependent on an act of will of a god, is shown by another section of the *Shintō denju*: “Punishment and advantage arise [spontaneously]. The gods do not impart good fortune. If man does good, spontaneously advantage will be produced. The gods do not impart punishment: if man does evil, automatically there will be punishment.” (*Shintō denju* 68: NST XXXIX, p. 45) Razan had to make himself clear on this point, if he did not want to be confused with the proponents of the *tentō shisō* 天道思想.

¹⁶¹ *Shintō denju* 1 (NST XXXIX, p. 12). In his headnote to this passage, Taira Shigemichi quotes a parallel passage from an older Shinto text of the Yoshida school, in which Shinto terms are substituted for *li* and its various aspects (*ming, dao, xing*): “In heaven and earth [*li*] are called gods, in the myriad things spirituality, and in man the heart. The heart, then, is the dwelling of the gods and the shrine of chaos (*konton no miya* 混沌ノ宮).” Taira claims (ibid., same page) that this quotation is from the *Shintō taii* 大意, ascribed to Urabe Kanenao 卜部兼直 (fl. ca 1215), but the quotation appears to be from Kanenao's *Shintō yurai ki* 由來記 (cf. Hayakawa, *Shintō sōsetsu*, p. 1). A slightly different wording can be found in the beginning of the *Shintō taii* (Hayakawa, op. cit, p. 8), which work according to the *Shintō sōsetsu* should be ascribed to Yoshida Kanetomo 吉田兼俱 (1435-1511). Taira's mistake is perhaps due to the circumstance that the *Shintō taii chū* (text in Hayakawa, op. cit, pp. 141-146) by Yoshikawa Koretari (1616-1694) is in fact a commentary on the *Yurai ki*. In one of the colophons of the *Shintō taii chū* 註 (quoted Hayakawa, op. cit, p. 146), the *Yurai ki* is referred to as the “*Shintō taii* of Kanenao.”

reflected in it at that time, but that, when these things have passed, it is [again] as it is, [in its] original [state of] nothingness. This sounds very elevated, but in Shinto it is rather different. If in the heart there would exist no spirituality, how could it at a given time suddenly appear? *Originally the heart has no colour or form, but the principle that from the beginning certainly is there, one calls gods or spirituality or subtlety.* This is a secret doctrine of Shinto and must not be divulged.¹⁶²

“No colour or form” is generally said of the *li*, and “a principle (*daoli* 道理) that from the beginning is present” in the heart, cannot very well be anything else but the *li* that make up human nature (*xing*). “Spirituality” (*ling*) and “subtlety” (*miao* 妙), however, are qualifications of the heart as a dualist concept, as the compound of *li* (*xing*) and *qi*. Here again we find that the gods are identified with *li*, but *li* adorned with such unusual epithets that it can hardly be recognized as such.

In one of the above quotations (*supra*, p. 182) we have already seen how Razan explained the unity of the gods and the heart by saying that they were both the same *qi*. In the last quotation but one he explicitly refers to the same metaphor which was also used by Seika, the comparison of the heart to a mirror.¹⁶³ This metaphor occurs in Zen writings,¹⁶⁴ but in Neo-Confucian writings of Chinese origin it is only rarely used, as a cursory glance at the sections on “The Heart” in the *Xingli daquan* or the *Xingli jingyi* 性理精義 will show. When the comparison is made it is generally the dictum of Cheng Yichuan that “The heart of the Holy Ones is like a [clear] mirror, like standing water.”¹⁶⁵ In Japan, however, at least in the cases of Seika and Razan, this metaphor is

¹⁶² *Shintō denju* 73 (NST XXXIX, p. 46). The different meanings that Buddhists and Confucians attached to the terms “heart” (*xin*) and “nature” (*xing*) is one of the more famous topics in the polemics between these two systems. In the *Seiri jigi genkai* Razan has the following to say: “When Buddhists are speaking of ‘nature,’ it is like when Confucians speak of ‘the heart.’ They take those aspects of the ‘heart’ that are defined as ‘emptiness,’ ‘spirituality’ and ‘the faculty of the intellect,’ and call those nature. (*Seiri jigi genkai* 2.8a)

¹⁶³ According to Razan, the metaphor was first used in the *Shijing*: “That one compares the heart to a mirror will have begun with [the phrase] ‘my heart is not a mirror, you cannot scrutinize it.’ (*Shijing* 26. WJB). In books by Zhuangzi and others, and in Buddhist works it also appears, but they are referring to different things.” (*Seiri jigi genkai*) 2.5a)

¹⁶⁴ The metaphor is used, e.g., in the *Tanjing* 壇經 (see Chan, transl., *The Platform Scripture*, p. 41).

¹⁶⁵ *Yishu* 18.16a. The phrase also appears in the *Chengshi cuiyan* 程氏粹言 2.25a. Thence it is quoted in the various standard works such as the *Xingli daquan* (32.2a) and the *Xingli jingyi* (9.13a).

very much in evidence. It has, moreover, a long history in medieval Shinto literature¹⁶⁶ and, no doubt under Shinto influence, it also appears in *shōmono* of Confucian works.¹⁶⁷ However that may be, the implication of this metaphor definitely is that the heart is a unitary concept.

When Razan stresses the possibility and the necessity of cleansing the heart, one is again reminded of Seika. In this Shinto context, Razan of course does not use the concept of *gewu*, but that of purification:

When one thinks no wanton thoughts in one's heart, no evil things, when one does not look at evil forms or listen to lewd sounds, when one does not speak wanton or bad words, when in one's heart one is sincerely intent on communicating with the gods (*shinmei*) and is reverent, one speaks of "inner purification." This is considered as the "purification of the heart" (*shinzai* 心齊). Since the heart is originally empty, this is the "purification of the heart." ... To regulate what has not yet been regulated and to pursue this regulating of the heart to its highest degree, is called "purification." It is the concentrating and regulating of the heart that is scattered and confused. If this heart is correct and pure, it will become the dwelling of the gods. If it is not, when one worships the gods will not accept [this worship]. ... This purity of the heart again is the "inner purity." Apart from this there exists the purification of the Six Roots 六根清淨之祓. This is [a ritual] that that Buddhists perform in emulation of [the Way] of the Gods. The Six Roots are the senses of vision, hearing, smell, taste and touch,

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Shimizu Sadao, *Shintō-shi*, p. 260, the quotations from the [*Nihon Shoki*] *Jindai kuketsu* by Inbe Masamichi: "The heart (*shenlū*; J. *shinryo* 神慮) is like a clear mirror that reflects the myriad things. It does not reject one dharma (*fa*; J. *hō* 法), nor is it soiled by one speck of dust. In heaven it is god, in the myriad things spirituality, and in man it is his true heart (*zhengxin* 正心). When the spirituality of the myriad things or of the heart of man is pure and clear, then as such it is god." And: "The Plain of High Heaven is the name for emptiness and purity. In reference to man it is the state of mind when no thought arises. Amanominakanushi, who was born in this Plain of High Heaven, is the origin of the bright *li*."

¹⁶⁷ Compare, e.g., the commentary given in the *Mōji-shō* by Nobukata on *Mengzi* VII A, 1 ("Those who exhaust their hearts will know their nature") with Zhu Xi's commentary or, for that matter, with Zhao Qi's commentary to the same: "The [*Sishu zhangju*] *jizhu* says that the heart is the god-like and bright [part] of man (*ren zhi shenming* 人之神明); that in which all *li* are possessed, and with which man reacts to the myriad affairs. This means that being the dwelling of the gods (*shinmei* 神明) and possessing all *li* is the substance of the heart, and that reacting to the myriad affairs is the function of the heart. 'To have all *li*' is said in reference to *li*. For example, it is the substance of a mirror to be without one darkened spot and to reflect things. 'To react to the myriad affairs' is said in reference to affairs. In the same way as everything that stands in front of a mirror must necessarily be reflected, this heart changes in reaction to all kinds of things and affairs: this is its function. [As regards] 'to exhaust' — if, when one has exhausted (i.e. expelled completely. WJB) the human desires and the evanescent thoughts (*kelū*; J. *kakuryo* 客慮), the heart has become like a mirror that by its original substance is clear and one will know the nature that one originally has. ... " (Quoted from Ōe Fumiki, *Shisho*, p. 110)

and the faculty of the intellect. They do not exist outside the heart. [Therefore,] if one practises inner purification, the Six Roots will not become dirtied.¹⁶⁸

One way to characterize the Shinto thought of Razan is by the word “unity.” Razan had set out with the double background of a Confucian and a Shinto erudition, and the fact that a number of Neo-Confucian elements had previously found their way into Shinto thought must have made the attempt to conciliate the two seem both feasible and worthwhile, even when — perhaps: precisely because — Razan had gained a better knowledge of Confucian philosophy than the old Shinto theologians had had. So much the better, if this would imply the task of divesting Shinto of its Buddhist accretions.

Razan’s preoccupation with proving “unity” had two main moments. One was historical and political: “The Way of the Gods is the Kingly Way.” As Razan writes in his commonplace book (entry dating from the Keichō era):

Someone asked: “How does one define the boundary between Shinto and Confucianism?” I answered: “From my point of view their *li* is one and the same. Only their [way of] doing [things] is different. After [Mononobe no] Moriya 物部守屋 (d. 587) had died, Shinto was not practised. [Then] Kūkai 空海 (773-835) came, and the Law of the Gods perished all at once. The damage that the heterodox [religion] has done is very great.”

He asked: “The books on the Age of the Gods of the *Nihongi* and Master Zhou’s Explanation of the Diagram of the Supreme Ultimate — are those [like] two sides of the same coin?” I answered: “I do not know yet. Ah! The Kingly Way transforms itself and turns into the Way. The Way is what we call Confucianism. This is not [as the Buddhists call it] an ‘external Way’: the ‘external Way’ is Buddhism. The Buddhists have blocked the path of benevolence and righteousness. How sad! For long now the empire has not known this Way.”¹⁶⁹

One of the reasons why the Way of the Gods could be said to be the same as the Kingly Way we find mentioned in the following quotation:

¹⁶⁸ *Zokkai*, p. 17a-b. Cf. for the purification of the heart *Shintō denju* 64 (*NST* XXXIX, pp. 43-44), and for the purification of the six roots *Shintō denju* 14 (*NST* XXXIX, p. 17). Cf. also *Bunshū* 66 (II, p. 360), where the “inner purification” is equated with “seriousness,” which preserves the heart that the gods may dwell there.

¹⁶⁹ *Bunshū* 66 (II, pp. 360-361).

The people are the lord of the gods (*tami wa kami no nushi nari* 民ハ神ノ主也). “*Tami*” means [us], humans. Precisely because men exist, they are able to worship the gods. If men would not exist, who would be able to worship them? Therefore, to rule the people is the beginning of reverence to the gods. If they rely on the virtue of the gods, men’s lot, too, will be improved.¹⁷⁰

Man is like the day. The Way of the Gods is like the night. Though day and night are not the same, their *li* are identical. The same can be said of the Way of Life and [the Way of] Death. “Life” can be compared to “today” or “this year,” “death” to “yesterday” or “yesteryear.” Even as, if one knows the Way of the Life well, one will also know the Way of Death, thus, if one knows the *li* of man well, one will also automatically know the Way of the Gods.

One should reverently keep one’s distance from the gods and not defile them. The Way of the People should be in accord with righteousness. When for a while one exclusively [occupies oneself with] implementing [these two precepts] one will be in communication with the gods (*shinryō ni tsūzuru nari* 神慮ニ通ズルナリ).¹⁷¹

This quotation has also brought us from the political to the religious and metaphysical moment. In the realm of religious thought Razan’s point of departure was the conviction that the macrocosm and the microcosm, the whole of heaven and earth and the heart of man, are one. In Shinto terms this means that all must be “god,” or that at least everything must be inhabited by, permeated by the gods. And in Confucian terms this means that everything has its *li* and that these *li* are fundamentally and originally one. If, however, one wants to prove the unity of Shinto and Confucianism in these terms, it becomes necessary to identify the *li* with the gods and *vice versa*. We have seen what problems this logically necessary identification caused Razan.

In his Shinto writings Razan evinces quite a number of other concerns. To

¹⁷⁰ For the meaning of “the virtue of the gods” cf. my translation *supra*, where it is defined as “the conduct of government.” The expression “the people is the lord (*zhu*; J. *shu*, *nushi*) of the gods” stems from the *Zuo zhuan*, sixth year of Duke Huan. Legge, *The Ch’un Ts’ew*, pt 1, p. 48, translates the passage in which the phrase occurs as “*The (state of) the people is what the Spirits regard. The sage kings therefore first secured the welfare of the people, and then put forth their strength in (serving) the Spirits.*”

¹⁷¹ *Shintō denju* 6 (NST XXXIX, p. 14). Cf. for the second and third paragraph of this translation resp. the commentary by one of the Cheng brothers (“Day and night are the Way of life and death. If one knows the Way of life, one knows the Way of death.”), quoted by Zhu Xi in his commentary to *Lunyu* XI, 12, and *Lunyu* VI, 22 (“While respecting spiritual beings, to keep aloof from them”; Legge’s translation).

mention a few: he thinks it necessary to vindicate along Confucian lines the real existence of the universe and of the heart (versus Buddhism), to stress the law-like character of the gods in contrast to the concept of *tentō*, etc. However, here we neither can concern ourselves with all these aspects, nor need we do so.

After all, our first concern is to establish to what extent Razan can be regarded as Seika's disciple, in the sense of having inherited Seika's interests, problems, approach and solutions. In this respect, the foregoing exposé has shown that certain resemblances, e.g. the use of the mirror metaphor, can be found but that, on the other hand, Razan's interest in cosmological and metaphysical theories is appreciably greater than Seika's.¹⁷² In the absence, however, of any writings by Seika that deal with Shinto no detailed comparisons can be made.

In other fields, however, detailed comparisons are possible. As we have seen, Seika gave the most systematic account of his doctrine in the form of a commentary on the *Daxue*, and since Razan, too, wrote several such commentaries, it would seem best to start from these.¹⁷³

The first thing we notice is that Razan is extremely orthodox as compared to

¹⁷² Seika is quoted once in *Shintō denju*, as criticizing the Yoshida for indulging in baseless speculation about the *himorogi* (*shintō denju* 37 [NST XXXIX, p. 30]).

¹⁷³ The *Henchosho-moku* lists a number of exegetical works on the *Daxue*: *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 4, p. 56; p. 58. The *Bunshū* contains several postfaces to editions of the *Daxue* made by Razan: *Bunshū* 55 (II, p. 203; p. 208). Also we have the following extant copies:

(1) The *Daigaku genkai*, Razan's main exegesis of the *Daxue*, containing several introductory chapters and a line-by-line commentary of Zhu Xi's Preface and the complete text (*jing* and *zhuan*). A manuscript of this work, in three volumes, is in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko. According to the *okugaki* Razan wrote the work for the instruction of his sons. The *okugaki* is dated Kan'ei 7/4/14 (25-5-1630). All my references are to this manuscript.

(2) The *Daigaku [Dōshun] shō* 大學道春抄 in one volume. The dates and circumstances of its writing are not known. More than a century after Razan's death, in Kansei 1 (1789), this work was printed in Kyōto, anonymously and with minor variations, under the title of *Daigaku-shō kō* 大學抄稿. The editor of this edition mentions Razan in his preface as a possible author. Contrary to the *Genkai*, this work does not treat the whole of the *Daxue*, but only the *jing*, esp. the Three Principles and Eight Steps. It does so, moreover, in a free style, almost like an essay, not in the form of a line-to-line commentary. All my references to the *Daigaku Dōshun shō* are to the autograph in the possession of the Kokkai Toshokan. An early manuscript copy of this work, entitled *Daigaku-shō*, is kept in the library of the Ashikaga Gakkō, while of the *Daigaku-shō kō* three printed copies and one manuscript copy have survived.

(3) The third explanation of the *Daxue* by Razan is the chapter "Daigaku" in the *Santoku-shō*. It also confines itself to the *jing*. Even as regards the wording it is in places very much like the *Daigaku Dōshun shō*.

Seika.¹⁷⁴ Of course he follows the arrangement of the *Daxue* text made by Zhu Xi and also Zhu Xi's interpretation of all concepts that are usually explained in the course of a commentary on the *Daxue*, e.g. the "illustrious virtue," "the heart," *gewu*, *li*, seriousness, etc. These terms can serve as a kind of litmus-paper to test the differences between Razan and Seika, and in this way we will use them here.

The first concept one is confronted with when reading the *Daxue* is "illustrious virtue." In his commentary Zhu Xi identifies it with the "heart." The points Razan touches on in his description in the *Santoku-shō* are the normal ones, but for the last two:

- The illustrious virtue is the original heart (*benxin* 本心) man has received from heaven.
- This heart has no form, no colour, no voice *Chuanxilu* and no sound, but one may not conclude from this that it has no real existence.
- It is the heart that makes the senses function.
- It is like a clear mirror.
- Precisely because such a mirror is empty, it reflects all things as they are and becomes empty again when there is nothing to reflect. "Like in a mirror we reflect all various forms, in our hearts we hold the *li* of all things."¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁴ In his *Zuihitsu* Razan gives a curious and not altogether flattering explanation of Seika's unorthodox opinions: "Someone asked: 'Is the meaning of 'to love the people' automatically included in the [words of] the *Daxue* 'to renew the people'?' Master Hokuniku (= Seika) answered: 'In 'to love the people' the meaning of 'to renew the people' is included.'" I, Razan, think that Hokuniku had read the *Yangming wenlu* 陽明文祿 and had seen some interpretations that pleased him. Therefore he spoke like this, for the theories of the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi were what [every one] was always thoroughly studying. Moreover, many people possessed the [*Sishu*] *daquan*, *Tongyi*, *Jishi*, etc., but in those days the Collected Works of Yangming, the *Sishu zhixin rilu* 四書知新日錄 etc., were not yet kept in every house [as they are now. Therefore] I think that, because [the book] was rare, [Seika], when he saw it, thought it precious." (*Bunshū* 75: II, pp. 499-500; written in Keian 1, 1648.)

¹⁷⁵ 174. *NST* XXVIII, p. 173. Cf. the more sophisticated explanation of the same in the *Daigaku genkai*: "*Mingde* is the name of the heart. It is something that a man at his birth has received from heaven. ... This heart has no colour and no form, and therefore it is called 'empty' (*xu*). It is empty, but nevertheless it shows signs of being alive and active, and therefore it is called "empty and spiritual" (*xuling*). [Moreover, since it is] bright, one calls it 'unobscured' (*bumei* 不昧). ... 'Empty, spiritual and unobscured' is said of the substance and the function of the heart together. 'To contain all *li*' is its substance; 'to react to the myriad affairs' is its function. ... It may be compared to a mirror. Because [like] a mirror it is empty, it is [called] 'empty.' That it reflects colours and forms is [meant with] 'spiritual.' ... Because it is empty, it is spiritual. This is meant by *mingde* 明德. Because it is empty, it can contain all *li*. Because it is spiritual, it can react to the myriad affairs. Emptiness automatically implies spirituality." (op. cit. I, ad *mingde*)

One calls the heart “illustrious virtue,” Razan proceeds, because the *li* (i.e. the virtues of benevolence, righteousness, etiquette, wisdom, trust, loyalty, filial piety), which are present in the heart, are illustrious. These *li* can be observed when, e.g., one is loyal to one’s lord, filial towards one’s parents, etc. These *li* are not only truly present in the heart, together they *are* the heart: one merely gives different names to its various manifestations, in the same way as the same water can be called waves or current, the same fire smoke or flames.¹⁷⁶

Not only the *li*, however, but also the passions are part of the heart. The Holy Ones had passions, and so has everyone else.¹⁷⁷ The point is that these passions must be carefully controlled. One “must see where they originate,” and see to it that they conform to the *li*. The heart as such, before the passions have arisen, is peaceful and clear like the blue sky. In the same vein, the passions may be compared with rainstorms, clouds and thunder.¹⁷⁸

Desires and selfishness may obscure this illustrious virtue, but it does not therefore cease to exist. The sun and the moon may be obscured by clouds and mist, but as soon as the weather clears they reappear. The illustrious virtue is always there; it is man that obscures it or makes it clear.

In the same way as all other things, man, too, is made of Yin, Yang and the five elements, i.e., of *qi*. “In his heart he has the *li* of the myriad things; the *qi* of heaven and earth he makes to be his *qi* and the heart of heaven and earth to be his own heart. His heart he makes to be one and the same with the *li*.”¹⁷⁹

“Because the heart originally is the *li* of the Great Ultimate (*taiji* 大極), ... it is wholly good, devoid of any evil.”¹⁸⁰ All evil, i.e. selfishness and desires, originates in

¹⁷⁶ NST XXVIII, pp. 173-174.

¹⁷⁷ Cf. *Daigaku Dōshun shō*, p. 3b: “When we make very fine distinctions, we should call that what Heaven gives to man, nature, that what is the master of the body, the heart, and the function of nature we should call passions. ‘Empty and spiritual and unobscured’ is said of the heart; ‘to contain all *li*’ is said of the nature; ‘to react to the myriad affairs’ is said of the passions. ... taken all together, one regards these as the illustrious virtue.”

¹⁷⁸ NST XXVIII, p. 174

¹⁷⁹ NST XXVIII, p. 175. Cf. *Daigaku genkai* 2.1b-2a: “Man takes the heavenly *li* to be his nature and the *qi* of heaven and earth to be his body. ... *Li* and *qi* together form the heart. [In it] are emptiness, spirituality and the faculty of the intellect (*zhijue*). It is what rules the body. ... This emptiness, spirituality and intellect sometimes originate from the *li* and sometimes from the *qi*. These are not the same.”

¹⁸⁰ NST XXVIII, p. 162.

the *qi*, the form, and affects man through the senses. This does not mean, however, that everything originating from the *qi* is necessarily evil. Anyhow, the heart has to act, and in order to act it has to work through the *qi*. Consequently, it has to see to it that the *qi* conforms to the *li*, the original goodness that is the heart. “From the heart one controls the *qi*.”¹⁸¹

This is, in short, what in the *Santoku-shō* Razan says in explanation of the terms “heart” and “illustrious virtue.” From our paraphrase and from the accompanying notes it will have become clear that in the orthodox Neo-Confucian doctrines expounded here by Razan these concepts are essentially dualistic.

On this point there is a rather subtle difference between Seika and Razan. We have seen that both make use of the metaphor of the mirror. The difference is that Razan uses it especially to explain the *mingde*, the “heart of the Way,” which can legitimately be described in terms of emptiness, spirituality and brightness, while for Seika it is a metaphor of the heart as such. Seika has what could be called a commonsense, monistic conception of the heart: the dirt that adheres to the mirror and obscures it is of external origin. Razan, on the other hand, remains true to the orthodox dogma of the dualistic character of the heart: the *qi* that obscures the *li* (= *xing*) is an integral part of the heart.

Another difference with Seika appears in Razan’s explanation of the concept of *gewu*. In a postface to the *Daxue*, written in the eleventh month of Kan’ei 9 (December 1632 / January 1633) at the request of Ishikawa Jōzan 石川丈山,¹⁸² he says:

One of the Eight Steps of the *Daxue* is *gewu*. Is it not a great [pity that someone like Han [Yu] left out *gewu* when he wrote his *Yuan dao* 原道, either [because] he knew [its full meaning] but did not speak [of it], or [because] he had not paid

¹⁸¹ NST XXVIII, p. 162. In NST XXVIII, pp. 169-170, Razan explains this dual character of the heart in terms of “the heart of the Way” and “the heart of man,” identified respectively with *li* and *qi* (cf. *supra*, n. 50).

¹⁸² Ishikawa Jōzan (1583-1672) was a *samurai* from Mikawa and thus a hereditary retainer of the Tokugawa. After the siege of Ōsaka (1615) he gave up his military career and retired to Kyōto to devote himself to literary pursuits. For his biography, cf. Hitomi Chikudō 人見竹洞 (1620-1688), *Ishikawa Jōzan nenpu*. To judge by the number of letters Razan wrote to him (*Bunshū* 5-6) and Gahō’s epilogue at the end of *kan* 6 of the *Bunshū*, Jōzan was one of Razan’s *intimi*.

attention to it? As to the explanations of *gewu*, in Zheng Xuan's commentary *ge* is explained as "to come," "to make come," in the sense of "good calls forth good, evil calls forth evil." Sima Guang explains it as "to fend off" in the sense of "warding off the external things." According to Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137-1181; he was Zhu Xi's collaborator in the compilation of the *Jinsilu*. WJB) *gewu* means that "between the things and oneself there is no partition." And Zhu Xi, finally, just takes over the interpretation of the Cheng brothers and explains it as "the investigation of things."

Since *li* originally have no form, [Confucius] gives people something solid to stand on by giving [*li*] a name that is derived from the things and affairs, which do have a form. This he does, because he is afraid that "having no form" will merge into "being empty."

Wang Shouren 王守仁 of the Ming wrote in his *Chuanxilu* 傳習錄 that *ge* means "to correct," "to perfect." One [should] correct "the things of one's heart." Lin [Zhaoen] said that *ge* means to "throw away," "to discard." If one lets go the external things, one's original heart will be spiritual and clear. Both theories are quite elevated. However, in Wang's theory one perceives a certain duplication with "to rectify one's heart," and the theory of Lin is after all not very different from that of Sima. Lord and servant, father and son are external things: can one throw away the lord or the father and then be loyal and filial? However, then the external things cannot really be fended off, nor can one throw them away. It is like doing away with the brightness of a mirror, so that it cannot illuminate anymore.¹⁸³

The myriad things all have [their own] affairs, and each affair has its own *li*. The *li* are the nature of the heart. Heart and nature are originally one, but fettered as they are by the *qi* of the form and obscured by egoistic desires, they cannot be made into one. Therefore the Holy One wrote the *Daxue* and taught the people [first] to desire to make their heart and the *li* not be two things, and then he indicated [how to do this], saying: "The extension of knowledge is in the investigation of things." Great indeed is the meaning of *gewu*!

Nowadays we revere and believe the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi and we understand *gewu* in the sense of "the investigation of the *li*." I hope that you will not deviate from this [interpretation]. A man of old said: "If we express it in these terms, should we not say that someone who does not go to the gate (i.e. the school. WJB) of the Cheng [brothers] and Zhu Xi [is practising] a heterodox kind of *gewu*? [But] if he enters from this gate, he has almost reached the gate of Confucius!"¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ Razan's attempt to use the mirror metaphor upside down may be witty but misses the point. Razan goes wrong because of his rather arbitrary definition of (external) things. That he knew Lin Zhaoen's thought better than this, he had shown in the *Daigaku genkai*: "According to Lin Zhaoen, *wu* is not the *wu* of 'external things' (*waiwu* 外物), nor is it the *wu* of 'affairs and things' (*shiwu* 事物). Whatever hampers the heart even a little he calls *wu*. He calls it the "non-heart," and [says that] if one throws it off, the heart will of itself be perfect." (op. cit., ad *gewu*)

¹⁸⁴ *Bunshū* 53 (II, p. 172). In the *Daigaku genkai* Razan also gives a detailed survey of the various

If Razan's own gloss of *ge*, therefore, was the rather pedestrian *itaru*, in his explanation of *wu* he shows a little more originality.

"Things" (*wu* 物) are "affairs" (*shi* 事): Heaven and earth are things and their operation is an affair; sun and moon are things and their brilliance is an affair; water and fire are things and their blazing and being wet are affairs. Talking about men, [one can say that] lord and servant or father and son are things, and that loyalty and filial piety are affairs.¹⁸⁵ ... Therefore it is said that "things" are "affairs."

Affairs have no form. Things do have a form. Out of fear that [the people] would lapse into "emptiness and inactivity," because [affairs] have no form, [Confucius] through the use of the character *wu* ("things") made [the concept] full (*shi* 實), and [in this way] made [the people] realise the *li*. If between heaven and earth one thing exists, one affair exists, [and] surely there exists one *li*. Therefore one talks of the *li* of things and of the *li* of affairs. To investigate the *li* thoroughly and reach its highest point one calls *gewu*.¹⁸⁶

The fact that Razan adheres to the orthodox interpretation of *gewu* implies that the concept of *li* also rises in importance. Razan describes this concept in the following terms:

Since these *li* are the same, the heart of man can penetrate the *li* of all things under heaven. When one thoroughly investigates the *li* of those things and affairs that one already knows, one's knowledge will also be perfected. As to the discipline: one should think about them (i.e. the *li*. WJB) in the acting of one's body, observe them in one's every thought. From one's own body and heart one extends [one's reflections] to the human relations. [From] the revolutions of heaven and earth up to things like birds and beasts and grasses and trees, each

conflicting theories of the Three Principles and *gewu* which arose in Song and Ming times. It shows a great familiarity with the texts and problems in question.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. *Daigaku Dōshun shō*, pp. 12b-13a: "Lord and servant, and father and son have a form. [This is] the reason why they are things. Loyalty or filial piety do not have a form. [This is] the reason why they are affairs. [However,] when one exhaustively investigates the Way of lord and servant, loyalty [appears] automatically to be present. When one exhaustively investigates the Way of father and son, filial piety [appears] to be in its midst. For this reason the character *wu* was not read as *shi* (affairs), nor did one speak of 'exhaustively investigating the *li* of affairs (*shili*): one wrote 'to investigate things' (*mono ni itaru*). If it does not have a form, it is 'empty'; if it does have a form, it is 'full' (*shi* 實). In order to make people pursue the study of full [things] (*jitsu no manabi*), one spoke of 'investigating things.' In order not to let [these studies] be empty."

¹⁸⁶ *Daigaku genkai* II, ad *gewu*.

thing necessarily has a way how it should be (*shikarubeki tokoro*), a reason why it cannot but be like this (*kaku no gotoku arade wa kanawanu yue*). This is [its] *li*.¹⁸⁷

To this definition Razan remained true, although with him the identification of the *li* with the heart is rather more pronounced than it usually is in Chinese sources. In his commonplace book (the fascicle dated Keian 1, 1648) he notes down the following thoughts about “the *li* is one but particularised in all things”:

To understand that the *li* are one is not easy, but the most difficult [thing] is to understand that they are particularised [in all things]. [To say] that all affairs and things return to one heart, that all words and phrases are *in nuce* [present] in the heart, that there is only one heart — that can [be understood]. [However,] if one swallows down [this dogma] like a cormorant a jujube, does one really know its taste? Therefore, [really to understand what is meant with] “the *li* are one,” is not easy.

Why is heaven high? Why is the earth broad? Why is water wet and does it go downwards? Why does fire blaze upward? What is the reason that one should be filial to one’s parents, loyal to one’s lord or master? The reasons for all of these things should be investigated. Therefore, [to understand how the *li* are particularised in all things] is most difficult.

Even a Sage like Zengzi only got to hear [the doctrine of] “the one that pervades all”¹⁸⁸ when, at last, after [his discipline of] “examining himself on three points,”¹⁸⁹ truth had accumulated and his strength had been refined; then, gradually, he got to hear [the theory of] the one that pervades all. How much more [difficult would it be to understand] that other [teaching]! Therefore, Yanzi, too, mentions that [Confucius] both “enlarged his mind with learning and taught him the restraints of etiquette,”¹⁹⁰ and told him of this (i.e. of the theory of the one that pervades all. WJB) only after he had done both these things. If one does not do it like that, [one’s learning and thinking] will be “labour lost and perilous.”¹⁹¹ This one has to keep in mind constantly.

If one does not understand the particularization of *li*, only narrowly

¹⁸⁷ *Daigaku genkai* II, ad *gewu*.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. *supra*, n. 63.

¹⁸⁹ *Lunyu* I, 4. The three points are loyalty 忠, trust and trustworthiness in his relations with his friends 信, and zealotry in practising 習 the teachings that the Master imparted to him.

¹⁹⁰ *Lunyu* IX, 11. Legge translates: “Yan Yuan sighed and said: ‘I looked up to them (i.e. the doctrines of Confucius), and they seemed to become more high; I tried to penetrate them, and they seemed to become more firm. I looked at them before me, and suddenly they seemed to be behind. The Master, by orderly method, skilfully leads men on. He enlarged my mind with learning, and taught me the restraints of my propriety.’”

¹⁹¹ *Lunyu* II, 15. Legge translates: “Learning without thought is labour lost; thought without learning is perilous.”

preserves this brilliance and emptiness (i.e. the heart. WJB), and thinks that the Way is in there, is that not like standing with one's back to a mirror and looking for clarification? What one should do is to read what the Holy Ones are saying, and not become ensnared by heterodox schools.¹⁹²

In so far as Razan here unhesitatingly understands the idea of *li* as a unity (*li yi* 理一) in terms of the heart, we may say that he is a disciple of Seika. It is what we have come to expect of a Japanese Confucian of the beginning of the seventeenth century. But where he comes to insist on the importance of *li* as it is particularised in all existing things (*fenshu* 分殊) and on the importance of studying also this second aspect of *li*, we must say that he is trying to emancipate himself from his background in an effort to approach the original teachings of Zhu Xi.

Nevertheless, Razan had his doubts. These doubts mainly centred around the relations between *li* and *qi* and, by implication, the origin of evil. That *li* and *qi* could not exist independently was accepted by all Confucians, orthodox and heterodox alike, but when they were confronted with the problem to what extent *li* and *qi* should or could be distinguished and which was the more important of the two, different philosophers gave different answers.

What was Razan's position? In the chapter of the *Santoku-shō* entitled *Ri-ki no ben* 理氣の辨, Razan gives all the usual answers: *li* and *qi* are always together; the *li* is absolutely good and the *qi*, through study, can be perfected; human nature is good, and evil arises from the *qi*.¹⁹³ It is difficult, on the basis of the *Santoku-shō*, to impute to Razan any deviation from orthodoxy. The most one can say is that soon after the first paragraph the attention shifts from the cosmological aspects to the interplay of *li* and *qi* in the formation of the human heart. Of course, Razan knew the theories of Wang Yangming, which, some scholars¹⁹⁴ suspect, were the reason for this, but if Razan was interested in Yangming's formulation of the interrelation of *li* and *qi*, we yet cannot say

¹⁹² *Bunshū* 75 (II, p. 499).

¹⁹³ Cf. *NST* XXVIII, pp. 161-171, esp. pp. 164-167; Brüll, "Prinzip und Materie," pp. 21-31.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. e.g. Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 208-209; Ishida, "Zenki bakuhan taisei no ideorogii," *NST* XXVIII, pp. 418-420.

that he ever believed in it. He only went so far as to formulate, in the privacy of his commonplace book, a kind of compromise:

Li and *qi* are one and [yet] two, two and [yet] one. This is the sense in which the Confucians of the Song wanted it to be understood. Master Yangming, however, said: “*Li* is the innate norm (*tiaoli* 條理) of *qi*, and *qi* is the movement (*yundong* 運動) of *li*.” If one takes [this last statement] into account and reflects [on the problem, one must conclude that] the former (i.e. the Confucians of the Song. WJB) make rather too sharp a distinction. Since [the time when] this later scholar (i.e. Wang Yangming. WJB) [gave his definition], we cannot throw out the latter and choose the former. In the main, [however,] they come down to one and the same: is this not all said of the heart?¹⁹⁵

But Razan’s problem went deeper than this. His real problem, for which neither Wang Yangming nor Zhu Xi could offer a solution, was that of the origin of evil. Wang Yangming (and may others, e.g. Seika) had just ignored the problem. Other Confucians had imputed the origin of evil to the *qi*, but Razan could not accept this solution, because he could not believe the *qi* to be sufficiently independent. The argument in which he formulates these doubts is based on the commonly accepted truth that “outside the *li* there exists nothing” 理外無物. From this he makes some logically sound, but to the orthodox Confucian mind rather disturbing deductions:

Human nature is identical with *li*, [and since it is said that nothing is outside *li*], nothing in the world is outside of human nature. All *li* are good. This is the reason why Mencius called human nature good. If this is the case, however, is

¹⁹⁵ *Bunshū* 68 (II, p. 400). Cf. Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 208, and Ishida, “Zenki bakuhan taisei no ideorogii” (*NST* XXVIII, p. 419), where this same entry is quoted. The entries in this chapter of the *Zuihitsu* cannot be dated. Cf. also *Bunshū* 14 (I, pp. 157-158), where Razan puts the same problem in more or less the same terms to the Korean envoy Im Kwang and his party. In this letter, dated on the eighth day of the last month of winter, Kan’ei 13 (4-1-1637), Razan is more explicit: the “Confucians of the Song” are Zhu Xi and Yi T’oegye. This letter is quoted and commented upon by Abe, *Chōsen*, p. 205. Cf. also my translation in “Yi T’oegye and Japan,” p. 26. The relevant passage, which proves that Razan had not espoused Yangming’s ideas, runs as follows: “Therefore, when I reflect on [this problem of the relation between *li* and *qi*, it seems to me that] his (= Yi T’oegye’s) distinction of *li* and *qi* [would lead one] to say that the Supreme Ultimate is *li* and Yin and Yang are *qi*. In other words, does not [his theory] have the shortcoming that it leads to a complete separation? [On the other hand,] if we bring *li* and *qi* together into one, we would have to say [with Wang Yangming] that *li* is the innate norm of *qi* and *qi* the movement of *li*, and we would not [be able to] choose between good and evil. In other words, does not [this theory of Yangming] have the shortcoming that it leads to licentiousness? It is something that one has to discern clearly in one’s heart.”

then what is called evil outside of human nature, or inside? If you say that it is outside, then [you contradict the proposition that] nothing is outside human nature. If you say that it is inside, then [you contradict the proposition that] human nature originally has no evil. What is in fact the origin from which evil arises? Former Confucians have not told this. How then could it be easy to tell?¹⁹⁶

Heaven and earth and the myriad things originate from the *li*. Does evil, then, also originate from inside the *li*? The *li* are good. How could evil ever come from them? In that case, however, what is the origin of evil? And what kind of heart is this heart of mine that knows this so-called evil? From this one can truly see that human nature is good. However, one can talk about this only with someone who is a great sage.¹⁹⁷

Human nature is good. Human nature is identical with the *li* of the heart. In the world there is nothing that is outside human nature nor is there anything that is outside of the *li*. If one believes these words, then what is the origin of that which is called evil? If one does not agree with them, one cannot dispel the perplexities [caused by] the theories concerning human nature of Gaozi 告子, Xunzi 荀子, and Yang Xiong 楊雄.¹⁹⁸

The first of these three quotations dates from “the prime” of Razan’s life, i.e. from between *ca* 1610 and *ca* 1615, and the last one from 1648. This suggests that the problem occupied Razan during a large part of his life. He kept these doubts to himself, however, and never mentioned them either in the works that were meant for publication or in those that he wrote at the request of others.

The concept that I have left till last is “seriousness” (*jing* 敬). About seriousness Razan

¹⁹⁶ *Bunshū* 67 (II, p. 390). Ishida, “Zenki bakuhan taisei no ideorogii” (*NST* XXVIII, p. 419), says that Razan’s proposition that “nothing is outside of human nature” is derived from Wang Yangming’s dictum that “outside of the heart there are no things” (*xin wai wu wu* 心外無物). This is, to say the least, debatable. The truth of Razan’s proposition is deduced from the fundamental identity of *li* and *xing*, and from the idea that all things have their own *li*: axiomata that were quite irrelevant to Yangming. Moreover, *wu* in Yangming’s dictum should be understood in the technical sense that he gives to the word in his explanation of the *Daxue*: not as “things” in the general sense of solid objects, but as “the first stirrings of the will” (*yi* 意).

¹⁹⁷ *Bunshū* 68 (II, p. 397). This quotation contains a reference to “the feeling of shame and dislike,” mentioned in *Mengzi* II A, 6, and VI A, 6. Razan here reasons as follows: all men have the “feeling of shame and dislike” and the other three of the *si duan* 四端. This proves, that the *li*, of which these *si duan* as “principles” are present in our heart, i.e., that we possess a “nature” that is perfectly good.

¹⁹⁸ *Bunshū* 74 (II, p. 484). Elsewhere, too, Razan broaches the problem in much the same terms, e.g. in the questions that he asked his sons Gahō and Tokkōsai in 1640. (Cf. *Bunshū* 34: I, p. 380; Abe, *Chōsen*, p.

wrote a number of essays, treating it either on its own or in relation to the concepts of “righteousness” (*yi* 義) and “heart” (*xin*). Since “seriousness” played an important role in the school of Yamazaki Ansai, where it gave rise to furious polemics,¹⁹⁹ we will here give rather longer quotations than the subject intrinsically deserves in the case of Razan.

The master of the human body is called “heart.” The master of the heart is called “seriousness.” If [a place with] vermillion gates and gorgeous buildings does not have a master, it stands closed and empty. If the heart is not the master of [this] splendid [body of] seven feet, it is nothing but blood, skin and flesh. The best way to preserve it and not to lose it (sc. the heart. WJB) is seriousness. Seriousness is the master of the heart and the basis of the myriad affairs. Inwardly, the preservation and nurturing [of the heart] and, outwardly, the “nine things one has to think of”²⁰⁰ and the “nine points of behaviour,”²⁰¹ as well as important [rites] like the manhood ceremony, marriage, mourning and worship, yes, even small things like the stages of sweeping, answering, and behaviour²⁰² — all these depend on it! Therefore, young children of the school for minors should know it and, on the other side of the scale, even the Holy Ones have nothing to add to it. ... [The word “to rest” (*zhi* 止) has a meaning similar to that of “seriousness.”] Therefore one praised the virtue of King Wen, saying: “As a lord he rested in benevolence, as a servant in reverence (*jing* 敬), as a father in affection, as a child in piety, and in his relations with the people of his country he rested in trust.”²⁰³ ... Is therefore “resting while maintaining one’s seriousness” (*zhi jing*) not also good? Its meaning is precisely that.

The “illustrious virtue,” the “loving of the people,” and the “highest good” of the *Daxue* are nothing but seriousness and resting. If with seriousness one maintains oneself, is that not also “illustrating one’s illustrious virtue”? If from

209).

¹⁹⁹ Cf. *Nihon Jurin sōsho* VI, where the representative writings on this topic by disciples of Ansai are collected. The problem was *in nuce*, whether the “inner” (*nei* 内) and “outer” (*wai* 外), which had to be rectified by “seriousness” and “righteousness” respectively (cf. the quotation from the *Yijing*, *infra*, n. 205), referred to one’s own body (inner) and the state (outer), or to the heart and the body. The first thesis was held by Ansai, the second one his disciple Satō Naokata.

²⁰⁰ Cf. *Lunyu* XVI, 10. The “nine things that are subject with him (i.e. the gentleman. WJB) of thoughtful consideration” (Legge) are seeing clearly, hearing distinctly, having a benign countenance, a respectful demeanour, sincerity in speech, and a reverent carefulness in doing business; when in doubt he questions others, when angry he thinks of the difficulties that he might become involved in through his anger, and “when he sees gain to be got, he thinks of righteousness.”

²⁰¹ Cf. *Liji* 13 (“*Yuzao*” 玉藻), 28. Legge translates: “[A man of rank] did not move his feet lightly, nor his hands irreverently. His eyes looked straightforward, and his mouth was quiet and composed. No sound from him broke the stillness, and his head was carried upright. His breath came without panting or stoppage, and his standing gave an impression of virtue. His looks were grave.”

²⁰² Things that were taught in the *xiaoxue*, the “school for minors.” Cf. Zhu Xi’s preface to the *Daxue*.

²⁰³ *Daxue*, third *zhang*, third paragraph, regarding a quotation for the *Shijing* (“*Daya*,” 1, fourth stanza).

oneself one extends to others, is that not also “loving the people”? If one has regulated oneself and regulated others, does not that [mean that] in all things one uses to the utmost the *li* of how things should be (*shili dangran zhi ji* 事理當然之極)? Is this not also “resting in the highest good”?²⁰⁴

The *Zhou Yi* says: “With seriousness one rectifies one’s inner life and with righteousness one rectifies one’s outer appearance.”²⁰⁵ A Confucian of old has said: “Seriousness and righteousness stand together, and virtue does not stand alone.”²⁰⁶ Seriousness is the master of the heart, the root of one’s inner life. Righteousness is the [standard of] right according to which the heart controls affairs. If one clings to it, one rectifies one’s outer appearance. Will not virtue [then] arise because of this? That which rules the body is the heart. The place where the heart remains is the body. That the cultivation of the body is our basic [concern] is a teaching of the *Daxue*. One cultivates one’s body through [restraining it with] seriousness. Therefore the investigation of things, the extension of knowledge, the making sincere of one’s will and the making correct of one’s heart are all seriousness. If seriousness is present within me, outwardly righteousness will prevail. Nevertheless, righteousness is, indeed, not to be considered as something external. If one looks for it, one will [see that] it is truly inside, just like no heart exists outside of the body. Seriousness and righteousness are important virtues. One must think about them.²⁰⁷

That seriousness “is the lord of the form and the basis of the myriad affairs,” is a dictum of Zhu Xi,²⁰⁸ the tenor of all Razan’s remarks on the subject, and of unsuspected orthodoxy. The ease, moreover, with which Razan moves from the “preservation of the heart” to the “rectification of outward behaviour” and back again shows that the problem that divided Ansai and his disciples had not yet thrown its shadow.

As becomes clear from the above, the articulation of Razan’s interpretation of the *Daxue* is quite different from Seika’s. To recapitulate, for Seika the focal point is “the

²⁰⁴ *Bunshū* 17 (I, pp. 188-189), “Keishi-sai ki” 敬止齋記. Razan wrote this inscription in Keichō 12 (1607).

²⁰⁵ *Yijing*, fourth appendix, section 2 (“*Kun*” 坤), 6. Legge translates: “The superior man, by his self-reverence maintains the inward (correctness), and in righteousness adjusts his external acts.”

²⁰⁶ *Yijing*, fourth appendix, section 2 (“*Kun*”), 6. Legge translates: “His reverence and righteousness being thus established, his virtues are not solitary or of a single class.”

²⁰⁷ *Bunshū* 27 (I, p. 311), “Keigi setsu” 敬義說, undated. Cf. furthermore *Bunshū* 27 (I, p. 310), “Shin setsu” 心說; *ibid.*, (pp. 310-311), “Kei setsu” 敬說; *ibid.*, 68 (II, pp. 403-404); *ibid.*, 69 (p. 416).

²⁰⁸ Cf. *Bunshū* 68 (II, p. 404).

highest good,” one and undivided and eternal and identical with the human heart. Cultivation of the heart through *gewu* makes this original nature shine forth and automatically enables one “to illustrate the illustrious virtue,” i.e. teach the people to fulfil its duties under the five human relations, and “to love the people,” i.e. to create such material circumstances that the people will be able to follow these teachings. According to Razan, however, one should start perfecting oneself through the investigation of *li*, and after having gone through the subsequent stages of self-cultivation, one should try to perfect others. “The highest good” is a measure, indicating to what extent both these activities should be pursued. We can say that for both “the heart” was the single most important concept, but that they differed considerably as to its definition. And since “the heart is empty and spiritual” and “leaves no trace,” seriousness was for both a — rather vaguely defined — practice that involved concentrating the heart, strengthening its good tendencies and disciplining one’s behaviour according to the Confucian norms.²⁰⁹

2. Conclusions

On the basis of the foregoing description a number of differences with Seika’s doctrine can easily be pointed out. The points I shall want to stress here are the following three: the different importance that was accorded to Shinto, the different evaluation of the importance of *li* and *qi*, and the orthodoxy of Razan’s thought as compared to Seika’s. The matter of the “practical nature” of Confucianism I will leave out, as what could be said on this subject in the case of Razan would not differ materially from what I have already said in regard to Seika.²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ When in the “*Keishi-sai ki*” Razan tries to resume the whole of the *Daxue* under the heading of seriousness, it is not very convincing, a rhetorical tour de force rather than a serious philosophical argument. Generally, when writing on the *Daxue*, he hardly mentions “seriousness” at all.

²¹⁰ References to specific, historical situations occur sparingly in Razan’s Confucian writings, and when they do occur, they are mere illustrations. Unlike Seika, however, Razan also wrote historical works and he was actually involved in policy making. To these points I will return in the next chapter.

In regard to Shinto Razan's position is that Shinto is of autochthon Japanese origin,²¹¹ that it has been denatured by Buddhism, which obliterated certain of its essential features,²¹² and that in final analysis it is identical with Confucianism.

This identity with Confucianism Razan finds attested at various levels. The instructions that Amaterasu Ōmikami gave to her grandson Ninigi no Mikoto are, according to Razan, identical with the instructions that the Chinese Holy Ones Yao, Shun and Yu handed down to one another; the three regalia are the symbols of the three virtues of wisdom, benevolence and courage which also figure in Confucianism²¹³; the theogony of the *Nihon shoki* really is a cosmology similar to the Chinese cosmologies outlined in the *Yijing*, the *Taijitu shuo*, etc.

The identity of the theogony of the *Nihon shoki* with its supposed Chinese counterparts exercised Razan's mind as it had, to a lesser extent, Seika's, but he fights shy of a downright identification of the respective schemes. This attitude is apparent in the *Shin-Eki gō kan* 神易合勘.²¹⁴ Here Razan says:

When formerly I read the *Jindai no maki* (or *Kami no yo no maki*) of the *Nihon shoki*, I found that it was somewhat similar to the Way of the Changes. ... Since forerunners [of mine] have already arranged the order of the seven generations of the gods according to [the pattern of] the Supreme Ultimate, Yin and Yang and the five elements,²¹⁵ I will not dwell on this now.

Izanagi and Izanami, paired off as Yin and Yang, are *qian* 乾 and *kun* 坤

²¹¹ This is what might be called the official line that Razan follows in his Shinto writings. Privately, however, he was of the opinion that a great deal could be said in favour of the theory that the Japanese imperial house descended from Taibo 太伯, the eldest son of the ancestor of the Zhou dynasty Gu Gong (Tai Wang) 太王・古公. Cf. *Bunshū* 25 (I, pp. 280-282), "Jinmu-tennō ron." Cf. also Taira Shigemichi, "Kinsei shintō shisō" (*NST* XXXIX, p. 513); Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 356, 361-367. A complete *kakikudashi* of the "Jinmu-tennō ron" in Hori, op. cit., pp. 363-366.

²¹² See, e.g., Razan's preface to his *Honchō jinja kō* 本朝神社考, *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* I, pp. 365-366.

²¹³ The *locus* of these three virtues is the twentieth *chang* of the *Zhongyong*. Cf., in addition to the passage from the *Zokkai* quoted *supra*, the "Jinmu-tennō ron" (*Bunshū* 25: I, p. 280). The *Santoku-shō* and the "Santoku-kai" 三徳解 (*Bunshū* 30: I, pp. 331-332) are Confucian writings; no reference is made there to the lore of the three regalia.

²¹⁴ The copy of the *Shin-Eki gō kan* that is now in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko is a small leaflet of only three pages. It is a third generation manuscript copy. In view of the *okugaki* Razan must have written the original before Kan'ei 9/2/8 (28-3-1632).

²¹⁵ Cf., e.g., the first chapter of Watarai Ieyuki's 度会家行 *Ruijū jingi hongen* 類從神祇本源 (completed in 1320), *ZZGR* I, pp. 2-10. This tendency became especially strong in Yoshikawa Shinto, which was derived from Yoshida Shinto and was founded by Yoshikawa Koretari 吉川惟足. However, as Koretari, who lived from 1616-1694, was very much his junior, Razan can hardly be referring to him.

(heaven and earth: the first and the second of the trigrams and hexagrams. WJB), that existed before creation. That they bore the god of the sun and the god of the moon, [corresponds to] the trigram *li* 離 in the east and the trigram *kan* 坎 in the west. ... Moreover, that Amaterasu Ōmikami, though she has a Yin body, is called the goddess of the sun, is that not like *li*, [which is] a trigram [classified] as Yin and [yet] symbolizes the sun? And that Tsukiyomi no Mikoto has a man's body, is that not like *kan*, [which is] a trigram [classified as] Yang and [yet] has the appearance of the moon? ... ²¹⁶

Though these seem to be very forced interpretations, the two (i.e. the *Jindai no maki* and the *Yijing*. WJB) throw light upon each other. From this we may conclude that the Way of the Changes and the Way of the Gods are one [and the same] *li*. If in the *Jindai no maki* every now and then characters from the *Yi[jing]* are used, this means that [its author] Prince Toneri 舍人親王, too, will have had some ideas in this direction.

Master Shao (= Shao Yong), who with what was earlier regulated what came later (*yi xian zhi hou* 以先治後) and made a division between that what existed before heaven and that what existed after heaven (*fen xiantian houtian* 分先天後天), has discussed these things. I am now following his ideas and identify Izanagi with “that what existed before heaven” and Amaterasu Ōmikami with “that what has come into existence after heaven.”²¹⁷ I am not yet sure whether this is appropriate; I have written this down provisionally in order to show it to my children and grandchildren.

Of Seika's endeavours in this field very little is known or left. The only thing, in fact, seems to be a list of captions or headings of the various sections of the *Jindai no maki*. Making this kind of headings was a practice in which former Shinto theologians, too, had indulged. In this respect, what Seika did was nothing out of the ordinary. The headings, however, that he proposed were very different from those of his forerunners

²¹⁶ In this characterization of the trigrams *li* and *kan*, Razan follows the so-called “arrangement of Fu Xi 伏羲” as regards the orientation of the trigrams according to the points of the compass. In the rival arrangement, said to be that of King Wen, *li* should be south and *kan* north. Razan follows the arrangement of King Wen, however, when he classifies *li* as Yin and *kan* as Yang. In Fu Xi's classification it is *li* that should have been Yang and *kan* that should have been Yin. The association of *li* with fire and the sun, and of *kan* with (running) water, however, is again in agreement with the arrangement of Fu Xi. King Wen arranged the trigrams in a sort of family, in which *li* figures as the second daughter and *kan* as the second son. Cf. Legge, *The I Ching*, “Introduction,” p. 11; pp. 32-33; plates II, III; Honda, *Eki*, p. 8. What sources Razan had for this idiosyncratic arrangement I have not been able to establish.

²¹⁷ Forke describes the distinction Shao Yong makes between *xiantian* (“that what exists before heaven”) and *houtian* (“that what exists after heaven”) as follows: “Shao Yung stützt sich auf Fu Hsi, verbindet aber doch mit den Werten anscheinend einen anderen Begriff, er bezeichnet als frühere Himmels- oder Weltordnung (*hsien-t'ien*) die rein geistigen Naturvorgänge der Weltschöpfung in den ersten Stadien, und als spätere Weltordnung (*hou-t'ien*) die mehr materiellen späteren Umgestaltungen, welche einer empirischen Wahrnehmung zugänglich sein könnten. (A. Forke, *Geschichte der neueren*

and show strong Neo-Confucian influences.²¹⁸ He also mentions in his correspondence a number of Shinto works that he read or borrowed, amongst them a *Nihongi-shō* 日本紀抄.²¹⁹

On the other hand, the idea, for which (*vide* Razan's reference to Prince Toneri) it seemed possible to find precedents quite far back, namely, that Shinto was in some way or in some respects identical with Confucianism and that the former was explicable in terms of the latter, had gained currency amongst the scholars of the Yoshida School of Shinto. The Yoshida, as we have seen, were closely related to the Kiyohara. Therefore, living in the time and place that they did, Seika and Razan as a matter of course had come into contact with these ideas and could not fail to be interested in them. This similarity of interests as such, however, is no evidence of any direct influence exerted by Seika on Razan, and of the other characteristics of Razan's Shinto no traces can be found in Seika's writings.

Our net impression must therefore be that Shinto was of secondary importance to Seika and that as a theologian he is quite unimportant.²²⁰ We have therefore no reason to suppose that Seika in any way contributed to Razan's interest in Shinto, let alone that he taught it to him. Finally, a brief comparison of the works composed by Seika and Razan respectively would suffice to give a quantitative illustration of the different degrees of intensity of their interest in Shinto.

chinesischen Philosophie, p. 23)

²¹⁸ For examples and an evaluation see Takano Tatsuyuki, *Kobungaku tōsa*, pp. 429-435.

²¹⁹ The *Nihongi-shō* is mentioned twice in Seika's letters to Razan (cf. Ōta I, p. 267; p. 274). In the first letter, dating from the second or third month of 1606, Seika excuses himself for having kept for such a long time a *Nihongi-shō* in three volumes; in the second letter, that cannot be dated reliably, he thanks Razan for lending him a *Nihongi*. Another Shinto work mentioned two times in Seika's correspondence with Razan, is a *Nakatomi harai kunkai* 中臣祓訓解 in one volume (cf. Ōta I, p. 267). A third work, mentioned *ibidem*, is the *Toyoashihara shinpū Wa-ki* 豊葦原神風和記 in three volumes. It is interesting to notice that Seika, referring to these last two works, says that "this kind of books is written by [people] without eyes: they are not worth looking at."

²²⁰ Takano Tatsuyuki's suggestion (cf. *Kobungaku tōsa*, p. 435) that the remarks Kiyohara Kunikata 國賢 made in his postface (*okugaki*) of the imperial edition of the *Nihon shoki jindai no maki* (printed in 1599 in two volumes) to the effect that Shinto, "the roots and trunk," is more important than Confucianism, "the branches and leaves," and Buddhism, "the flowers and fruits," were inspired by Seika's efforts at devising new rubrics for the *Jindai no maki*, is not borne out by the text of the *okugaki*, which is couched in far too general terms. See the text in Hayakawa, *Shintō sōsetsu*, pp. 13-14. Furthermore, we should note that *Shintō denju* 37 (NST XXVIII, p. 30) is the only place where Razan quotes his teacher Seika on a Shinto topic.

As self-confessed Confucians, Seika and Razan both adhered to a number of basic tenets that distinguished them from the Buddhists and defined them as Neo-Confucian thinkers: they upheld the objective, “real” existence of the universe; they upheld the norm that self-cultivation should be pursued with the ultimate objective of governing the empire or assisting the ruler in governing it, and that self-cultivation was a necessary prerequisite for such activity; they were of the conviction that the way to do this, the “method” to cultivate oneself and to rule the people, was contained in the *Daxue* and in the rest of the Four Books and the Five Classics.

Within the scope of this credo, however, the accentuation can be shifted around quite freely. A number of contingent factors (the individual mental constitution, the historical situation, one’s education, social position, etc.) will decide the particular articulation that the Confucianism of the individual thinker will assume. Within the rich Confucian heritage and tradition it would be possible to find precedents for nearly every such individual articulation.

Instances of this variety of possible accentuations are afforded by Seika and Razan. Generally speaking, if one wants to vindicate the “real” existence of the universe, it is necessary to supply a cosmology, and any Neo-Confucian cosmology will have to use the concepts of *li* and *qi*. Seika, however, hardly ever pronounced himself on this topic. In his commonplace book Razan quotes Seika’s diatribe about the *li* being universal several times,²²¹ and Hori Kyōan has noted down a pronouncement of Seika on the theme of “the *li* particularised in the various things,”²²² but that seems to be all. On the even more interesting topic of the interrelation of *li* and *qi* Seika seems to have preserved complete silence. Evidently he was only interested in *li*, and that only because this concept lent itself to express, nay, to prove the universal validity of

²²¹ *Bunshū* 74 (II, pp. 483-484). This entry, dating from 1648, goes back to the *Seika mondō* (cf. *Bunshū* 32: I, p. 349); *NST* XXVIII, pp. 203-204). *Bunshū* 73 (II, p. 471; undated) has the same contents, but Seika’s name is not mentioned. In *Bunshū* 70 (II, p. 426), dated 1647, Razan quotes Seika on “No Ultimate and the Supreme Ultimate”: “Master Seika once said to me: ‘No Ultimate and the Supreme Ultimate means that there is no form and that yet there is *li*.’ Again he said: ‘The Mean is another name of *li*.’ I heard this and sighed [with admiration]. Later, when I read the books of the Confucians, [I saw that] he had hit the nail on the head as neatly as splitting bamboo. Ah! How delighted I was.”

²²² Quoted in Abe, *Chōsen*, pp. 105-106.

Confucianism. Cosmologies and cosmogonies hardly interested him, though, of course, when asked, he would subscribe to the consensus that on this point Neo-Confucian thinkers had reached by the beginning of the Ming.²²³

Razan, however, was hugely interested in these problems. He had to be, because of the important part that the cosmological concepts of Neo-Confucianism played in his Shinto philosophy. On the other hand, Razan, too, deviated from strict orthodoxy.

Since his Japanese writings like the *Santoku-shō* are of an introductory nature, the complexities that arise when one tries to define the interrelation of *li* and *qi* are not more than alluded to, and the stress falls on the concept of the heart, but in his Shinto writings it emerges more clearly what he required of metaphysics. What Razan was seeking for, both in his Shinto and in his Neo-Confucian thinking, was a principle that would explain the essential unity of world and man, and also safeguard the objective existence of both. Since the heart not only had connotations that savoured of Zen Buddhism, but was also bound up with a complex of ethical representations meant to explain and guide the moral behaviour of the individual, he could not possibly take this as his central, organizing principle. The choice was between *li* and *qi*. *Qi* is, however, an a-moral principle, while the *li* are identified with the supreme moral values. No wonder, therefore, that Razan chose *li* to be his central principle and reinterpreted it, in Shinto terms, as the gods (from whom heaven and earth originate, who fill all between heaven and earth, and are present in every man's heart), and in Confucian terms as *li* (which, as the Supreme Ultimate, brings forth the whole of creation, as *li* is present in all things and as human nature (*xing*) is present in the heart of man). It may be evident that this essentially monistic attitude, on the Confucian plane, left little room for *qi*. Hence Razan's problems in regard to the origin of evil.

His concern with safeguarding the objective existence of the world also brought

²²³ Cf. the following quotation from the *Seika mondō*: "I (= Razan) asked about the theory of *li* and *qi*. The Master said: 'Even if today you would gather here all famous Confucians of the Song and the Yuan, they could not be more detailed and clear that what is written in the books. What I could say about it would therefore be the same as what you have read.' I asked: 'You mean books like the *Xingli daquan*?' The Master said: 'Yes.'" (*Bunshū* 32: I, p. 348; *NST* XXVIII, p. 201) See also Ishida, "Zenki bakuhan-taisei no ideorogii," *NST* XXVIII, p. 418.

him to a different interpretation of *gewu*: it was wrong to concentrate only on purifying the heart, for “things” could not be done away with or ignored. They existed and had to be investigated. It was precisely through an objective investigation of the things and affairs of this world that one would come to know the *li*. These *li* were immanent in “things and affairs” as well as in the heart. To concentrate only on the heart would lead to solipsism and the result would be something rather like Buddhism.

Seika, on the other hand, organized his thinking around the concept of the heart, with the expected results: the accent lies on personal, individual perfection (the obligation to perform public duties is not denied, certainly not, but it is definitely regarded as secondary to keeping intact one’s personal integrity), and action is regarded as contingent on “knowledge.” “Knowledge” to Seika clearly has the mystical sense of a full, internalised, integrated understanding of “The One,” in his case the “good, one and undivided,” which is also the heart.

Their attitudes in regard to the orthodox tradition were also different. Seika imperiously reduced the complexities of this tradition to make it fit his own ideas, while Razan made a conscious effort to understand and reproduce precisely these complexities, though he was not completely successful. The fact that he made this effort should be stressed. Razan did not automatically end up with orthodox Neo-Confucianism because it happened to be the only kind of Confucianism known at the time. He always explained the orthodox tradition with full appreciation of the polycentric structure of Neo-Confucianism and placed it against the background of the other, heterodox attempts at systematisation and interpretation.

This brings me to the last point I want to make. Why did Razan make this effort? Why did he choose to follow Zhu Xi’s orthodox Neo-Confucianism, rather than the teachings of one of the newer schools of the Ming? The following quotation will provide a clue:

Somebody again asked me: “I hear that since the beginning of the Ming there are people who have something to say about the Commentaries of Zhu Xi. Is

that true?" I answered: "Ever since Zhu Xi's Commentaries on the Four Books etc. appeared, through the remainder of the Song and the Yuan till the Great Ming, those who followed his school have been more than could be counted. Under the Great Ming [have appeared] Cai Xuzhai's [*Sishu*] *mengyin* 四書蒙引,²²⁴ Chen Zifeng's [*Sishu*] *qianshuo* 淺說,²²⁵ Lin Ciyai's *Cunyi* 存疑,²²⁶ Guan Daxun's [*Sishu*] *sanshuo* 三說,²²⁷ and Guo Zhuyuan's 郭洙源 [*Sishu*] *jizhu yi* 集註翼.²²⁸ These were all true to the Commentaries of Zhu Xi. Since China is a huge country, there must exist many more books that have not come to our land.

Ever since Wang Yangming's *Chuanxilu* appeared there have been quite a few people, starting with [his disciples] Wang Ji (Longxi) 王畿・龍溪 (1498-1583) and Qian Dehong (Xushan) 錢德洪・緒山 (1496-1574), who talked of "knowing one's original heart" and of "applying one's intuitive knowledge (*liangzhi*)," and who scoffed at Zhu Xi, [saying] that he was no good. There exist quite a few works, [written by people who] study this way of thinking, e.g. Zheng Guanqing's *Sishu zhixin rilu* 四書知新日錄²²⁹ and Mei Lin's 梅林 [*Sishu*] *yijian* 臆見.²³⁰

People like Luo Qinchun,²³¹ Huo Weiyai²³² and Chen Qinglan²³³ honoured Zhu Xi and rejected Lu Xiangshan and Wang Yangming, [as] appears from the *Kunzhiji* 困知記 and the *Xuebu tongbian* 學部通辨. Lin Zhaoen published his *Sishu zhaiyi* 四書摘義 and tried to establish one definite theory, criticising both Zhu Xi and Yangming. Apart from them there will certainly exist many more.

This is how confused people are. There are those who believe, and those

²²⁴ Cai Qing (Xuzhai) 蔡清・虛齋 (1443-1508), *jinshi* of 1484. Biography in *Ming Shih* 282; *Ming ru xuean* 46. A Ming edition of the *Sishu mengyin*, which was part of Razan's library, is now in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko.

²²⁵ Chen Chen (Zifeng) 陳琛・紫峯, *jinshi* of 1517. Biography in *Ming Shi* 282.

²²⁶ Lin Xiyuan (Ciyai) 林希元・次崖 (c. 1480 - c. 1560), *jinshi* of 1517. Biography in Goodrich, *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, p. 919 sqq. Xiyuan wrote both a *Sishu cunyi* and a *Yijing cunyi*; a copy of the Ming edition of the *Sishu cunyi* is now in the possession of the Naikaku Bunko. In China, because of their unorthodox character, both books had been ordered burnt immediately after their publication. A new edition was printed only in 1741.

²²⁷ Guan Daxun 管大勲, *jinshi* of 1565. For biographical references cf. *Mingren zhuanji ciliao zuoyin*, p. 773.

²²⁸ No details known.

²²⁹ Zheng Weiyue (Guangjing) 鄭維嶽・觀靜 (Ming). A book (6 fasc. in 8 vols) with this title that formerly belonged to Razan, is at present kept in the Naikaku Bunko.

²³⁰ No details known. In his *Kikensho-moku* Razan lists a *Mei Lin yijian*, and a book (12 fasc. in 4 vols) with this title that formerly belonged to the Hayashi family is at present kept in the Naikaku Bunko.

²³¹ Luo Qinchun (Zhengan) 羅欽順・整庵 (1465-1547) was a *jinshi* of 1493. Biography in Goodrich, *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, p. 972 sqq.

²³² Huo Weiyai (Dao) 霍渭崖・韜 (1487-1540), *jinshi* of 1514. Biography in Goodrich, *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, p. 679 sqq.

²³³ Chen Qinglan (Jian) 陳清瀾・建 (1479-1567); *chü-jen* of 1528. Biography in Goodrich, *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, p. 148 sqq.

who doubt, and those who half doubt and half believe. This is how confused the scholars are.

Although the Confucians of the Great Ming were quite conceited in their criticism of scholars of earlier times, to me they do not appear to be all the good. When the learning of the Way had been neglected for more than a thousand years, ever since the Qin and the Han, the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi appeared and clarified the Four Books and the Six Classics. When we know the heart of the Holy Ones, this is solely due to the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi, as is the fact that [we], scholars of a later age, expose the learning of the Way. When it is a matter of reading the writings of the Holy Ones, whom else should we believe, if we ignored the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi?²³⁴

From this passage and from other, similar passages in the works of Razan, we see that when Razan declares himself to be a follower of the orthodox school of Zhu Xi, there are two acts of faith involved: (a) that the Classics, the very words of the Holy Ones, are necessarily true, and (b) that the best interpretation of the Classics is given by Cheng Mingdao, Cheng Yichuan, and Zhu Xi. Why the Cheng brothers and Zhu Xi? Because they were the ones who had re-established the old tradition that had petered out after Mencius and who had given one consistent set of commentaries on all the Classics. And Razan is right: Lu Xiangshan and Wang Yangming quoted from the Classics, and Wang Yangming wrote his own interpretation of the *Daxue*, but neither of them ever wrote continuous commentaries as Zhu Xi did.

Seika worked with a much more diffuse conception of Confucianism. He lacked Razan's sense of history and seems to have assumed that parts of the truth, of *his* truth, could be found everywhere within the Confucian tradition. Razan, on the other hand, was a fundamentalist. He firmly believed that the ultimate truth, and the *nec plus ultra* of the literary tradition, were to be found in the Classics, and that, therefore, one should return to these sources. Programmatically Razan was very close to the so-called *kogaku-ha* 古學派, but contrary to these later thinkers he does not seem to have noticed the fatal gap that exists between the original Classics and the Classics as interpreted by the philosophers of the Song; a gap that the scholars of the *kogaku-ha* did their best to explore.

²³⁴ *Rongo Wa-ji kai*, pp. 5a-6a.

APPENDIX I: ON *qi*

In general it can be said that in Neo-Confucian metaphysics the concept of *qi* is even less systematically developed than that of *li*. The several accounts that are given of *qi* as the matter out of which all things are made, are clearly conflicting. In one theory, *qi* is equated with the five elements, and to each of these elements a specific realm is assigned:

[In the human body] “earth” is used to make the flesh, “wood” the hairs, “water” the blood and the other fluids, “metal” the muscles and bones, while “fire” is used to make the heat of the body. Again, as regards the five organs, the finest part (*jing* 精) of “fire” is the heart, that of “wood” the liver, that of “earth” the spleen, that of “metal” the lungs, while the finest part of “water” is the kidneys.²³⁵

According to this first theory, then, *qi* is divided into five different kinds, that each show a similar, internal gradation from coarse to fine.

Elsewhere, however, where differences in *qi* are alleged as an explanation of the differences existing between plants, animals and men, it is said that

Plants and trees, being born upside down make their roots to be their head and their branches to be their extremities (i.e. the least important parts. WJB). Birds and animals, being born sidewise, move about horizontally, but man, having received the straight *qi*, has a round head in imitation of the form of heaven, square feet in imitation of the earth, two eyes in imitation of the sun and the moon, and the *hyakue* 百會 (place where moxa can be applied. WJB) on the top of his head in imitation of the polestar, while the number of his organs and fingers is five in imitation of the five elements.²³⁶

In this case, there are three different kinds of *qi*, the “blocked up” (*sai*; J. *soku* 塞), the inclined” (*pian*; J. *hen* 偏) and the “straight” (*zheng*; J. *sei* 正) *qi*, which are

²³⁵ *Santoku-shō*: NST XXVIII, pp. 161-162.

²³⁶ *Santoku-shō*: NST XXVIII, p. 175. For the parallels with the human body, cf. *Huainanzi* 7 (“*Jingshen*” 精神), p. 2a.

responsible for three definitely segregated realms of nature.

In a third theory, however, it is assumed that *qi* is one continuum with local variations in density:

There is pure *qi* and turbid *qi*; sometimes it is clear and sometimes dark, sometimes thick and sometimes thin. Sometimes it opens and sometimes it clogs up. ... There are Holy Ones, Sages, wise men and gentlemen. These are men who have received pure and clear *qi*. Then there are mean men, evil men, stupid men. These are men who have received *qi* that is turbid and coarse. Then there are men who are honest and trustworthy, but stupid. These have received *qi* that is turbid and thick. There are others again who are smart and able, but who have a fierce streak and never unwind. These are men who have received clear but coarse *qi*.²³⁷

The fact that no one ever tried to eliminate these inconsistencies and that everybody was satisfied to argue *ad hoc* on the basis of one or other of these theories, shows that the concept was used pragmatically, in order to furnish an explanation of observed differences. Depending on what was felt to be the nature of the difference (whether it was a difference in kind or in degree, a deep chasm or a bridgeable gap), one or other of the conceptions of *qi* was chosen, or rather: had been chosen, for the cases are highly traditional.

Since in Neo-Confucianism the most essential difference is the difference between the Holy Ones and the ordinary human beings, and since one of the important preliminary questions that must have been answered affirmatively or else no one would ever embark on a course of Neo-Confucian self-cultivation, is whether this difference can be diminished, this question was stated in terms of the *qi* of Holy Men and Sages being more pure than the *qi* of ordinary men.

Although the fact that the problem is stated in the terms of my “third theory” creates a strong presumption in favour of the malleability of *qi* and thus of the perfectability of men, the theory is not as clear and unambiguous on this point as I have made out. There was quite some discussion, and ultimately the answers that were given ranged from “no” to an emphatic “yes.” A curious compromise was

²³⁷ *Santoku-shō*: NST XXVIII, p. 165.

suggested by Matsunaga Sekigo, who distinguished two kinds of *qi*:

In man this [first] kind of *qi* means that he is born rich or poor, that he has a long life or a short life, or that he meets with disaster or good fortune. Such differences it does occasion. This [it does] because there are differences in the length or thickness of his *qi*. This *qi* is the *qi* that does not change once you have received it. Next there is the *qi* in which there are differences between pure and turbid. Those who have received pure *qi* become wise men and Sages; those who have received turbid *qi* become stupid and incompetent. This *qi* is the *qi* that, after one has received it, can still be improved.²³⁸

Most of the optimist thinkers, however, amongst whom we find Razan, were more pragmatic and in this context only interested in *qi* as “something improvable and prefectable.”²³⁹ Pessimists there were too, but not amongst the thinkers with whom we are concerned.²⁴⁰

²³⁸ *Irin-shō*, NST XXVIII, p. 308.

²³⁹ See *Santoku-shō*, NST XXVIII, pp. 165-166.

²⁴⁰ See Bitō, *Nihon hōken shisōshi kenkyū*, p. 74.

APPENDIX II: ON *LING*

I have already said that *ling* is a qualification of *qi*. I could be more precise, and say that *ling* is used as a qualification of the operations of the heart, of its *qi* or *yong* aspect. In his commentary on the Three Principles of the *Daxue* Zhu Xi defines the illustrious virtue, which he identifies with the heart, as *xuling bumei* (empty, spiritual and unobscured), and in his commentaries on Zhou Dunyi's *Taijitu shuo* he explains the term *ling* that occurs in the phrase “Only man receives its (i.e. the *qi*'s. WJB) finest (*xiu* 秀) [part] and he is the most spiritual (*ling*)” as follows:

When men or things come into being (*sheng* 生) all have the Way of the Supreme Ultimate within [themselves]. However, Yin and Yang, the five elements and the ether-like and solid *qi*²⁴¹ mix and revolve; as concerns [the *qi*] man is endowed with — he alone receives its finest [part]. For this reason [man's] heart is the most spiritual and he can avoid losing the whole of his nature.²⁴² [This heart] is what one calls the heart of heaven and earth; it is what is highest in man.²⁴³

Both steps of the argument, namely that man is made of better *qi* than the rest of creation and that the heart of man is made of better *qi* (described as *ling*) than the rest of his body, we find repeated separately in the rest of the same commentary:

Zhu Xi said: “This one *qi* of Yin and Yang and of the five elements churns between heaven and earth. Its finest and best part becomes man; its dregs become things. The finest and best [part] of the finest and best [*qi*] becomes the Holy Ones and Sages. The dregs of the finest and best [*qi*] become the dumb and stupid men.”²⁴⁴ Someone asked: “Does spiritual place (*lingchu* 靈處) mean heart, or does it mean nature?” [Zhu Xi] answered: “Spiritual place just is the

²⁴¹ For the meaning of this term see Yasuda Jirō, *Chūgoku kinsei shisō kenkyū*, pp. 16-17.

²⁴² Because of the supremely good quality of the *qi* out of which man is made, his nature is not necessarily obscured but can be made to shine forth wholly and completely.

²⁴³ *Xingli jingyi* 1.7b.

²⁴⁴ *Xingli jingyi* 1.7b.

heart; it is not the nature. The nature is *li*.”²⁴⁵

That Razan knew this interpretation, or rather this usage of the term, is shown by the following quotation from the *Seiri jigi genkai*²⁴⁶:

The heart is a living entity and it likes to move. It is not something that is quiet and dead. ... [It is said that] the heart is a place of movement: it moves because of the *qi*. [It is said that] it is a spiritual place: it is spiritual because it consists of *li* and *qi* together. (*rei naru tokoro wa ri to ki to awasuru ni yotte rei wo nasu*). As concerns [the term] “subtle” (*miao* 妙) — it does not mean “being very good,” but refers to [the fact that the heart] cannot be measured (i.e. that its actions cannot be foreseen or calculated. WJB).²⁴⁷

The heart consists of *li* and *qi* together. [In it] are emptiness, spirituality and the faculty of the intellect (*zhixue*). This is the place that is the ruler of the body. With “emptiness and spirituality” is meant that it has no form and no colour and that it is spiritual and subtle (*lingmiao*). With the “faculty of the intellect” is meant that it can know and understand well. These then are the things that are in the heart. This emptiness, spirituality and the intellect [at times] come forth out of the *li* and [at times] out of the *qi*. These [two] are not the same.²⁴⁸

That *ling* is used adjectively of special kinds of *qi* is also shown by the next quotation, belonging to a rather different field of speculation. Writing about the dragon, one of the “Four Spiritual Animals,”²⁴⁹ Razan poses these questions:

Has the dragon a shape or has it not? It can become big and small, it can retract and expand, it can show itself and it can hide. [In] its spirituality [it] cannot be measured. However, some have detained them: people of old captured and pickled them. If that is so, do they not effectively have a form? Would it be something like [the story that] the people of Lei Zhou 雷州

²⁴⁵ *Xingli jingyi* 1.7b.

²⁴⁶ The *Seiri jigi genkai* is a Japanese annotation of the *Xingli ziyi*, a Neo-Confucian primer by Chen Chun (Beixi) 陳淳·北溪 (1153-1217); biography in Franke, ed., *Sung biographies* I, p. 95 sqq. A Japanese reprint of the *Xingli ziyi* was made in Kan'ei 9 (1632). The autograph (?) of Razan's *Genkai*, written in 1639, is now in the possession of the Sonkeikaku Bunko. The original Chinese text of Chen Beixi is not entered in the *Genkai*. All references are here made to the printed edition of the *Seiri jigi genkai* made in Manji 2 (1659).

²⁴⁷ *Genkai* 2.5b.

²⁴⁸ *Genkai* 2.1b-2a.

²⁴⁹ The Four Spiritual Animals are the unicorn, phoenix, turtle and dragon.

(“Thunder District”) captured the thunder and ate it? The dragon and the thunder, do they have [a form] or do they not?²⁵⁰

The questions as such, of course, need not detain us. The point is that in this entry in his commonplace-book Razan describes the dragon as *ling*, and evidently thinks of it as a kind of *qi*. The qualifications “to be able to retract and expand” and “not being capable of measurement” are the same that are used when the concept of *shen* 神 is being defined.²⁵¹ In fact, the most common gloss of *ling* is *shen* and its most common Japanese renderings are *kami* and *tamashii*. And *shen* definitely is a kind of *qi*.

We can therefore conclude that in Neo-Confucian doctrine *ling* (*miaoling*) is used in reference to the heart, the microcosm, while *shen* is used of the macrocosm. This would also explain the absence of the term *ling* in the works of Zhang Zai. It is, however, to some extent a matter of preference. Cases that *shen* qualifies operations or properties of the heart do occur,²⁵² and instances that *ling* is used as a predicate of cosmic forces, too, can be found, especially in a Shinto context. Nevertheless, the distinction seems to be a useful one.²⁵³

The sense in which both *shen* and *ling* are ordinarily used, outside of this philosophical context, is “unmeasurable,” “incalculable,” “mysterious,” “inexplicable.” Hence it can be applied to many things that for some reason or other are felt to be beyond comprehension. However, these words can also be used as terms that have a specific, dogmatic content. This point is overlooked by Yasuda Jirō in his discussion of Zhang Zai’s dictum that “because it is one, it is god-like; because it is two, the

²⁵⁰ *Bunshū* 35 (II, p. 390).

²⁵¹ The tag that *shen* is “what cannot be measured” derives from the following passage in the *Yijing* (third appendix 1, 5; Legge, *The I Ching*, p. 357): “That which is unfathomable in (the movements of) the inactive and active operations (= Yin and Yang) is (the presence of a) spiritual (power).”

²⁵² Cf., e.g., Razan’s commentary to *Mengzi* IV A, 16 (“Of all the parts of a man’s body there is none more excellent than the pupil of the eye.”): “When man and things are intermingling, the god-like (*shen*) *qi* of man is in his eyes. Therefore, if within his heart ‘all be correct,’ the god-like *qi* will be refined (*jing* 精) and thus the pupils will be clear. If within the heart there is wickedness, the god-like *qi* will be scattered (*san* 散) and thus the pupils will be dark.” (*Dōmō-shō* 童蒙抄 I, p. 3b, quoted from the edition of Kanbun 6 [1666])

²⁵³ The term also figured in Christian polemics. See Gernet, *Chine et Christianisme*, p. 198 sqq, for examples where *ling* is used by the Jesuit missionaries as the translation of “rational” in combinations like *lingxing* of *linghun* 靈魂 (“soul”).

transformations occur” (*yi gu shen, liang gu hua* 一故神、兩故化).²⁵⁴ I do not think that the “requirements of formal logic,” which forbid a thing to be one and two at the same time, forced Zhang Zai to call an entity that did not conform to this rule (i.e. *qi*) “mysterious” (*shen*). As appears clearly from Zhu Xi’s commentary to this passage,²⁵⁵ the term *shen* is applied because “This one thing (*wu*) circulates between all affairs and things. [Aspects of it] like Yin and Yang, like [the fact] that it retracts and expands, goes and comes, rises and falls, and thus acts within the ten, hundred, thousand, yes, myriad [things], all this is this one thing.”

Yasuda’s second example, too, is not very convincing. In his quotation from the *Zhuzi yulei* 朱子語類 we find the phrase “It is *li* that is mysterious and not to be measured” (*li ze shen er mu ce* 理則神而莫測), which at first sight seems to upset my contentions.²⁵⁶ This entry in the *Yulei*, however, is a commentary to Zhou Dunyi’s *Tongshu* 通書 (sect. 16). In this section Dunyi constructs an opposition between *wu* that “when it moves is not at rest,” and *shen* that “though it moves has yet no movement.” This is because “things cannot interpenetrate (*tong* 通), but the *shen* subtly [works within] the myriad things” (*miao wanwu* 妙萬物). (The second part is a quotation from *Yijing*, fifth appendix, 6.) For this opposition between *wu* and *shen* Zhu Xi wants to substitute his own opposition between “receptacles” (*qi* 器) and *li*. Ergo, in the context of this argument he has to equate *li* with *shen*, but this cannot be taken as Zhu Xi’s standard definition either of *li* or of *shen*.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

²⁵⁴ Yasuda, *Chūgoku kinsei shisō kenkyū* (rpt, 1977), p. 40. Quotation from *Zhengmeng* II, 2.

²⁵⁵ *Zhangzi quanshu* 2.5b.

²⁵⁶ Yasuda, *op. cit.*, p. 41 and note 71.

CHAPTER IV

CONFUCIANISM AND THE BAKUFU

Razan spent the last fifty years of his life in the service of the *bakufu*. Since to later generations he has been known primarily as a Confucian philosopher, the conclusion that has usually been drawn is that he must have been employed by the *bakufu* in this capacity. Reduced in this way to its bare outlines, the rather arbitrary nature of this thesis as well as the various ways in which it may be proven or disproven, become clear.¹

As the story is usually told, Razan was hired as the result of an interview with Ieyasu, on which occasion he showed a vastness of erudition that by far surpassed that of the erudites who were in attendance. In his *Nozuchi* 野槌 Razan describes the interview in the following words:

When I was still young and the *daishōkoku* was still *naidaijin*,² I had an audience with him at his palace on Nijō. The Zen fathers [Shō]tai 承兌 and [Sanyō Gan]kichi 三要元吉 and Kiyohara Gokurō 清原極菴 (= Funabashi Hidekata 船橋秀賢) were also in attendance at the time. [Ieyasu] asked how many generations there had been between [Han] Gaozu 高祖 and Emperor Guangwu 光武. Because nobody could remember he asked me, whether I knew. I answered that in the annals of the *Hou Han* [Shu] it was written that Emperor Guangwu was a descendant of Gaozu in the ninth generation. When again he asked in

¹ In furnishing biographical details I will stay as much as possible within these limits. For a full-fledged biography of Razan the reader is referred to Hori Isao, *Hayashi Razan*.

² *Daishōkoku* 大相國 is the Chinese equivalent of the Japanese title of *daijōdaijin* 太政大臣. According to the *Kugyō bunin* 公卿補任 Ieyasu was appointed *naidaijin* 内大臣 and given senior second grade in Bunroku 5 (1596), promoted to junior first grade in Keichō 7 (1602), and appointed *udaijin* 右大臣 in Keichō 8/2/12 (24-3-1603), at the same time that he was made *seii taishōgun* 征夷大將軍. The office of *udaijin*, however, he laid down in the tenth month of the same year. From then on until Genna 2/3/27 (12-5-1616) when, one month before his death, he was appointed *daijōdaijin* he is mentioned every year among the *sanni* 散位, i.e. persons who had a rank but did not hold office, as *zen-udaijin*.

which book something was written about the “spirit-recalling incense” 反魂香, all said that they were not sure, and I answered that the “spirit-recalling incense” does not appear in the main text of the *Shijji* or the *Han [Shu]*, but that in the “*Yuefu* 樂府 of Lady Li” in the Collected Works of Bai [Juyi] 白居易 and in the notes to the poems of [Su] Dongpo 蘇東坡 it was written that Emperor Wu burned it and summoned the spirit of his wife. Again he said: “What is meant with the “orchids of Qu Yuan 屈原?” I answered: “According to the notes [to the *Chuci* 楚辭] of Zhu Wengong 文公 (= Zhu Xi), it was the marsh orchid.” The *daishōkoku* looked left and right and gave vent to his amazement, saying: “This youngster knows a lot.” This was in Keichō 10 (1605).³

The descriptions that Razan’s *Nenpu* and *Gyōjō* give of this audience are substantially the same. The *Nenpu*, however, also mentions another audience that preceded the one described here by Razan.⁴ This first audience probably took place on the twelfth day,⁵ but anyhow between the eighth and fifteenth day of the fourth month of Keichō 10 (between May 25 and June 1, 1605), when Ieyasu had temporarily moved from the castle in Fushimi to the Nijō-jō on account of the transfer of the office of *shōgun* to Hidetada. The second audience must have taken place between the twenty-first of the seventh month (4-9-1605) and the twenty-second of the eighth month (4-10-1605) of the same year, when Ieyasu was again staying at the Nijō-jō.⁶ From a letter by Seika to Razan, it seems probable that a third audience had taken place in between the other two, at the castle in Fushimi, in the course of the fifth month. The letter in question is an undated letter, reading:

³ *Nozuchi* (*Kokubun chūshaku zensho* XII), p. 229. In Isseidō catalogue no. 82 (1996), under no. 9362, we find a photograph of a sheet entitled *Hankonkō hihō* 秘法 no koto, dated 1367 (Jōji 6), and copied by the monk Chōe 朝恵. In this text the incense is identified with the Japanese *nemunoki*.

⁴ *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1 (p. 14). *Kakikudashi* of this passage in Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 88-89.

⁵ Cf. letter (4), translated *infra*.

⁶ The *Shiryō sōran* places the second interview on the twenty-first day of the seventh month, on the authority of the *Nozuchi*, which does not mention a date, and the *Kansei chōshū shoka fu*, which is a late, secondary source. For more details, cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 89-90.

As [you said in] your letter, your expectations have not been few since then (i.e. since the first audience. WJB). Yesterday you had an audience with the *fuchū* (= Ieyasu). Very good! What did he do and say? This is what I have been worrying about. Ka[ko] Bu[zen-no-kami Munetaka] 賀古豊前守宗隆 has already left for Ōsaka? I am very sorry to hear this. Have pity on him. I hear you went to Chōshōshi the other night and that Shōyū 勝熊 (= Matsunaga Teitoku 松永貞徳), too, unexpectedly met you there. I was not present at the gathering. I have, alas!, plenty [to do at the moment]. For two or three days I have been cutting bamboo and even hoeing grass. I discussed [building] a small annex with the carpenter. The carpenter made a rough sketch, but I do not know whether it will be done or not. Poor me! For [this] reason I am not yet able to accept your kind invitation. Let us put it off till another day.⁷

More interesting, however, than the chronological outlines is the question how these interviews came about. As a general rule, this kind of audiences does not come out of the blue. Some spadework must be done in all such cases, and in this case it had been done by Seika and his allies. In several of his letters, Seika refers to happenings at Ieyasu's court that acquaintances had evidently reported to him,⁸ and later on he comments on the audiences

⁷ Ōta I, p. 264; *DNS* XII.31, p. 607; cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 91. If the order in which the letters are arranged in the *Seika bunshū* is any indication, this letter must have been written after the fourteenth of the fourth month, and rather close to the first of the sixth month, as only one letter comes between this letter and a letter dated on the first of the sixth month. Therefore, trying to construe this letter as referring to one of the "known" interviews would lead to forced interpretations. It is better to assume, with Hori Isao (cf. *Hayashi Razan*, p. 91), that at least one more audience did take place. The dates, however, that Hori proposes (between the thirteenth and the fifteenth of the fourth, or between the twenty-first of the seventh and the twenty-second of the eighth month) are either improbable or impossible.

⁸ The two most important ones were Jō Masamochi (cf. *infra*, n. 17) and Kako Munetaka, Seika's friend and compatriot (he also came from Harima). Not much is known about Munetaka. According to Ōta (I, p. 15), the sources are limited to a number of references in Seika's works, several letters (twenty-four pages in all) from him to Seika, on the back of which Seika copied out the *Jindai-ki*, and an entry in the *Tokiyoshi-kyō ki* 時慶卿記 (Genna 4/4/16). From this it appears that he was an old friend also of Akamatsu Hiromichi and used the title of Buzen-no-kami. According to Hori (p. 55; no sources quoted) he changed his name to Masatoshi 正利. To this Takano Tatsuyuki (*Kobungaku tōsa*, pp. 426-428) adds that he served under Toyotomi Hideyori and later moved to Edo where he presumably worked for the *bakufu*. For his high opinion of Razan see, e.g., a letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 9/12/22: Ōta I, pp. 144-145; *ZZGR* XIII, p. 116. The *Tokiyoshi-kyō ki* as quoted in *DNS* XII.29, p. 294, mentions a Kako Buzen[-no-kami] under Genna 4/4/17. Munetaka thus cannot be identified with the Kasuya Munetaka (dates unknown; cf. *Kokushi daijiten* s.v. "Kakogawa-

themselves. I will here translate the relevant passages, in chronological order.

1. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 10/2/26 (14-4-1605).

One thing has come to my ears. In front of the *shōgun* three or four of his favourites embroidered on the fact that you have been giving lectures and made it into a tapestry of lies. Little men like them have always been the same. Although you do not need to have [any] apprehensions [on their account], and one “can slip through Song in commoners’ clothes,”⁹ [nevertheless] human affairs must not be treated lightly. This is because human affairs [ultimately] are the *li* of heaven, [like in] “in studying one starts low but [eventually] one rises high.”¹⁰ This is again [a phrase] that you might lecture on.

“The stones of other hills,”¹¹ they are mere pebbles: is not the day that you like polished jade [will shine] already be contained in the present [events]? That with what they [try to] undo you, and that what I congratulate you on, are [both] in this.

Today the weather happens to be nice and clear. Take this old servant as your guide and direct your steps to a lonely spot halfway, and wait for me. I shall also come and tell you the things that I have heard. Therefore, have this old servant bring you quickly to this spot halfway, and then send him about his business. I think that I cannot come to you, nor should you come to me, for we must both be careful about human affairs. What do you think of it?

Generally speaking, if you are friends with somebody, [you are friends] in good luck and in bad luck, in prosperity and in adversity; you have to warn him, congratulate him, condole him; you grieve together, rejoice together and lay plans together. If [the friendship] is not something like this, it is a business relation, a nodding acquaintance. [Such a relation] is not [according to the standard] of

han”): although his name is written with a different character for *-taka*, most of the particulars would fit him, but he seems to have died during the Ōsaka *fuyu-no-jin*.

⁹ Reference to an incident in the life of Confucius. Cf. *Mengzi* V A, 9.

¹⁰ Quotation from *Lunyu* XIV, 35. In the commentary of the *Sishu jizhu* one of the Cheng brothers is quoted as having said: “Methinks that studying, on a low level, the affairs of man, means, on a high level, to penetrate into the *li* of heaven. If one should [only] practise, however, and not observe, then this would not be sufficient [to allow one to assume that], on a high level, [one will] penetrate.”

¹¹ *Shijing* 184. In the poem these stones are used as whetstones to polish jade. In the allegorical interpretation of this poem by one of the Cheng brothers, which Zhu Xi quotes in his *Shijing* commentary, these stones are the mean men who as it were polish the *junzi* (cf. *Shijing jizhuan* 5.6b).

righteousness, nor [does it come] from the heart. What do you think of it?¹²

Seika's hopeful and optimistic appraisal of the situation turned out to have been true, for a few days later he writes to Razan:

2. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.¹³

Someone who yesterday came from the southern castle (= Fushimi-jō) said that in this matter the *bakufu* (= Ieyasu) has no intention of criticising you severely. It was nothing but the "buzzing about of one green fly."¹⁴ If we "threw out [these slanderers] and gave them to the wolves and tigers," there would still be left.¹⁵ Or what did the poet say [of such people]?¹⁶

The incident seems to have had its uses. As Seika had foreseen, it had brought Razan to Ieyasu's notice. It probably gave one of Seika's allies, Jō Izumi-no-kami Masamochi 城和泉守昌茂 (1551-1626), who "is now attending upon the *bakufu* in Fushimi,"¹⁷ the opportunity to defend and praise Razan in front of Ieyasu and to prepare the ground for the summons that Seika refers to

¹² Ōta I, p. 150; ZZGR XIII, p. 119. Cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 42-43.

¹³ Only one letter, dated on the twenty-seventh of the second month (15-4-1605), comes between this letter and letter (1). If we assume that the letter in the *Seika-sensei bunshū* are arranged chronologically — according to the prefatory notes of the editor they should be — this letter must have been written after the twenty-sixth of the second month and, in view of the next letter in which Seika thanks Razan for his letter of Keichō 10/3/3 (20-4-1605; cf. *Bunshū* 11: I, pp. 128-129), not much later than the first of the third month.

¹⁴ *Shijing* 219. "Green flies" are a symbol of slanderers. For the translation cf. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, p. 172.

¹⁵ *Shijing* 200. Cf. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, pp. 151-152.

¹⁶ Ōta I, p. 151; ZZGR XIII, p. 119. Cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 44.

¹⁷ Ōta I, p. 151; ZZGR XIII, pp. 119-120. Jō Izumi-no-kami Masamochi had originally served under the Takeda, but later on, together with his father, he had entered the service of Ieyasu, where he rose to *sōshaban* (master of ceremony) and *daimyō* of Oshikumagaya (Musashi; 7000 *koku*). During the Ōsaka campaign, however, he broke some military rules and as a result found himself interned in the Ishiyama-dera. He was pardoned in Kan'ei 3 (1626), but died on his way back to Edo (Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 94). He is often mentioned by Seika, who also wrote some pieces for him. See especially his "Jō Sen-boku Masamochi no juzō o san-su," dated Genna 1/6/13 (8-7-1615), in which no mention is made (as yet ?) of his disgrace, though the Ōsaka campaign had already been concluded in the preceding month.

in the following letter:

3. Undated letter from Seika to Razan, written after Keichō 10/4/5 (22-5-1605).¹⁸

Furthermore, on account of Jō's introduction, you will be accorded an audience with the *bakufu*, you say? My sincere congratulations! These two or three favourites in front of him — in everything they do or say [a sting is hidden, like] arsenic in honey or a snare within a [trapping] device. You should not think lightly of them! Think about this, and take this into consideration. If one has the virtues of a gentleman, but not a gentleman's talents, one may meet with being thwarted and bested by small people. The teaching of the Holy Ones of "doubling one's guard and building [extra] defences,"¹⁹ is it for nothing?²⁰

Within a few days after the writing of this letter, on the twelfth of the fourth month (29-5-1605), the audience really took place:

4. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated on Keichō 10/4/14 (31-5-1605).

The day before yesterday you saluted (*bai*) the *shōgun*? I, too, was pleased. For joy I could not sleep.²¹

The preceding letters are all antecedent to, or refer to the first audience. The great interview, which took place in the course of the seventh month and which Razan describes in the *Nozuchi* cannot be dated, and the

¹⁸ The letter that in the *Seika-sensei bunshū* precedes this one is also included in the *Seika bunshū*, and is there dated on the "first five-day of the first month of summer," i.e. on the fifth day of the fourth month (22-5-1605). The next roughly datable letter, eight letters further on, is letter (5); for its date, cf. *infra*, n. 22.

¹⁹ Reference to the *Yijing*, first appendix (the explanation of the hexagram *kan*). Cf. Legge, *The I Ching*, pp. 236-237.

²⁰ Ōta I, p. 153; ZZGR XIII, p. 121. Cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 93.

²¹ Ōta I, p. 263; cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 89. Cf. also the letter from Seika to Razan in which Seika writes that he "expressed his thanks on behalf of you (= Razan), for the audience and the introduction with the *bakufu* of the other day" to Jō Masamochi (text in DNS XII.31, pp. 614-615).

Seika-sensei bunshū contains only one unambiguous reference to it. (In the *Seika bunshū* it is not referred to at all.)

5. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.²²

The three pieces on the Star Night (= the Tanabata festival. WJB) I have been reciting [over and over again] without putting them down. As for me, I have not even one piece. My lack of energy [should make] you pity me. ... The *Daxue yanyi* 衍義 and the [*Daxue yanyi*] *buyi* 補遺²³ are books that those who study must certainly read and discuss. You have read them too? The most important points of ruling the country and pacifying the world are exhaustively [treated there]. One ought to be glad about your lecture to-morrow on the *Daxue* and honour you for it. I am really vexed that I will not be among the audience.

Yesterday, when you had your audience with the *bakufu*, the *funai* (= Ieyasu) did nothing strange? [Your] letter to Ka[ko] Bu[zen no kami Munetaka] I have kept back, waiting for [somebody who] can bring it to him.²⁴

In the following year, Keichō 11 (1606), Ieyasu stayed in Fushimi from the sixth day of the fourth till the twenty-first day of the ninth month (12-5 till 22-10-1606). According to the *Nenpu*

the Master (= Razan) frequently went to Fushimi to wait upon [Ieyasu]. When the time came that Ieyasu returned to Sunpu there was an order, saying: "Next year you must come to Sunpu and [from there] go straight to Edo to wait upon the *shōgun*." On account of this command he made haste with the preparations for his journey east.²⁵

²² The reference to the "three pieces" on the Tanabata Festival makes it seem probable that this letter was written between the seventh and the middle of the seventh month of 1605.

²³ The *Yanyi* is a compilation in forty-three fascicles by Zhen Dexiu 眞德秀 (1178-1235); a detailed description of this work is given in de Bary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy*, pp. 106-123; for Zhen Dexiu cf. Franke, *Sung Biographies* I, pp. 80-90. The *Yanyi bu* (not: *Yanyi buyi*) in 160 fascicles was compiled by Qiu Jun 丘濬 (1420-1495); biography in *Ming Shih* 181.

²⁴ Ōta I, p. 156; ZZGR XIII, pp. 122-123. Cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 90-91.

²⁵ *Nenpu* under Keichō 11 (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 14). The account given in the *Gyōjō* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 3, p. 38) is even terser than that in the *Nenpu*.

Razan dutifully went to Sunpu and Edo the next year, Keichō 12:

On the first day of the third month (28-3-1607) [Razan] left the capital and on the eighth he arrived in Sunpu. Here he stayed on until the following month, and in the middle of the fourth month he left Sunpu for Edo. He saluted the *shōgun* Hidetada and was in attendance on him for fifteen days. ... Then he returned to Sunpu and wrote his *Tōkō nichiroku* 東行日録 (“Diary of a Journey East”).²⁶ Thereupon he was in attendance upon Ieyasu for several months. ... Thereafter he was given leave and returned to Kyōto. Moreover, he received the order and since he could not refuse, he shaved his head and changed his name to Dōshun 道春. He also received instructions, [according to which] he went to Nagasaki and thence he returned to the capital.²⁷

The following year, Keichō 13, Razan again went to Sunpu, where

he was in attendance upon Ieyasu day and night, reading the *Lunyu* 論語, the *Sanlue* 三略, etc. He received a plot of land and a building subvention as well as an annual salary. Moreover, he received the keys of the library and [was allowed to] read the shogunal books as much as he wanted.²⁸

This account is very sketchy. Moreover, the facts it reports are chosen with hindsight. We are told how the future Confucian-in-chief of the *bakufu* set his first, unwavering steps on the ladder of success. We are not told of the insecurity of these beginnings, of the tergiversations and the soul-searching that accompanied them, nor of the criticisms that were elicited by Razan’s choice of this kind of career. Yet, as his correspondence with Seika shows, all these existed.

The first thing we learn from the correspondence with Seika is that the chronological order of events was rather different from what is reported in the

²⁶ *Bunshū* 22 (I, pp. 243-246).

²⁷ *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1 (p. 15). Cf. *Gyōjō* (ibid., *Furoku* 3, p. 38) where the same story is repeated.

²⁸ *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1 (p. 15). Cf. *Gyōjō* (ibid., *Furoku* 3, p. 38).

Nenpu. The trip to the south (Nagasaki) Razan supposedly made in Keichō 12, after he had returned from Edo and Sunpu, must in fact have been made at the end of Keichō 10 or the beginning of Keichō 11, as can be inferred from a letter that probably dates from the end of autumn or the winter of Keichō 10,²⁹ in which Seika refers to it. The letter reads:

6. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.

About your journey to the western provinces and the south of Kyūshū I did not yet know the rights. I [only] heard by rumour that the *sōfu* (= Ieyasu) had given [such an] order. Now it has finally materialised. An auspicious omen! My sincere congratulations! This pair of *tabi* is merely in order to wish you that you do well on the way. It is not [given] in order to [give you] a thing. Please accept it. Then I would be very glad.”³⁰

The journey to the east, too, is mentioned one year earlier than one would have assumed on the basis of the *Nenpu*. Already in the second or third month of Keichō 11 Seika twice mentions such a project in his letters, the second time saying:

7. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated “twenty-fourth day of the same month,” i.e. Keichō 11/3/24 (1-5-1606).

As regards your emotions about our separation on account of your journey to the east, nothing can be done. However, [it is] also [said]:

²⁹ Ōta I, p. 266. The letter is included in the *Seika bunshū*, where it precedes a letter dated on Keichō 11/2/20 (28-3-1606). It is itself preceded by a letter that, to judge by its contents, was written at approximately the same time as letter (5). This means that a gap exists in the correspondence — in the *Seika bunshū* — from the seventh month of Keichō 10 till the second month of Keichō 11, bridged only by this one letter. The fact that in the *Seika-sensei bunshū* an even greater gap exists, from the eighth month of Keichō 10 until the fifth month of Keichō 11 (cf. the letters in Ōta I, p. 157), could in itself be an indication of a prolonged absence of Razan from the capital.

³⁰ Ōta I, p. 266.

“Do not be lax about official business.”³¹ How could you make light of it? As regards the way back — you will come in attendance on the *bakufu* (= Ieyasu) on the day that he enters the capital? Come back quickly, come back quickly!³² That is the only thing I am concerned about.³³

Contrary to the journey to Kyūshū, this plan was probably not put into effect, though as a matter of fact the next recorded letter of Seika to Razan dates from the seventeenth day of the fourth month (23-5-1606), eleven days after Ieyasu’s arrival in Fushimi.

8. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated the seventeenth day of the fourth month (23-5-1606).

Yesterday I [had the pleasure of] listening to your refined conversation all day long. Its taste still lingers between my cheeks and teeth. Most, most gratifying! Would you be so kind as to tell this also to [your brother Nobu]zumi? ... Are you really going to the southern castle (= Fushimi) tomorrow? After you have come back we must have a talk about how things are with the government.³⁴

From this time onward the (as Seika called it) “official business” claimed a major part of Razan’s time, and Seika had to forego the pleasures of his company. Seika showed his displeasure with this state of affairs a number of times,³⁵ to wind up with a magnificently sulking letter:

³¹ Cf. *Shijing* 121; 162; 167; 169; 205, where we find the phrase “*wang shi mi gu*” 王事靡盬. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, translates it as “The service to the king must not be defective.”

³² The characters *zao* 棗 (jujube; J. *natsume*) and *gui* 龜 (turtle) are here used instead of their homophones *zao* 早 (early, fast) and *gui* 歸 (to return).

³³ Ōta I, p. 267. The first time Seika mentions the journey is in an undated letter to Razan, in which Seika says: “I have received the four volumes of the *Baochi quanshu* 保赤全書. I am very glad. When will [you start on] your journey to the East? For me it is rather sad. [Other things] I will leave till my next letter.” The second time is in this letter (7), which in the *Seika bunshū* immediately follows the letter just quoted, and starts with “I have returned the *Baochi quanshu*.”

³⁴ Ōta I, pp. 267-268.

³⁵ Cf. e.g. the following letter (undated; written probably in the middle of the fifth month of Keichō 11): “For some time now I have seen or heard little from you. How far off [you seem]!”

9. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 11/8/12 (14-9-1606).

My feelings of isolation: [I feel] like the first breezes of fall or like the last summer rains,³⁶ like wind-blown sage-brush³⁷ and withered grass, like a dazed fly, like a frozen turtle, like the weathered remnants of an earthen doll or a peach-wood idol. [These feelings] are not things that can be expressed in words or be written with a brush. I leave this all to your reflection.³⁸

The next week, however, it was Seika's turn to leave Razan. As he informs Razan, in a letter that, though undated, must have been written on the nineteenth or the twentieth of the eighth month, he has been invited by Asano Yoshinaga 浅野幸長 to visit him in his castle in Wakayama.³⁹ In Razan's *Nenpu* we find the following entry concerning this visit:

At this time Seika went to the south of Kii. The Master (= Razan) saw him off. He regretted this separation. Seika with his own hands took the *Yanping dawen* and gave it to him, saying: "[In this work] the method of disciplining the heart (*xinfa*), the method [that was taught by Yanping, [is set forth]]. It is the gate that gives access to the teachings of Ziyang (= Zhu Xi). That I now show it to you is not without intent."⁴⁰

As if you were keeping me away. I think that you make much out of your official business, [while] your neglect of me is simply terrible. [However,] nothing can be done about that." (Ōta I, p. 157; ZZGR XIII, p. 123) In another letter Seika speaks of "turning your jade-like footstep [hither] when you are free from official [duties]." (Ōta I, p. 158; ZZGR XIII, p. 124). In a different letter again, written on the twenty-eighth day of the seventh month of the same year (31-8-1611), Seika complains: "Of late I do not see you at all, and I cannot tell you all the things that I have on my mind. Alas! How many they are! The *bakufu* has entered the capital, you say. I imagine you being night and day in attendance at his side. Are you happy [with it], or have you found it to be a chore?" (Ōta I, p. 163; ZZGR XIII, p. 126)

³⁶ Cf. *Du Fu quanji*, p. 4 ("Qiuyu tan"). The character *fu* 伏 denotes the period of the end of summer and the beginning of autumn.

³⁷ Cf. *Du Fu quanji*, p. 111 ("Zeng Li Bai").

³⁸ Ōta I, p. 163; ZZGR XIII, p. 126. This letter is continued in Ōta I, p. 268.

³⁹ In his postface to the "Chinese and Japanese poems exchanged between guest and host on the Eastern Mountain" ("Tōsan hin-shu shiika no batsu" 東山賓主詩歌跋, *Bunshū* 51: II, p. 157) Razan says that Seika left for Wakayama on the twenty-first of the eighth month (23-9-1606) and returned on the first of the eleventh month (30-11-1606).

⁴⁰ *Nenpu* under Keichō 12 (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1. p. 15). Regarding the possible importance of

When we compare this account with the letter, however, it becomes evident how much the former has been slanted. In the letter Seika writes:

10. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.

Though I should be able to send you the *Yanping shu* (= the *Yanping dawen* ? WJB) this instant by a servant, I suddenly have some affairs on hand and want to go to southern Kii. I am nearly about to set the first step of my journey. Therefore I have put the book-boxes and such in another library, so I do not happen to have [this book] near me. Nothing to be done. I was coming in order to announce to you my journey south and to take leave, but while lowly, cumbersome [concerns] were pressing me and I was still hesitating and undecided, you sent your letter. I should gladly tell you all the things that I have on my mind! If for some reason I am detained today, I will certainly [come to] take leave in person. [I write this] in the greatest hurry. Words cannot express fully what I want to say. Let alone this brief letter. I greet you twice.⁴¹

Apparently, it was Seika who came to take leave of Razan, and it was Razan who had asked for the *Yanping dawen* and on this occasion probably did not even receive it.⁴²

When Seika was staying in Wakayama Razan sent him a letter in which he evolved ideas about taking service that *mutatis mutandis* are of relevance to

this scene for Razan's status as a Confucianist, see *supra*, Ch. I, pp. 63, 65-66.

⁴¹ Ōta I, pp. 163-164; ZZGR XIII, p. 126.

⁴² Seika referred to the *Yanping dawen* in earlier letters, e.g. a letter dated Keichō 10/1/23 (12-3-1605). This letter seems to have influenced the wording of the entry in the *Nenpu*; it reads: "Have you ever tried to open the *Yanping wenda* (*sic*), or not? It is the [source] whence [the teachings] that in Ziyang master and disciples imparted and received have come. Anyone who studies must read it. Do you have this book? If not, I will lend you [the copy] that I have." (Ōta I, p. 147; ZZGR XIII, p. 117) In the next letter (in the *Seika-sensei bunshū*) Seika writes: "The *Yanping yilu* (*sic*), two volumes in all, I gave to this old man. [Li Yanping] all the time uses the words "free and easy" (*saluo*; J. *sharaku*, *share* 洒落). Methinks, he is someone who deeply wants to emulate Lianxi (= Zhou Dunyi), and [like him] he has a taste [for this kind of mental attitude]. How about you having a go at him?" (Ōta I, p. 147; ZZGR XIII, p. 117) For a third letter in which Seika mentions the *Yanping dawen* and the effects that reading it would have cf. letter (15).

his own efforts to enter the service of Ieyasu.

11. Letter from Razan to Seika, written in Keichō 11 (1606).

Formerly, when Zhongni 仲尼 (= Confucius) was summoned by Bi Xi 佛肸 and wanted to go, Zilu 子路 had his doubts.⁴³ Again, when he went to Gongshan 公山, Zilu was also doubtful.⁴⁴ He did not know that [Confucius] wanted to do these things because he wanted “to make an Eastern Zhou”⁴⁵ and did not want to be “a bitter gourd.”⁴⁶ Therefore even a Sage like Zhongyou 仲由 (= Zilu) still could not yet avoid having such doubts. Let alone someone [like me], who is not a Zhongyou! How difficult it is therefore to know when the Holy Ones take service or remain at home.

Is it not also the same with your journey to Kii? We could not well not have some doubts at the outset, but now we have no doubts [anymore] regarding the present. Bi Xi and Gongshan both were people in revolt, and yet [Confucius] went. Why then [not go] in case of someone who is not a Bi Xi or a Gongshan? How could your journey to the south of Kii not be fitting? Zilu is a person whom I revere. And yet he doubted. How much more [should I doubt], not being Zilu? Is not my doubting also fitting? I see how Confucius told Zilu that [he went], because, having gone there, he had things to do. And thereupon Zilu probably did have no more doubts. This is why I also had some doubts in the beginning and finally have no more doubts [now]. As regards my own [feelings] in this matter — on the one hand I am glad about it and, on the other, I am apprehensive.

In olden times the transformations (*hua* 化) [that were brought about] by King Wen[’s virtue] expanded south. [The songs in which the results of these transformations showed] were connected with [the Dukes of] Zhou 周 and Shao 召. These are the “Songs of Zhou and the South” and the “Songs of Shao and the South.”⁴⁷ Now, if the Way [you transmit] goes south, should that tend to the instruction of only one

⁴³ Cf. *Lunyu* XVII, 6. The reason that Zilu was doubtful was as follows: “Zilu said: ‘Master, formerly I heard you say, ‘When a man in his own person is guilty of doing evil, a superior man will not associate with him.’ Bi Xi is in rebellion, holding possession of Zhongmao; if you go, what shall be said?’”

⁴⁴ Cf. *Lunyu* XVII, 4. In this case, too, Zilu has similar reasons for his lack of approbation.

⁴⁵ *Lunyu* XVII, 4.

⁴⁶ *Lunyu* XVII, 6.

⁴⁷ Razan is here referring to Zhu Xi’s introduction to the section “Zhou nan” of the *Shijing*. Cf. *Shijing jizhuan* 1.1a-b.

country, one generation? No, it will rather be conducive to the instruction of a myriad countries and a myriad generations! This is something that I cannot but be glad about.

When you reach the country, you must inform yourself of its government, [especially about the question whether] there is somebody whom [its lord] employs, entrusting his country to him. That he (= Yoshinaga) wants to see you is because of the original goodness of his heart. If he cannot profit by your [teachings], that will be because of his egoistical desires. I am expecting something from the lord of this country. That is the reason that I cannot but be apprehensive on this account.

I am glad, and then I fear. How could it not be like this? [Therefore,] on this occasion, please let me say [what I want to say]. We, your disciples, are “ambitious and too hasty.” We do not know how “to restrict and shape” the [measure of] perfection [that we have reached]. We merely wish that you will sigh “Let me return!”⁴⁸

Is Junchi⁴⁹ 順知 with you? Give him a word from me. Kamesaburō⁵⁰ 龜三郎 and my younger brother [Nobu]zumi 信澄 both offer you a word [of greeting]. Alas!, [all] bamboos of the Southern Mountain are not sufficient to write out our feelings of loneliness.⁵¹

The contrast of this letter of Razan with the deprecatory, even slightly ironic tone that Seika affects when he recounts his adventures in Wakayama, is striking.

12. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 11/11/3 (2-12-1606).

The night before last I arrived in the capital. How much I have longed [for you] since [we parted] I cannot express in words. The other day, when Sansei⁵² 三清 came down [to Wakayama, he brought] one letter

⁴⁸ Cf. *Lunyu* V, 22. Legge translates: “When the Master was in Chen, he said, ‘*Let me return!* Let me return! The little children of my school are *ambitious and too hasty*. They are accomplished and complete so far, but they do not know how to *restrict and shape* themselves.”

⁴⁹ Who this Junchi was, is not known. Cf. Ōta I, Introduction, p. 21.

⁵⁰ Kamesaburō, also known as Genko 元古 (cf. Ōta I, p. 278), can be identified with Shibue Shunkō 澁江春江 (cf. *Bunshū* II, p. 178), about whom no particulars seem to be known. Ōta does not make this identification; cf. Ōta I, Introduction, p. 21.

⁵¹ *Bunshū* 2 (I, pp. 23-24).

⁵² Sansei, also known as Dōan 道安 (Cf. Ōta I, p. 74), is mentioned several times in Seika's and Razan's writings. His full name was Takeda Sekka 武田夕佳 (1547-1628); he was a *bakufu*

and one poem [from you] that glittered and shone in the desolate wilderness. It made me very glad. I finally could not obtain a reliable messenger, so I could not thank you suitably. This has been like a thorn in my back: I have not forgotten it. ... When I was in the south, since it was a request from the lord [of Wakayama], I could do nothing about it and I composed an inscription for the stele of the shrine of Suga[wara no Michizane] 菅原道真 in Waka-no-ura.⁵³ [The request] was very sudden. If you ask me, I was [like] an actor wearing the hat of Su Dongpo.⁵⁴ It was ridiculous. One day when you are free, you must come. [Then] we can discuss [this piece] and laugh about it. How about it?⁵⁵

It may be necessary to stress the fact that all this is of more than biographical importance. In the foregoing letters we can point out a number of problems with which not only Razan, but anyone who found himself in similar circumstance was confronted. Should one leave Kyōto, the one and only city at the time where a cultural life was possible? Leave it for the inconveniences and isolation of the provinces and the insecurities incident to the service under a warrior? Would they you employ you, anyhow? In Razan's case, for example, it is evident that he was made to several odd jobs before he was finally taken into regular employ. What would they make you do? On what terms would you be employed? For someone like Seika, who knew his warriors and was fairly securely established in his own *milieu*, the prospect was hardly enticing,⁵⁶ and even Razan, if we may judge by his letter (11),

physician (cf. Ōta I, Introduction, p. 20).

⁵³ Text in Ōta I, pp. 114-118; ZZGR XIII, pp. 98-101.

⁵⁴ This phrase is either a phrase that Seika used in the original draft of his Inscription (in which case it has been deleted, for it is not in the present text), or it refers to Seika himself. I have chosen the second interpretation. The phrase occurs in poem no. 153 of the *Chūka Jakubokushi shō* 中華若木詩抄 and is explained in the Japanese commentary *ibid.* as "to ape the manners of a great man without having his talents." (See Kamei Takashi, *Gogaku shiryō to shite no Chūka Jakubokushi shō*, pp. 225-226.) Cf. also Morohashi III, 6930-597.

⁵⁵ Ōta I, p. 164; ZZGR XIII, p. 126. This letter is continued in Ōta I, p. 268.

⁵⁶ Seika's experiences with the warriors went a long way back. According to the *Gyōjō*, after his little tiff with Toyotomi Hidetsugu, Seika escaped to Nagoya (Kyūshū) where he became the tutor of Kobayakawa Hideaki. Here he met Ieyasu and, on his invitation, he came to Edo at the end of the following year (1593). (*NST* XXVIII, pp. 189-190; Ōta I, p. 6-7; ZZGR III, p. 395). Possibly Ieyasu offered him some kind of position as lecturer-in-waiting but, if he did, Seika

which he wrote when he was still trying hard for Ieyasu's favour, was anything but positive. A few years later, when he had been in service for four years, he was still less than enthusiastic. This appears clearly from a long letter he wrote to Seika in Keichō 16 (1611).

Since this letter, besides being illustrative of the point under discussion, gives an interesting picture of Razan's life in Sunpu and of his state of mind at that time, it merits quotation in full. In the beginning of the letter Razan says that he wrote it some time after he had returned from Kyōto, where he had been kept so busy that he had had no opportunity to visit Seika. According to the *Nenpu* Razan visited Kyōto twice in Keichō 16. The first time he came with Ieyasu, for whom he wrote the draft of an oath that the *daimyō* of Central and West Japan were made to swear. At the end of the year (he returned to Sunpu only in the following year) he came a second time.⁵⁷ In his letter Razan will therefore be referring to the first visit, which lasted from the seventeenth day of the third until the eighteenth day of the fourth month (29-4 till 30-5-1611).⁵⁸ Hence the letter was probably written in the fifth or the sixth month of Keichō 16. It reads as follows:

turned it down. His *Shikeigayū kai* ("Explanation of 'The Four Landscapes Are All Mine'"), which he wrote when he was in Edo, can be read as an affirmation of his independence *vis-à-vis* Ieyasu. This supposition seems to be borne out by the story told by Kang Hang, that Ieyasu at an unspecified occasion offered Seika a house in Kyōto and a stipend of 2,000 *koku*, but that Seika refused the offer (cf. *supra*, Ch. I, n. 85). This stipend, offered moreover before 1600, is very high. Razan started in 1608 on a salary of 300 *hyō* (120 *koku*), which was commuted in 1611 to a fief of 310 *koku*. To this were added, in 1624 and 1651, 300 *hyō* and 500 *koku* respectively. In 1651 Razan says that his total revenues are nearly 1,000 *koku* and the *Kansei chōshū shoka fu* reports his income as amounting to 917 *koku* (cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 378).

⁵⁷ The entry in the *Nenpu* for Keichō 16 says: "Ieyasu entered the capital and made the feudal lords of all provinces submit a written oath. The Master had drafted it. Thereupon Ieyasu returned to Sunpu and the Master, too, went there. There was an order, [in virtue of which Razan] was given the villages in the neighbourhood of Kyōto to be his domain. Upon receipt of the sealed documents he returned to Kyōto. Rizai 理齋 and Nobutoki 信時 (his uncle and adoptive father, and his natural father respectively) were very glad." (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 16)

⁵⁸ Cf. *Shiryō sōran* XIV, Keichō 16. The oath-taking on the twelfth day of the fourth month (24-5-1611) is here described as follows: "Ieyasu established a statute in three articles, sent this to the *daimyō* of the capital region, West Honshū, Shikoku, and Kyūshū, and exacted their written oaths." The text of the oath can be found in *Tokugawa kinrei kō* I, nr. 155. Cf. also *Shiryō sōran*

13. Letter from Razan to Seika, written in Keichō 16/5 or 16/6 (June-July 1611).

Last time, when I was about to leave Kyōto, you sent me one beautiful *jueju* 絶句. ... That night I stayed in Minakuchi in Ōmi. There I wrote my answering [poem, using the] same rhymes, to offer to you. This journey was very hectic and eventually I did not get [an opportunity] to visit you. Some days after I had left [Kyōto], I suddenly felt very much mortified and disturbed [about that]. I did not feel at all content. The whole way up to here I was kept busy. Since then I have availed myself two or three times of a messenger to send you my words, but I am not yet sure whether these have reached you.

How are you doing these days? [Here] in [Sun]pu there is nothing out of the ordinary. I imagine that Kyōto, too, will be as it has always been. As regards the pupils who come to your gate and attend at your side, have you found any who daily become closer to you and are not tainted with bad rumours? [Even] in the beginning, [when I was with you,] I could not keep an eye on each of them and know them all. Let alone now, that we are separated and I live here apart [in Sunpu]!

I feel myself as if I am [more and more] going in for fame and profit, as if I am hastening to [get myself] a flying (*sic*) neck-shackle 飛鉗. It is shameful. It is terrible. However, I hold the keys of the library⁵⁹ in [Sun]pu. I try one of the buildings, and the boxes are filled [with books]. I leave it to my hand [which one] to pick up. The happiness of reading a book I have not yet read!

It is as if one were diverting oneself in the Shanglin 上林苑 Park, and the scents and the green colours [of the trees] bewitch the eyes and - red and purple - all is spring! It is as if one has entered a Persian jeweller's shop, and left and right the lustre and brilliance [of the gems] bedazzle the eyes! It is as if one holds Ganjiang 干將 or has grasped Zhanlu 湛盧 (the names of two famous swords. WJB) and cuts through a dragon or cleaves a rhinoceros and does not even bloody the blade! It is as if one has harnessed flying yellows 飛黃 (a mythical race of horses. WJB) and, leading Chengdan 乘旦 as an extra horse,

XIV, entry under Keichō 17/1/5.

⁵⁹ The word here translated as "library" is *unkō-rō* 芸香樓, i.e. "Building of Rue Scent." This must be a generic name for libraries, as the leaves of the rue were inserted between the books to keep the silverfishes out.

one chases the lightning and pursues the wind and [covers] ten thousand *li* in a moment!

Do not think that this is exaggerated. My only pleasure is books. I [never] tire of reading them, reverently and at ease. When I have entered this building, I sometimes forget to go back and do not notice that the sun is setting. This is a favour from my lord, and one thing that I have gained. Is it not also [a reason] to be glad?

In ancient times lord En of Kamo⁶⁰ (b. 634) was very intelligent and had read widely. He entered the Katsuragi-san. This mountain was a dwelling of the immortals. For a long time he stayed in a cave in the rocks. Then he trod on the Kinpu-sen. His footsteps have well-nigh completely covered all the holy places of our country. Some say that, drifting on the sea, he went to China. The *sangi* Ono no Takamura⁶¹ 小野篁 (802-853) went to the isle of Oki. Then [his poem containing the lines] “The mail-boat at the jetty” and “my place of banishment on the waves”⁶² made the round of the Eighty Islands (= Japan). He lived with the fishermen and played with the crab-fishers, but his poems will be known in all eternity. The chief librarian Miyako no Yoshika 都良香 (834-879) even surpassed his master (?), the Minister of the Right Suga[wara no Michizane].⁶³ His poems were in everyone’s mouth. One day he threw away his cap and entered a cave on the Ōmine. Some say that he passed away when he was more than one hundred years of age. These three gentlemen were men who had travelled far and had read much. They were men who had the air of an immortal and the makings (lit.: the bones) of an adept. Men of later generation all looked up to them and longed to emulate them.

⁶⁰ With Lord En no Kamo is meant En no Ozuno 役小角, better known as En no Gyōja 役行者, the precursor and forefather of the Yamabushi. Cf. Rotermund, “Die Legende des Enno-Gyōja.”

⁶¹ Ono no Takamura was banned to Oki in 837 on account of his opposition to the dispatch of embassies to China. Within three years, however, the emperor had pardoned him and reinstated him in his former rank, because of the high esteem in which he held Takamura’s literary talents. Takamura was appointed *sangi* 参議 (imperial councillor) in 847. (For the rendition of this title, cf. Morohashi X, 35724-6.)

⁶² Cf. *Wa-Kan rōei shū* (NKBT LXXIII, nr. 644): “The mail-boat at the jetty sets forth when the wind has died down; my place of banishment on the waves becomes visible as the day clears.”

⁶³ Miyako no Yoshika became *monjō-hakase* 文章博士 in 875 and *jijū* 侍從 (chamberlain) in 876. As such he drafted many of the imperial decrees. He was famous for his literary compositions in Chinese, both poetry and prose. (For the rendition of the title that Razan gives him, *chosakurō* 著作郎, cf. Morohashi IX, 31410-44.) The words that I have translated with “surpassed his master” are *lansui* (J. *ransui*) 藍水. Generally (cf. e.g. *supra*, Ch. I, n. 191) *lan* is used in proverbial expressions of the type “indigo is bluer than blue,” i.e. “the disciple surpasses the master.” In this sense I have translated it. In view of their respective age, however, it seems unlikely that Yoshika was the disciple of Michizane, who was eleven years his junior. In fact, in none of their biographies mention is made of any special relation between the two.

When I was a child I was raised in an ordinary family and grew up in a poor neighbourhood. I lived hidden under [a roof thatched with] wormwood and caltrops and did not know houses [with roofs made of] *enju* (*sophora japonica*) and maple wood. I was like a piece of earthenware that feels ashamed [when compared to] pearls and jade. I resembled a withered tree that fears [comparison with] plums and willows. Moreover, my nature was uncouth, my knowledge narrow. I felt depressed like one who has a hangover.⁶⁴ Why was it this way? My skin wanted lustre; my appearance was thin and lean. When it was hot I got sun-struck, and when the wind blew I had to sneeze. When I did not eat and drink at regular hours, my breast and bowels clogged up. If there was any hitch in my routine, the two demons of illness and the three worms came forth or fled.⁶⁵ So I was never without medicine in my pouch. My only wish was that my old illnesses would meekly end. How should I have hoped for an appearance like that of an immortal, for the bones of an adept?⁶⁶

When I was a boy I went to the west. I crossed the sea and advanced by land. After several tens of days I reached Hi[zen]. The place where I stayed [was such that] when I [looked] out of my window [I saw] the ocean. The places I passed on my way were the shoals of Akashi, the tide of Akama, the narrows of Ashiya, and the waves of Matsuura. When I was in Kyōto, staying at home, my uncle had commanded me to read books. Being young, I had studied them and my heart had found peace in them. Not seeing strange things, I had not been distracted. But now, why was I so much confused?

When I was about twenty years of age I read the books by the Cheng [brothers], Zhu Xi and [other] Confucians. This was the first time I knew that the learning of human nature and principle existed. And when I was in my twenty-second year I obtained a meeting with you. I heard your disputations and steeped myself in your bountiful kindness. And then I thought that the virtue and the literature of our country all lay in you.

The following year I met our Lord in Kyōto. In this connection I went to Edo in Mu[sashi]. How vast [this country seemed], and how boundless! Nowhere in the distance a mountain to be seen! I did not know how vast the blue expanse of heaven could be. This then was the

⁶⁴ Cf. *Shijing* 191. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, renders the passage translated here as “I felt depressed like when one has a hangover” as follows: “Oh, merciless Heaven, the disorder is never settled, every month it grows; it causes the people to have no peace; *the grieved hearts are as if* (intoxicated:) *stupified*.”

⁶⁵ For the “two demons of illness” (*er shu* 二豎) cf. Morohashi I, 247-572; for the “three worms” (*san peng* 三彭), which cause injuries in the human body, cf. *ibid.*, 12-1455.

⁶⁶ Cf. Morohashi I, 374-273

Field of Musashi. On my way there and on my way back I saw the rapid streams of the Tenryū and the Ōi, and the twisting paths in the mountains of Hakone.

And now I am in Suru[ga]. Every morning and every night, when I look up, [I see] the Fuji rising above the clouds. How should this not be happiness? These were my journeys to the east and west. As regards waters, I have seen the endless expanse of the ocean, as regards rivers, the depth and rapidity of the great rivers. As regards plains, I have seen the flat, vast Field of Musashi. As regards mountains, I see the rising height of the Fuji. For books I read the thousands of volumes that are in the *shōgun's* library, and as regards men, I have met you. Should I not be glad?

However, I am now twenty-nine years of age. When I want to tell someone what I am studying all day, I feel [useless] like somebody who is skilled in carving up dragons, like [someone who is selling] ceremonial caps to the people of Yue.⁶⁷ It is as if [I were trying to speak] the language of Chu in Zhuang or Yue.⁶⁸ In these times master-artisan Shi 石 would not be able to let his axe whistle,⁶⁹ and how would Bai Ya 伯牙 [be willing to] play [his music suggesting] running water?⁷⁰ Is it all finished? Everyone says: "Forget for a time that you are studying, and come with us." [But when] I say "Like this?" and have taken a board to hand and meet them in a game of *go*, they say: "Is this better than doing nothing at all?"⁷¹ When I am in great form, cracking jokes, they say: "Have your prose and poetry stuck in your

⁶⁷ Reference to *Zhuangzi*, 1 ("Xiaoyao you" 逍遙遊), 6. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* I, p. 172, translates: "A man of Song who dealt in the ceremonial caps (of Yin), went with them to Yue, the people of which cut off their hair and tattooed their bodies, so that they had no use for them."

⁶⁸ Reference to *Mengzi* III B, 6. Legge translates: "Suppose that there is a great officer of Chu here, who wishes his son to learn the speech of Qi: will he in that case employ a man of Qi as his tutor, or a man of Chu?" "He will employ a man of Qi to teach him," said Busheng. Mencius went on: "If but one man of Qi be teaching him, and there be a multitude of men of Chu continually shouting out about him, although his father would beat him every day, wishing for him to learn the speech of Qi, it will be impossible for him to do so. But in the same way, if he were taken and placed for several years in Zhuang or Yue (names of a street and a ward in the capital of Qi), though his father would beat him wishing him to speak the language of Zhu, it would be impossible for him to do so."

⁶⁹ Reference to *Zhuangzi* 24 ("Xu Wugui" 徐無鬼), 6. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* II, p. 101, translates: (Zhuangzi said:) "On the top of the nose of that man of Ying there is a (little) bit of mud like a fly's wing. He sent for the artisan Shi to cut it away. Shi whirled his axe so as to produce a wind, which immediately carried off the mud entirely, leaving the nose uninjured."

⁷⁰ Cf. *supra*, Ch. I, n. 5.

⁷¹ Reference to *Lunyu* XVII, 20. Legge translates: "Are there not gamblers and chess players? To be one of these would still be better than doing nothing at all."

mouth?" When I am explaining the Vast Treasure of the East,⁷² [they ask]: "May we abolish the laws and statutes?" When I am reading the *Azuma kagami* 吾妻鑑, they ask: "Where are the [*Nihon*] *shoki* and the other Veritable Records?"⁷³ When I am giving a lecture [on the military classics], the [*Liu*] *dao* and the [*San*] *lue*, they say: "Have you tied up the Four Books and Six Classics and put them away?"

And I "agree with the current customs and consent with an impure age,"⁷⁴ and pretend that I do this for the sake of harmony. How could I say that I learned from Hui of Liuxia⁷⁵ 柳下惠? My present self is not my former self, and [yet] I am like that man. How could I say that I [try to] emulate Qu Boyu⁷⁶ 蘧伯玉? My spirit is wilting, and with my literary [talents] it must be likewise. The phrase "having dreamt of the brush his talents became exhausted,"⁷⁷ is a perfect description of me. Deep indeed was the meaning that you laid in the poem you sent me.⁷⁸

However, "because the tongue is very supple, it lasts longest; when a tree has no talents of its own it will not be cut down" 木自不才以不伐.⁷⁹ [This phrase refers to] the actions of those who roam outside the pale of this world. Did the three gentlemen [whom I mentioned] just now, know this? Or did they not know this? I could not aspire to one ten thousandth [part of the talents] of these three.

⁷² With this term is meant the *Go-seibai shikimoku* 御成敗式目, a law code of the Kamakura *bakufu* compiled in 1232 by order of Hōjō Yasutoki 北条泰時 (1183-1242).

⁷³ I.e. the *Rikkokushi* 六國史 ("Six National Histories"), two of which, the *Sandai jitsuroku* 三代實錄 and the *Montoku jitsuroku* 文德實錄, have the term "Veritable Records" (*jitsuroku*; Ch. *shih-lu*) in their title. The composition of the other four of the *Rikkokushi*, too, is patterned after that of the Chinese Veritable Records.

⁷⁴ Reference to *Mengzi* VII B, 37. Mencius uses this phrase to describe the "good, careful people of the villages," the *xiangyuan* 鄉原, the hypocrites whom Confucius called "the thieves of virtue" (cf. *Lunyu* XVII, 11).

⁷⁵ Hui of Liuxia is mentioned several times in the *Lunyu* and the *Mengzi*. See esp. *Mengzi* V B, 1. Mencius says of him that "he was wanting in self-respect" (II A, 9) and that "he was the most accommodating one under the sages (V B, 1).

⁷⁶ Qu Boyu was a friend of Confucius. He is mentioned twice in the *Lunyu*; the second time (*Lunyu* XV, 7) Confucius says of him (Legge's translation): "A superior man indeed is Qu Boyu! When good government prevails in his state, he is to be found in office. When bad government prevails, he can roll (his principles) up, and keep them in his breast." For other references cf. Morohashi IX, 32509-23. Razan is here trying to pre-empt possibly flattering comparisons of his behaviour, which he himself regards as degrading, with that of the Sages Hui and Qu Boyu, whose adaptability was proverbial.

⁷⁷ The reference is to a story about Jiang Yan 江淹 who once, in a dream, gave back a five-coloured brush and as a result lost his literary talents (cf. Morohashi VI, 17140-26/27).

⁷⁸ Poem in Ōta I, p. 72; ZZGR XIII, p. 76.. N.B. The date given in the *Seika-sensei bunshū*, Keichō 9, cannot possibly be correct.

⁷⁹ Origin unknown.

Moreover, what I want [to do] is to study the Holy Ones and Sages.

The writer of [the poem] “Jian xi” 簡兮⁸⁰ and the smiling old fisherman⁸¹ sung, I think, because they were Sages. Amongst the men of old there were those who sank into obscurity and [played] the fool, and those who, when a whole country had forgotten the date of the day, refused [to tell it], saying that they were drunk and did not know.⁸² This [kind of behaviour] is not easy to imitate.

Confucius said: “Your good, careful people of the villages are the thieves of virtue.”⁸³ If now, acting this way, I would say that I am not one of those good, careful persons of the villages, it would be as if I were holding a net, had entered into a river or lake, and were saying to others: “I am not a fisherman.” Would it not be better to throw away the net and have people believe me of their own accord?

I have read the books of the Holy Ones and Sages. [I know that] such is their intent; it is something I cannot endure. My ambition, however, to provide for my parents and the obligations I have to my friends and brothers, do not leave me any choice. To this state things have come. Everybody is thinking what he should say of me. If you, Master, are not finding fault with me, then send me, please, a warm-hearted letter. What pleasure that would be!

[One more thing] I will add. You exhorted me [to write] *waka*, thinking that — this being our national custom — I was sure to have such an inclination. I have no family tradition nor did I receive [a tradition] from a teacher. However, I thought of the slaves of Zheng Beihai⁸⁴ 鄭北海之奴婢 who chided each other iwht [quotations from the] *Shi[jing]*, and I have not forgotten it. Now [I have written] one barbarian poem and have called it “Song of Suruga.”⁸⁵ Who will be able to listen to these words like [the sound of] birds and beasts, unless he has the ears of Gelu 葛盧 of Jie 介?⁸⁶ Five rustic poems [I wrote] like this. I merely add [this poem] at the end [of this letter] for you to have something to laugh about. I hope that you will not read it

⁸⁰ *Shijing* 38. According to the commentary by Zhu Xi the author of this poem is a Sage “who, not being able to fulfil his ambitions, serves as a musician.” Cf. *Shijing jizhuan* 2.7a-b.

⁸¹ The smiling fisherman hails from *Chuci* 7, “Yufu” 漁夫.

⁸² Meant is the viscount of Ji. The reference is to an anecdote in *Han Fei Zi* 韓非子, “*Shuolin*” 說林 1. Cf. *Han Fei Zi jishi*, pp. 440-441; transl. in W.K. Liao, *The Complete Works of Han Fei Tzu* I, pp. 239-240.

⁸³ *Lunyu* XVII, 11.

⁸⁴ The reference is to an anecdote about Zheng Xuan (Beihai) in *Shishuo xinyu* 世說新語, “*Wenxue*” 文學.

⁸⁵ The word *fū* in this title of the poem, “Suruga-fū,” should be interpreted as the word *feng* in “*Guofeng*,” i.e. “Songs of (one or other region).”

⁸⁶ Gelu was the lord of Jie, a country of the eastern barbarians, who understood the language of cows. Cf. Morohashi I, 359-139.

to strangers. Twice bowing, I have spoken respectfully

<i>ikuchiyo to</i>	[To express] my feelings of wishing
<i>iwau kokoro o</i>	[My Lord] many thousands of years
<i>Suruga naru</i>	I want to search for
<i>Fuji no kusuri wo</i>	The drug of immortality on the Fuji
<i>motomemakuhoshi</i>	That lies in Suruga. ⁸⁷

Up to and including the poem, the whole letter is rather pathetic, but if we disregard the elegiac overtones and paraphrase the main points Razan is making, it comes down to this: Although, as to outward circumstances, I have no cause for complaint (who, at my age, has seen so much of the world and has such an excellent library at his disposal?), yet I feel lonely and misunderstood. I am urged to conform to people who have no understanding of my skills and aspirations; what is worse, I do conform. Great literary figures of former times maybe felt the same and perhaps turned Taoist precisely for that reason. However, I do not want to follow their path. I want to follow the Confucian Sages. But that course implies the obligation to act according to my convictions, and that I find myself unable to do. The strain caused by this conflict is telling on me, and affecting even my literary talents.

In other words, Razan felt that the work and the atmosphere in Sunpu were not congenial, and that the life that he was forced to live there endangered his personal purity and led him to compromise his Confucian aspirations.

Could he have expected anything else? Was what had happened not exactly what he had foretold Seika that might happen, when the latter had gone to Kii? By no possible stretch of imagination could Asano Yoshinaga or Tokugawa Ieyasu be equated with the virtuous founding kings of the Zhou, but all Sages

⁸⁷ *Bunshū* 2 (I, pp. 25-28). Two *waka* that Seika wrote in answer to this poem have survived

who had found the throne occupied by rulers of lesser virtue, had lain low. Admittedly there were a few precedents, e.g. the ones cited in the letter to Seika (11), for taking service under such an immoral ruler, but most of the precedents pointed the other way. Why, then, had Razan taken service?

The obvious answer is, of course, that Razan had his family to care for. This is the reason he mentions himself in his letter. But that cannot be the whole story. He had at least two alternatives: he could either have established himself as an independent teacher of Chinese and Confucian studies, as Seika, Kan Tokuan, Matsunaga Sekigo, or Nakae Tōju had done or would do, or he could have made his living as a physician. His knowledge of medical lore was certainly sufficient,⁸⁸ and the pattern, too, was not uncommon.⁸⁹

If he chose to follow the career of a *bakufu* official, he must have had some other, additional motive. One can argue that this motive was none other than that it was very difficult for an ambitious young man to turn down the offer of a position with the *bakufu*. Nobody will deny that Razan was ambitious. However, if this were all there was to it, it would only have biographical importance. Before we settle for this explanation, we must first try to see whether we cannot find any reasons or motives for his behaviour that have wider, historical implications.

Before turning to Razan, however, I will examine Seika's case. After all, Seika was the one who had engineered and at certain points sponsored Razan's official career, at least in its initial stages. That Seika had always had high hopes for Razan becomes clear from some of the letters we have translated

(cf. Ōta I, p. 217).

⁸⁸ Cf. e.g. the testimony of Razan's son Tokkōsai in the *Gyōjō* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 3, p. 50).

⁸⁹ Many of Razan's friends and colleagues had studied medicine at the same time they studied Confucianism, e.g. Nawa Kassho, and even practised it, e.g. Hori Kyōan (by Razan and his disciples he is referred to as "I Seii" 醫正意, "the physician Seii": cf. *Kangakusha denki shūsei*, p. 24). Amongst Seika's disciples there were in fact a number of practising physicians (cf. the list in Ōta I, Introduction, pp. 20-21), while Seika himself, too, to judge by an anecdote reported in his *Gyōjō* (Ōta I, p. 8; *NST* XXVIII, p. 191), was well read in medical lore.

above.⁹⁰ We also know, that Seika held his intellectual attainments in high regard. But in his letters we can find yet another point being stressed: “The Way is vested in you.”

14. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 12/1/26 (22-2-1607).

At this time the spring breeze is still chilly. Please take care of your health.⁹¹ Your body is not your private possession. For one thing, it is what remains of your parents and, for another, it is that on which the Way rests.⁹²

Seika evidently was of the opinion that Razan’s talents, and especially his Confucian studies, should and would cause reverberations on a national scale.

15. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.⁹³

I am very, very happy that you have read the two volumes of the *Yanping yilu* 延平遺錄. I am happy not for your sake, but for mine. But I am happy not only for my sake. This is [cause for] happiness for the whole country, for myriads of men, for myriad generations. That is: if you fully accept and internalize [the values expressed in this work], steep yourself in them, and thus attain [Yanping’s] “freedom and ease.”⁹⁴ If you do not do this, then our present happiness will be [the

⁹⁰ Cf. e.g. letter (1), second paragraph, “The day when you like polished jade will shine.” Cf. also his letter of Keichō 9/9/10 (22-10-1604): “In these times of moral confusion your native talents are quite out of the ordinary. Will not the intention of Heaven be in it [for something]? Spare yourself and be careful of yourself! Do not squander [your talents] wildly! [It is] for this reason that, every time we meet, I am not ashamed to make small talk or [to speak] confusedly. I say unreservedly everything I have to say. For [all] I wish, [is] your jade-like perfection. What I say is, so to say, ‘the pebbles of other mountains.’” (Ōta I, p. 141; ZZGR XIII, p. 114)

⁹¹ For my translation of “your health” cf. Morohashi II, 2697-56.

⁹² Ōta I, p. 166; ZZGR XIII, p. 128.

⁹³ To judge by its position in the *Seika-sensei bunshū*, this letter was written in the beginning of the second month of Keichō 10 (1605): the last dated letter before it is dated Keichō 10/1/23 (12-3-1605) and the first dated letter that follows it, Keichō 10/2/26 (14-4-1605).

⁹⁴ Cf. *supra* n. 42.

cause of] future unhappiness. A [cause of] unhappiness to the whole country, to myriads of men, to ten thousand generations. All that, too, is implied in this. It is not a matter of only my happiness or unhappiness, or of yours. Think about this.⁹⁵

We have seen Seika, in a similar vein, adjuring Razan to read some *Daxue* commentaries. (Cf. *supra*, letter 5: “The *Daxue yanyi* and the *Daxue yanyi bu* are books that those who study must certainly read and discuss. ... The most important points of ruling the country and pacifying the world are all exhaustively [treated therein].”) Evidently, Seika was of the conviction that, in some way, studying certain books and subsequently putting them into practice was beneficial to the country as a whole.

Seika makes a sharp distinction between books that “everyone who studies” must read, and those books that are nice to read but not essential.⁹⁶ If, in one of his letters, he represents his urge to tell people to read certain books as one of his more likable idiosyncrasies,⁹⁷ he must be talking about this latter kind of books. The cases of the *Yanping yilu* and of the *Daxue yanyi* and the *Yanyi buyi* are clearly different. Because of their contents, to read these books was in some way conducive to the main aim of Confucianising the country and benefitting the people, and therefore they had to be read — by Razan.

Why by Razan? Seika’s answer to these questions is rather ambiguous. If he really thought that practising Confucianism would in some way be beneficial to the country, why did he not act himself? Why did he have to expect everything from Razan? The excuses he makes may be funny, and flattering to Razan, as they are in the following letter, but they hardly amount

⁹⁵ Ōta I, p. 148; ZZGR XIII, p. 118; NST XXVIII, pp. 101-102.

⁹⁶ Cf. the letter in Ōta I, p. 152; ZZGR XIII, p. 120. Cf. also the letter in Ōta I, p. 157; ZZGR XIII, p. 123.

⁹⁷ Cf. a remark in a letter to Razan (Ōta I, p. 152; ZZGR XIII, p. 120): “That I urge you to read books certainly is not [because I think it would be good] for you. To rejoice when I see good and to grieve when I see evil, is one of my silly eccentricities. My numerous [other interests] have turned to ashes and grown cold; only this one thing I have not yet been able to forget. That I provoke the laughter of fashionable [men] lies in this.” Cf. also Seika’s undated letter to

to an answer to our question.

16. Undated letter from Seika to Razan.⁹⁸

[To read] these two books, the *Zhou [Yi]* and the *Yi[li]*, [makes one feel as if], thirsty and dusty [from a fruitless journey], one suddenly gazes upon a plum tree.⁹⁹ If, once in a lifetime, one has had the luck to read them, one has yet not lived in vain. However, someone like me is nothing but a bookworm: no good for the books, nor for man, nor for the world; rather harmful, really. All my hopes are [placed] on you. Think about it.

Seika's claim to absolute worthlessness cannot, of course, be taken seriously. The question must therefore be: What could Razan do that Seika could not? The answer must be that, while Seika for some reason (descent, past experiences, age) felt himself disqualified from taking office, Razan was willing to enter into service and had, through Seika's efforts, actually gained a foothold at Ieyasu's court. This would enable Razan to do what Seika *ex hypothesi* wanted him to do, namely to propagate Confucianism at court, to gain the ear of the ruler, and in this way to further the spread of Confucianism. This is a standard Confucian concept. Razan referred to it himself when he wrote to Seika in Kii. It would explain both why Seika interested himself in Razan's career and why he had placed his hopes on him.

This explanation, however, does not altogether fit the facts. Consider the following exchange of letters: in the first month of Keichō 12 Seika writes to Razan that he is the one "on whom the Way rests" (cf. *supra*, letter 14); on

Nawa Kassho (Ōta I, p. 172; ZZGR XIII, p. 131).

⁹⁸ Letter in Ōta I, p. 158; ZZGR XIII, p. 124. Since in this letter Seika asks Razan to come over "when he is free from official duties," it was probably written in the summer or autumn of 1606, when Ieyasu was staying in Kyōto. This is in accordance with the position of the letter in the *Seika-sensei bunshū*.

⁹⁹ Cf. Morohashi VII, 17788-19. Cf. also a phrase Seika uses in another letter (Ōta I, p. 172; ZZGR XIII, p. 131): "... is what gazing upon a plum tree is to a thirsty man, what contenting himself with the coarsest food is to a man who is hungry."

the first of the third month Razan leaves for Sunpu and Edo, and sometime in the course of the fifth month he writes the following letter, in which he gives vent to his disappointment:

17. Letter from Razan to Seika.¹⁰⁰

Sansei 三清 has come, and I have learned in detail how well you are and how peacefully you live. It has comforted me very much. Since our separation not a moment has passed that I did not think of you.¹⁰¹ Let alone now [that I am back here in Sunpu]. For the first time [in my life] my heart has to give thought to the [affairs of] state, and I have to wait on my lord. For today, however, it is over. It is [already very] late: the eighth hour [in the morning (i.e. the time from one till 3 a.m.. WJB)]

I feel regret and [at the same time] I have to laugh at myself. If I [have to] “encounter men with smartness of speech,”¹⁰² I will have to refuse. [You] are sure to say: “Bear it patiently like this, wait for the appointed time.” [And I] will say: “How long [do you think] a man’s life is, that I wait for the river to clear?”¹⁰³ [You] will surely say: “If the Way would already have prevailed, there would be no use for you to change [the state of the empire] together [with me].”¹⁰⁴ You behold men’s hearts as if you “behold their lungs and livers.”¹⁰⁵ [You] will surely say: “[You say] you hate those flatterers. But how can anyone “who is devoid of principle possibly carry out his speech?””¹⁰⁶ That I feel regret and have to laugh at myself and am tarrying [here], unable to resolve myself [to leave], will that also be a sin between heaven and earth?

Last intercalary [fourth] month I left Sunpu and went to Edo. ... Since I came back from Edo, I have again stayed here and have been kept back up till now. ... All over the empire everything is the *bakufu*’s

¹⁰⁰ *Bunshū* 2 (I, pp. 24-25).

¹⁰¹ The expression which I have translated with “you,” *guangji* 光霽 (J. *kōsei*; “light and clear”), is used to describe persons who display these characteristics, e.g. Zhou Dunyi. Cf. Morohashi I, 1350-231.

¹⁰² *Lunyu* V, 5. Legge translates: “They who encounter men with smartness of speech for the most part procure themselves hatred.”

¹⁰³ For this expression cf. Morohashi I, 344-236.

¹⁰⁴ *Lunyu* XVIII, 6. Legge translates: “If right principles prevailed through the empire, there would be no use for me to change its state.”

¹⁰⁵ *Daxue*, sixth *zhuan*.

¹⁰⁶ *Daxue*, fourth *zhuan*. Legge translates: “The Master said, ‘In hearing litigations, I am like anybody. What is necessary is to cause the people to have no litigations. So, those who are devoid of principles find it impossible to carry out their speeches, and a great awe would be struck into men’s minds; this is called knowing the root.’”

business. Why is it that I toil here alone? Our lord is pure and bright. Why am I the only one to toil [for him]? [But] how could I be the only one [who has suffered in this kind of circumstances]? In all countries it was always like this. In Wei there was the writer of [the poem called] “*Jianxi*”¹⁰⁷; in Lu there was Nanyong 南容, who “would escape punishment and disgrace.”¹⁰⁸ This one also has to keep in mind.

Every now and then, when I happen to turn my head, I see clouds “like a mountain top, like fire, like cotton wool.” At the time the weather is sultry and hot, like fire and steam, and “the earth brings forth [its] spirits and, drying out, is about to die. Without bringing rain [these clouds] spread and cover [the whole expanse of] heaven.” How sad! Is this poem of the monk Fenzhong¹⁰⁹ not also [very] apt? Moreover, “they come forth out of the caves in the mountain.”¹¹⁰ How noble was [Tao] Yuanming’s return to his home! In his flight to the Taixing [Range] 飛于太行, how beautiful was the filial piety of Mr. Di.¹¹¹ It is because of [these associations] that I feel something, looking at the clouds. ... Because I have not yet returned, I feel ashamed before Yuanming; because my parents are in the capital, I feel ashamed before Mr. Di. For this reason, seeing the clouds, I look within myself. ...

At the moment I am building a house here. In ten days and some the building work will be finished. The magpie does not let the dove in, so the dove builds its own nest.¹¹² You may know from this how clumsy it will be. What do you think of my words? I am now “twining [mulberry roots] and making window and door,”¹¹³ but it will be ready shortly. Then I will certainly return to Kyōto. I am bursting with things I want to

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *supra*, n. 80. The fact that the Sage who, disguised as a musician, supposedly sings this song, comes from Wei, is not mentioned in Zhu Xi’s commentary to the *Shijing*, but in the “old commentary” by Zheng Xuan.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. *Lunyu* V, 2. Legge translates: “Of Nanyong (Confucius) said that if the country were well governed, he would not be out of office, and if it were ill-governed, he would escape punishment and disgrace.”

¹⁰⁹ See Morohashi XII, 42335-3, for the whole poem and for the circumstances in which it was written. Razan quotes only the last two lines and part of the first line. The first two lines are: “Like mountain tops, like fire, / and again like cotton wool, / They fly past, and [only] little shade / falls in front of the railing [we lean on]. / The great earth gives forth, ...” Morohashi gives the name of the monk as Fengshu 奉恕, not Fengzhong 奉忠.

¹¹⁰ Reference to a line in Tao Yuanming’s 陶淵明 famous poem “*Guiqulai ci*” 歸去來辭: “Without feelings the clouds issue forth from the mountain caves.”

¹¹¹ It is unclear to which person or story Razan is referring.

¹¹² Reference to *Shijing* 12, where the phrase is an allusion to the fact that the bride (the dove) moves in with her husband and does not build her own house. Here it cannot but mean that Razan did not need to lodge in the castle and had to build a house of his own. In the *Nenpu* nothing is said of this; rather, by saying that Razan received a building subvention in the following year, Keichō 13, it suggests that it was only in that year that he built a house.

¹¹³ Reference to *Shijing* 155; cf. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, p. 100.

tell you. If I do not spend a whole day at your side, how shall I be able to spread out even one ten-thousandth part of it?¹¹⁴ ... What I fear most is that I will fall back and not progress, lose and not succeed. You, too, sir, must study without ever growing weary of it, you must teach and transform.

If our suppositions were correct, Seika, taking his cue from the last two lines of the letter, should have told Razan to stay on and not to give up. He should have comforted him, and said that at all courts you are bound to be kept waiting interminably and that all service is likely to be frustrating. Seika, however, does not say anything of the sort. In his answering letter he says twice how glad he is that Razan will presently return to Kyōto, he comments on the visit that Razan had paid to Kako Munetaka in Edo,¹¹⁵ and makes cryptic references to the fact that youngsters are never satisfied:

18. Letter from Seika to Razan, dated Keichō 12/6/13 (5-8-1607).¹¹⁶

“If in life we wait for [complete] satisfaction, when well we be satisfied? To be at ease when not yet old, that is precisely to be at ease.”¹¹⁷ Do you know what [the writer] intended with this? I imagine that this was written by a man of old who was crowding seventy and feeling remorse. Actually, if he had not been old, he would not have said anything like this. What do you think?

If you meet Sansei, please pass him a word from me. Though I could write him a separate letter, it is terribly hot and I am not feeling too well. Please, forgive me.

From the fact that you so kindly sent me two letters, one after the other, I clearly realised the superior generosity of your deportment. It made me very happy. However, I have been waiting day and night for nothing but the time you would return to Kyōto. I have also come back

¹¹⁴ *Manyi* 曼乙 is here used for *wanyi* 萬一.

¹¹⁵ In his letter (17) Razan had written: “The other day, when I was in Edo, I spent several days in conversation with Kako. Out of the ten things we said, eight or nine were about you, and we seemed to be unable to drop [the subject].” (*Bunshū* 2: I, p. 25).

¹¹⁶ *DNS* XII.31, p. 596. A revised extract of this letter appears in the *Seika bunshū* (Ōta I, p. 271) to which the editor, Razan, has added the following note: “At this time Dōshun was in Sunpu. Seika sent him a letter. Here I reproduce an excerpt of it.”

¹¹⁷ The first two lines vaguely resemble a poem by Su Dongpo. Cf. Morohashi XI, 41247-138.

last month. Everything is all right, so please set your mind at rest. [When you wrote that] during your stay in Edo you spoke with Ka[ko] Bu[zen-no-kami], that one letter did not differ from seeing him. This is also something I owe to your kindness. You have heard nothing from him since? You say that the time of your return is near? That is what I am most glad about. ...

In other words, Seika's attitude is ambivalent, and the attitude of Razan is only slightly less so. Seika had done his best to introduce Razan, the receptacle of the Way, to Ieyasu, and the only thing he could possibly have intended with this was that Razan should take service. But hardly had Razan gained a precarious foothold within the *bakufu*, or Seika started to complain that he missed him, without wasting one word on the prospects of their cause at court. Razan himself is evidently tired of kicking his heels in Sunpu. He wants to return to Kyōto and regain its congenial atmosphere and his circle of literary acquaintances. In Sunpu he feels utterly lost, though he does not yet seem to have lost hope: he wants to continue in Ieyasu's service — why else should he be building a house? — and he has not yet given up the good cause: he is "afraid to fall back and not to progress, to lose and not to succeed" and urges Seika to continue untiringly with his efforts "to teach and transform them." Why he wants to do these things, Razan does not tell us, but his intentions are reasonably clear. On the whole this letter (17) is less despondent than the letter he would write four years later (cf. *supra*, letter 13).

Nakae Tōju

"To teach and transform them" is easier said than done. Individual self-cultivation and the propagation of Confucian ideals in a circle of like-minded friends might not be altogether impracticable, but to establish a "rule by virtue" in conformity with the rules of Confucian ethics was a different matter.

Seika and Razan found themselves confronted with the problem that always dogged Confucian reformers, namely that Confucianism has no viable recipe to bring about this rule by virtue. It must have been this problem that was at the origin of their inconsistencies and frustrations. On the one hand, as a system that propagates individual self-cultivation, Confucianism cannot deny the need for, and consequently the efficacy of, such self-cultivation. On the other hand, neither can it deny that, even when such self-cultivation is successful, the results will be experienced only by a very limited number of people, unless — the traditional answer — one could extend the sphere of one's influence by persuading the ruler. In practice, however, merely in order to gain access to the ruler compromises will be unavoidable, and these compromises have a tendency to vitiate the whole cause.

The alternative was that one wittingly restricted oneself to the personal sphere of self-cultivation and of teaching to a limited number of private disciples. Though even in that case one's teachings had to be shorn of literary trappings and Chinese erudition, as these could be a source of misunderstanding regarding one's professions and deflect the attention from the Way, yet, once one had occupied such a position, one could freely point out all the compromises and inconsistencies that the involvement of the "so-called Confucians" with the worldly powers gave rise to, and condemn them. Nakae Tōju 中江藤樹 (1608-1648), who was one of the few Confucian scholars to have entrenched himself in such a position, did not hesitate to do so.

Tōju's *bête noire* is the *zokuju* 俗儒, the worldly Confucian, whose "arrogance is extreme and whose talk is condescending."¹¹⁸ In the *Okina mondō* 翁問答 ("The Dialogues of an Old Man"), which he completed in his thirty-fourth year,¹¹⁹ he is very much concerned lest his "true learning" (*shōjin no gakumon*)

¹¹⁸ Quoted from the preface of the *Okina mondō* (NST XXIX, p. 20).

¹¹⁹ For more details about this text, cf. Kimura, *Tōju-gaku no seiritsu*, pp. 396-398.

be confounded with false (*nise*) Confucianism. When the Teacher in the dialogue has reached the conclusion that “it is the first and most urgent duty of man to enter into the gate of Confucianism and thus to end his delusions,”¹²⁰ his partner, the Disciple, remarks in a nasty *ad hominem*:

When one sees the men of this age who apply themselves to learning, they do not have any [special] advantages that one could call a sign of the efficacy of their studies. Quite the contrary: there appear to be men [amongst them] whose appearance has turned ill and who have become [rather] weird. What would you say, should I conclude that it is better not to apply oneself to learning?¹²¹

Of course, the Teacher cannot agree. According to him such a conclusion would be based only on the evidence afforded by the exponents of the false learning. He admits, however, that

the learning that is nowadays popular in the world is for the most part false learning. If one applies oneself to false learning, it brings no advantages at all. On the contrary: one merely becomes ill of appearance and weird. The suspicions of those who do not realise that there exists a distinction between true learning and false learning are quite natural.¹²²

Now that this distinction has been established as a fact, however, the two interlocutors move on to the discussion of the nature of the difference:

Since all teachings and learning have the Way of Heaven as their basis and standard, both in China and in the barbarian countries, those teachings and that learning are considered as true amongst the [many] Ways that are in accord with the god-like *li* of the Way of Heaven. Those one calls Confucian teachings or Confucian learning. [The teachings] that go against the god-like *li* of the Way of Heaven are false learning. Of them the [teachings of] the worldly Confucians, the Mohists, Yang

¹²⁰ NST XXIX, p. 48.

¹²¹ NST XXIX, p. 48.

¹²² NST XXIX, p. 49.

Zhu,¹²³ the Taoists and the Buddhists most closely resemble [the true learning]. The worldly Confucians read the texts of Confucianism and learn the commentaries, but they concentrate purely on memorizing and the art of writing. They only hear [the truth] with their ears and expose it with their mouths, but they do not know virtue nor do they practise the Way.¹²⁴

That they read all of the Four Books and the Five Classics and next the whole of the writings of the Masters and the Hundred Schools and learn them by heart, that they write prose and produce poetry, adorn their mouths and ears, that they only use it to seek employment and that the arrogance of their hearts is ever so deep - that is what I call the learning of the worldly Confucians, the learning [consisting] of memorizing and the art of writing.¹²⁵

Though these are generic attacks, there is not much room to doubt that they were principally directed at Razan and his friends. Texts in which Tōju specifically attacks Razan and members of his family also exist. These are the *Anshō Gendō o shiisuru no ron*¹²⁶ 安昌弑玄洞論 and his *Rin-shi kami wo sori kurai o ukuru no ben* 林氏剃髮受位辨,¹²⁷ which Tōju wrote respectively in his twenty-third and twenty-fourth year. Both are very short pieces, and both times Tōju has a straightforward case.

The first piece starts as an attack on Razan's eldest son, Yoshikatsu 叔勝 (1613-1629), who in an essay with the same title as Tōju's¹²⁸ had dared

¹²³ The Mohist are the followers of Mozi 墨子 (fl. 479-438 B.C.), who "has misunderstood [the concept of] Benevolence [that sometimes is explained] as 'complete fairness' or 'universal love,' and thus disturbed the order of important and unimportant, first and last." (NST XXIX, p. 51) Yang Zhu 楊朱 (440-360 B.C.?) was the philosopher who advocated hedonism and egoism. He "has misunderstood the abstruse doctrines of 'only for oneself' and of 'behaving oneself even when alone,' and thus he lost 'the truth that pervades all.'" (ibid.)

¹²⁴ NST XXIX, pp. 50-51.

¹²⁵ NST XXIX, p. 51.

¹²⁶ For details cf. Kimura, *Tōju-gaku no seiritsu*, pp. 261-262. Text in NST XXIX, p. 8-12.

¹²⁷ For details cf. Kimura, *Tōju-gaku no seiritsu*, pp. 262-263. Text in NST XXIX, pp. 13-17.

¹²⁸ See the beginning of Tōju's *Anshō Gendō wo shiisuru no ron* (NST XXIX, p. 8): Yoshikatsu's composition, which seems to be lost, was copied and sent to him by a friend in Kyōto. The murder of Kan Tokuan by one of his disciples, Yasuda Anshō 安田安昌, was something of a *cause célèbre* at the time. It took place on the day of the Gion Festival, the fourteenth day of the sixth month of Kan'ei 5 (15-7-1628). Yoshikatsu must therefore have written his "Discussion"

to call the murdered Kan Tokuan (Gendō) a “pure Confucian.”¹²⁹ How dare he!

Methinks, if one “investigates things and extends one’s knowledge,” then “makes one’s will sincere and one’s heart upright” and thus “cultivates oneself,” one will not be fettered by one’s bodily nature or by material desires and one will be able to return to “the fullness of one’s original being.” In this way, “if one attains a position, one will make the whole empire virtuous, and if one is poor (i.e. without an official position. WJB), one will in solitude make one’s person virtuous.”¹³⁰ This is what is called a Confucian.¹³¹

In Japan, however, so Tōju continues, no such men exist. The self-styled Confucians we have here actually do more harm than the heterodox schools, and Gendō was the worst of the lot. Why was he murdered?

As for Gendō’s life, though he read the books of the Holy Ones, his was only a learning of mouth and ears, of words and phrases; he did not know virtue. Therefore he could not transform the bodily nature. He trusted to his talents and acted at random. This was the reason why “he brought death upon himself.”¹³² Methinks, Gendō treated Anshō as a dog or a pig. Therefore Anshō was moved by his angry *qi* and committed this crime that goes counter to *li* and disrupts the constant [virtues].¹³³

Of course, this does not excuse Anshō. Both Gendō and Anshō were little better than beasts.

(*ron*) between that date and his departure for Edo, where he went in the tenth month of the same year to join his father. Tōju says (loc. cit.) that he received a copy of the composition in the winter of Kan’ei 6 (1629). Since Yoshikatsu had died in the winter of this year, Kan’ei 6, Tōju’s attack was posthumous.

¹²⁹ In the epitaph that he composed in the summer of Kan’ei 8 (1631), Razan does not use this qualification, but he does expatiate not only on Gendō’s scholarly capacities and qualifications, but also on the filial piety that he showed his mother and father. Razan ignores the suspicious circumstance that Gendō was killed by a disciple. He refers to the murderer as a “thief,” a “robber.” (*Bunshū* 43; II, pp. 68-69)

¹³⁰ Cf. the *jing* of the *Daxue*; *Mengzi* VII A, 9.

¹³¹ *NST* XXIX, p.8.

¹³² Cf. *Mengzi* VII B, 29.

When I call this worthless fellow, [Gendō,] someone with a human mask and a beast's heart, I mean that [his nature] was fettered by his material endowment, obscured by his human desires, that he had lost the virtue of his original heart. Therefore the spirituality of his heart knew nothing but the egoistic [notions of] passion and greed, profit and loss. ... his knowledge grew and grew, but his heart became emptier and emptier. Therefore he explained Confucianism and [used it to] beautify his words. He had already discarded the clear law of the *Daxue*. In imitation of the Buddhists he shaved his hair, thus despising the Holy Scheme [as laid down] in the *Xiaoxue*, thus drowning himself in the egoism of his material form, thus destroying the correctness of his [heaven-]decreed nature.

What is such a person, if not a common fellow, with the mask of a man but the heart of a beast? To call him a “pure Confucian” is the unsupported opinion of an irresponsible man.¹³⁴

This is a rather savage attack to unleash on any young boy, and less than charitable when one knows that he died just half a year ago.

It is interesting to note that Tōju does not mention any specific points in Gendō's behaviour that show in what way he had treated Anshō “as a dog or a pig.” Rather he reasons from the results back to the cause, the fact that Gendō was murdered by a disciple proving that he fell short as a teacher and as a human being. It is a dogmatic condemnation, but — it cannot be denied — a condemnation that is doctrinally correct. Evidently Tōju needed to lash out at the whole crowd of Kyōto intellectuals, whose behaviour tended to obscure a point that to him was of overwhelming importance and that he would state over and over again: the end of learning is moral perfection, not erudition.

It was not only the lure of erudition, however, that could distract the scholar from his path. A compromise in which he should acquiesce in order to ingratiate himself with the powers that forced it on him, could just as effectively undermine his status as a Confucian and lead him astray. Again it was the Hayashi who gave him the opportunity to make this point.

¹³³ NST XXIX, p. 9

¹³⁴ NST XXIX, p. 10.

On the last day of Kan'ei 6 (31-1-1630), by command of the *shōgun*, the rank of *Hōin* 法印¹³⁵ was conferred on Razan and his brother Eiki, and the next day they went to the New-Year's audience of the *shōgun* to thank him, dressed in monk's robes and with shaven heads. As was the custom on such occasions, Razan had to present a poem. To this poem he added a preface, and in this preface he tried out a curious line of reasoning that should conciliate his actions with his professed Confucian convictions:

Hōin is a Buddhist rank. ... , but my brother and I are, of course, Confucians. Well then, that we have shaved our hair is in pursuance of the long-established custom of our country. In what do we differ from Taibo 太伯 who cut his hair,¹³⁶ or from Confucius who [wore] his national dress?¹³⁷ Why then should we worry about it?

I have an explanation of this [title. The word] “*si*” 寺 (J. *tera*) meant “office building,” but [the Buddhists] borrowed it to render a Sanskrit word. “*jingshe*” 精舍 (J. *shōja*) originally meant “school.” Again they borrowed it and used it to translate [the Sanskrit] name *aranya* (“school”). “*Dian*” 典 means “always” and so does “*jing*” 經 (J. *kyō*). Because the words of the Holy Ones must always be followed by all generations, they are given this name. The Buddhists, however, took this as a pretext and named their *sutra*'s “*dianjing*” (J. *tenkyō*). Why then should I not go back to the original [meaning of this title]?

The former kings had clothes of the law (*fafu*; J. *hōfuku* 法服). They had words of the law (*fayan*; J. *hōgen* 法言). The four Books and the Five Classics have their method of reading (*dufa*; J. *dokuhō* 讀法). These can all be seen [, written down with] brush and ink; thus they

¹³⁵ See the entry in the *Nenpu* under this year (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 2, p. 22). *Hōin* (“Seal of the Law”) was a Buddhist rank that in later days was also commonly given to physicians, artists, Nō actors, etc.

¹³⁶ Taibo was the eldest son of King Tai of the Zhou who, knowing that his father wanted to leave the country to a younger son, fled the country and went to live with the barbarians. Here he adapted himself to the native customs, shaved his head and tattooed his body. The incident is reported in *Shiji* 4, but see especially *Lunyu* IV B, 1, and Zhu Xi's commentary. According to some traditions (cf. Razan's essay “Jinmu-tennō wo ronzu” in *Bunshū* 25: I, pp. 280-828) this paragon of Confucian virtue came to Japan and was in fact identical with the forefather of the imperial house and founder of Japan, Emperor Jinmu.

¹³⁷ Reference to *Liji* 41. “*Ruxing*.” Legge translates: “Duke Ai of Lu asked Confucius, saying, ‘Is not the dress, Master, which you wear that of a scholar?’ Confucius replied, ‘... I have heard that the studies of a scholar are extensive, but his dress is that of the state from which he sprang. I do not know any dress of the scholar.’”

will be handed down forever. Ink, therefore, is used to transmit the seal (*yin*; J. *in* 印) of the literature of antiquity. This is the seal of the law (*fayin*; J. *hōin* 法印) that I have taken. It is also allowable to call it the seal of the heart (*xinyin* 心印).

Now, the conferment of this rank is not something that we two have ever desired, but now that it has been decided from above, is it not a great favour?¹³⁸ Is it not something that, as people say, has been decreed by heaven?

The auspicious clouds in heaven
have come together with spring.
We, wearing our garb of the law,
greet the three excellencies.
Suddenly to us was transmitted
the Seal of Literature of ancient times.
We try it in our pond of ink, and look,
the ice all melts away.¹³⁹

This is a specious piece of reasoning, crowned by the forced image of ink thawing in spring. If the *shōgun* accepted it, Tōju was not taken in by this attempt to indicate that the present was not received in the spirit in which it was given. He did not stop to consider the preface of the poem for what it was: a frivolous exercise in the *genre* of explanations, but not the worst Razan could have done in the circumstances. He went for him with hammer and thongs:

Hayashi Dōshun has an excellent memory and wide erudition. He explains the Way of the Confucians, but [in fact uses it] only to adorn his words. He follows the law of the Buddhists and, contrary to all principle, has shaven his hair. ... Yet he calls himself a true Confucian. In Japan no Holy Men have appeared, but “the teachings of the heterodox schools are daily renewed and monthly increased.” ... Therefore he is pushed to the front and considered as the father of Confucianism in Japan, and many believe his words and imitate his actions. He occupies [this position], not doubting [himself]; he is quite content and prides himself on it with his disciples. When he went to Edo and served, his

¹³⁸ The character Razan uses, {Mor. 23303}, makes no sense. It might be used, as a kind of joke (?), for its (near) homophones 賚 or 禮, which would make sense and are attested combinations.

¹³⁹ *Shishū* 38 (II, pp. 1-2).

appearance was similar to that of a monk, and when, on the last day of the old year, [an honour] was conferred on him, it was a monk's rank. ... Fearing, however, the ridicule of his contemporaries, he composed a piece of writing to camouflage [the fact] that he was in the wrong, but the wrong he did [just the same]. ...

Methinks, it is the national custom of Japan to shave the hair on the crown of the head and to make a topknot with the rest of the hair. To shave one's hair completely and not to have a topknot is the hairstyle of the Buddhists, not the custom[ary one] of our country. The populace of Japan is very respectful to the monks. Therefore amongst the people with special skills there are those who seek to bring about that others will behave reverently to them, by imitating the appearance [of the monks]. Taibo cut his hair and Confucius wore his national dress because these were the customs of the country and they followed them. ... Thus [Razan], by putting [his action in the same category as] the legitimate opportunism (*juan*; 權) of cutting one's hair or the righteousness of [wearing] one's national dress, deceives himself and deceives others. ... Methinks, Taibo's cutting his hair is [an example of] legitimate opportunism. He was placed in an unusual situation of [rival claims of] fathers and sons, elder and younger brothers, but with his opportunism [he struck the right balance] and found the Mean. For this reason he is considered as "virtuous in the highest degree." Confucius [wore] his national dress "according to local [custom]," and thus "he lived there peacefully and was bountiful in his benevolence." ...

Though it is the Japanese custom, when performing the funeral rites, to use the Buddhist [ceremony], Dōshun did not use it when he buried his son. In other words, it is not the case that he did not know that one should not follow popular custom and should disregard the Buddhists. He merely "could not take that frame of mind and apply it to this [case]." Righteousness could be followed when he was burying his son; "how is it, that its benefits do not reach" his own person? It is, because egoistic desires have impaired [his nature]. ... Because his own way is topsy-turvy and unprincipled and not sufficient to move others, he borrows these [Buddhist traits], boasts of them and seeks to make others follow him. ...

Alas! He made more mistakes! He says that, if names are the same, one can use them interchangeably, [merely] altering their interpretation. Master Zhang once said: "Heaven is my father and earth my mother. Even such a small creature as I finds an intimate place in their midst." If that is true, all living men are children of Heaven, but should it therefore be allowed to call the common people by the name of Sons of Heaven? It is the height of thoughtlessness. He says: "Why should I not go back to the original meaning?" If we take him at his

word, we must conclude that, if one goes back to the original meaning of [the words] *jing* and *dian*, they are names of the books of the Holy Ones and [therefore] are not to be borrowed and used by the Buddhists. Shaving one's hair, however, or [the rank of] *Hōin* are, if one goes back to their origin, Buddhist ways and ranks. It is clear that they are not to be borrowed and used by a Confucian. ... How should we call someone who looks like a Buddhist, has the rank of a Buddhist and dresses in Buddhist clothes anything but a Buddhist?¹⁴⁰

Tōju did not have the monopoly on this kind of sentiments. Six years before Tōju wrote his first attack, Razan expressed himself in much the same terms in a letter to his friend Ishikawa Jōzan 石川丈山 and condemned, as Tōju would do later, the inconsistency of confessed opinions with observable behaviour.

19. Letter from Razan to Ishikawa Jōzan, dated Genna 8/7/20 (4-9-1622).¹⁴¹

In your letter you say that “not all monks refuse to feed their parents, not all Confucians refrain from eating them.” This is truly something to raise cold sweat on the brow of a Confucian. How should only you and me [be susceptible to this fear]? Should not [every Confucian ask himself whether] he has the name of a Confucian, but acts like a Mohist, goes by the name of Mohist but acts like a Confucian, is inwardly a Confucian but outwardly [behaves like] a Buddhist, or is inwardly a Buddhist but outwardly [behaves like] a Confucian? Moreover, [must they not ask themselves whether] their hearts and actions are one or two?

When someone has fallen into heterodox beliefs, yet establishes the names of father and son, it is [a case] similar to that of the benevolence of tigers and wolves.¹⁴² When, however, someone has

¹⁴⁰ NST XXIX, pp. 14-15. For the origin of the quotations (here indicated by quotation marks) and notes to the text, cf. the head-notes *ibid*.

¹⁴¹ *Bunshū* 6 (I, pp. 64-65).

¹⁴² Cf. *Zhuangzi* 14 (“*Tianyun*”), 2. Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* I, p. 345, translates: “Chief Minister Tang of Shang asked Chuang Tzu about benevolence. Chuang Tzu said, ‘Tigers and wolves are benevolent.’ He said, ‘How do you mean that?’ Chuang Tzu said, ‘Fathers and sons love each other. How should they not be benevolent?’”

entered the gate of Confucianism, yet denies his father and mother, it is as if “with help of the *Shi[jing]* and the *Shu[jing]* he is desecrating a grave.”¹⁴³ If among the Confucians there are gentlemen and mean men, why should we be surprised at it?

Here we have a man who, with a net in his hand, is standing over the water and trying to catch fish. If he tells others that he is not a fisherman, those who hear him will doubt him, but if he should throw away his net, then everyone would believe him. Not until there exist a father and a son does filial piety become possible. If someone casts off [his duties of] father and son and says that he is yet not unfilial, nobody will believe him. Yet, however deep he has fallen, the *li* of heaven “is not obscured all of the time.”¹⁴⁴ Therefore he must have some feelings about severing his relations with [people of his own] kind. For this reason I say that it is [a case] similar to that of the benevolence of tigers and wolves.

Moreover, among us Confucians, we have the Holy One warning Zixia that he must not be “a scholar after the style of a mean man.”¹⁴⁵ Is a scholar after the style of a mean man [any better than] an ape or a parrot, even if he can express himself? Therefore we have a proverb, saying: “To strike one’s father and mother with the *Classic of filial Piety*.” This word, though only a vulgar expression, is worthy of our attention. Who will not be startled by it?

If a Buddhist explains Confucianism, this Confucianism will also be [a kind of] Buddhism. If a Confucian expounds Zen, this Zen will also be [a kind of] Confucianism. Therefore I say: “[Those who are] Mohists in name but Confucians by their deeds, Confucians in name but Mohists by their deeds, inwardly Buddhists but outwardly Confucians, or outwardly Buddhists but inwardly Confucians, [may keep their feelings] vague and indistinct; they may “draw back and conceal”¹⁴⁶ [their real sentiments]. Nevertheless, their “lungs and livers”¹⁴⁷ will not escape the eyes of the Holy and Wise. If thereupon (i.e. having realised this. WJB) they will examine themselves and thus obtain the solid [base upon which] serving one’s parents [rests], will they not be able to come quite close to it?”¹⁴⁸

¹⁴³ Cf. *Zhuangzi* 26 (“*Waiwu*” 外物), 4. Translation in Legge, *The Texts of Taoism* II, pp. 134-135.

¹⁴⁴ Reference to Zhu Xi’s commentary on the Three Principles of the *Daxue*: “However, since [the heart] is fettered by its material endowment and obscured by human desires, at times it is dark.”

¹⁴⁵ Reference to *Lunyu* III B, 13.

¹⁴⁶ Quotation from Zhu Xi’s commentary on the sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue*.

¹⁴⁷ Quotation from the sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue*.

¹⁴⁸ As the last two references show, Razan conceived the consistency of opinions and behaviour in terms of *cheng* 誠, sincerity. (The sixth *zhuan* of the *Daxue* explains “To make sincere one’s will.”) In this letter his illustrations are all chosen with reference to one of the

The conflict between Tōju and Razan thus seems to be largely about means, rather than aims. According to Tōju, anything that distracts the adept's attention from practising Confucianism, and any compromise that will obfuscate the distinctive Confucian character of his actions is wrong. Razan assents to this rule. He is merely less rigorous in applying it, especially to himself. The result was that we find Tōju in a small village in Ōmi, caring for his mother and teaching to a motley assortment of students,¹⁴⁹ while Razan was in Edo, advising the *bakufu*, and came to be revered as the father of Japanese Confucianism and forefather of the hereditary *daigaku no kami*. Yet Tōju's influence, too, made itself felt, as gradually the school of Wang Yangming, whose patron he became, in Confucian terms "permeated the country."

Serving the bakufu

At this point we can draw some provisional conclusions. Razan was brought to the attention of Ieyasu through the good offices of Seika and Jō Masamochi. He impressed Ieyasu with his erudition, and after a probationary period he was taken into service and put to work in Sunpu as a — subordinate — member of the personal staff of Ieyasu. Seika, however, was not overly charmed with the result of his exertions (especially Razan's forced absence from Kyōto seems to have irked him) and Razan, too, was not much pleased with his new environment. One of the things he complained about was that his work forced him into compromises that went against his Confucian convictions and were

five human relations, that between fathers and sons, but the scope of his argument can easily be widened so as to include also the other four.

¹⁴⁹ See by way of illustration the anecdotes in his biography in Ban Kōkei 伴蒿蹊, *Kinsei kijin den* 近世奇人傳, pp. 21-27. The *Kijin den* was first published in 1790.

detrimental to his stature as a Confucian. He did not have to stand this. Yet he did. Why?

Like Seika, Razan nowhere clearly states the rationale for his actions, but the number of possibilities is not great. One reason, that would interest me least, may have been plain ambition. Another, socially determined motive may have been the attraction of the newly opened career possibilities in the *bakufu* bureaucracy. Up till now, Zen monks had been regularly employed as clerks and advisers, because of their knowledge of Chinese, but this might be turned into a niche for Confucian scholars. It will not be far wrong to say that the last circumstance was a factor in turning Seika's and Razan's thoughts into this direction, while personal ambition was a potent motive for Razan to persevere. These considerations, however, have nothing to do with Confucianism *per se*. As we have seen, however, Confucianism, too, had been a potent motive for Seika and Razan to engage on the course that led to Razan's eventual employ by the *bakufu*.

The question now becomes: is there any indication that Razan was appreciated by the *bakufu* as a Confucian scholar or that he was able to use his employment in order to further the cause of Confucianism? What will be the conclusions when we evaluate Razan's actions in the service of the *bakufu* under these two aspects?

For the period when Razan served under Ieyasu, the eleven years from Keicho 11 (1606) till Ieyasu's death in Genna 2 (1616), the *Nenpu* lists the following events, duties and activities:

- (*Keichō 12*) Razan goes to Edo to have an audience with Hidetada.
- (*Idem*) He reads to the *shōgun* the *Huangshi bingfa* 黄氏兵法¹⁵⁰ and, from the *Qian Han Shu* 前漢書, the annals of Gaozu and the biographies

¹⁵⁰ I.e. the *Sanlue*, one of the military classics. According to legend the book was given to Zhang Liang (*vide infra*, n. 153) by a supernatural being, called Lord Yellow Stone (Huangshigong 黄石公)

of Xiang Ji 項籍,¹⁵¹ Han Xin 韓信,¹⁵² Zhang Liang 張良¹⁵³ and Chen Ping 陳平.¹⁵⁴

- (*Idem*) He is ordered to shave his hair and take the name Dōshun.
- (*Idem*) He is sent to Nagasaki.¹⁵⁵
- (*Keichō 13*) “Day and night he serves in Ieyasu’s presence.”
- (*Idem*) He reads the *Lunyu*, the *Sanlue*, etc.
- (*Idem*) He is put in charge of the library.¹⁵⁶
- (*Keichō 14*) His brother Nobuzumi, who has been on probation since the preceding year, is sent to Nagasaki.¹⁵⁷
- (*Keichō 15*) He is ordered to write a letter to the viceroy of Fujian and letters to the captain of the ships of the Southern Barbarians and to the elders of Macao, all on behalf of Honda Masazumi 本多正純 (1566-1637) who at that time, as assistant (*shitsuji* 執事) of Ieyasu, is in charge of foreign relations.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵¹ I.e. Xiang Yu 羽, King of Chu and the last contender for the empire whom Liu Bang 劉邦, the founder of the Han dynasty, had to defeat.

¹⁵² One of Liu Bang's three most famous retainers, who helped him to found the Han.

¹⁵³ One of Liu Bang's three most famous retainers. In his youth he had tried to kill Qin Shihuangdi 秦始皇帝, but failed. He changed his name and studied military lore. (cf. *supra*, n. 148) until Liu Bang commenced the uprising that would lead to the overthrow of the Qin and the founding of the Han. He joined Liu and helped him establish the Han.

¹⁵⁴ He first served under Xiang Yu, but later he went over to Liu Bang, whom he served in a subordinate capacity. He played an important role in the factional strife at the courts of the later Han emperors Hui 惠 and Wen 文.

¹⁵⁵ Entries for Keichō 12 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 15; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 38.

¹⁵⁶ Entries for Keichō 13 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 15; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 38.

¹⁵⁷ Entries for Keichō 14 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 15. Nobuzumi had been introduced to Ieyasu and Hidetada in the previous year. Though the *Nenpu* only says that he went to Nagasaki “for some reason” and does not specify, it seems likely that, as had been the case with his brother a few years earlier, he went there on the *bakufu*'s business, sometime during the probationary period before he was regularly employed. The purpose of his trip is not mentioned either in the “Nagasaki itsuji” 逸事 (*Bunshū* 22: I, pp. 246-248) which Razan wrote on the occasion of Nobuzumi's safe return in the second month of Keichō 15.

¹⁵⁸ Entries for Keichō 15 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 15-16; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, pp. 38-39. The letter Razan wrote on behalf of Masazumi is in *Bunshū* 12 (I, pp. 130-131). A second letter to the viceroy of Fujian, Chen Zizhen 陳子貞, written on behalf of the Nagasaki *bugyō* Hasegawa Fujihiro 長谷川藤廣 (1567-1617; *bugyō* from 1606 till 1615)), *ibid.*, pp. 131-132. The letter to the captain of the Portuguese ships (dated Keichō 16), *ibid.*, pp. 132-133. Three

- (*Keichō 16*) Razan drafts the text of the oath that Ieyasu makes the *daimyō* of western Japan swear.¹⁵⁹
- (*Idem*) He receives land near Kyōto.¹⁶⁰
- (*Keichō 17*) Razan is ordered to move his family to Sunpu.
- (*Idem*) “He permanently serves within the castle and talks about things Japanese and Chinese, ancient and modern. A number of times his opinion is asked.”
- (*Idem*) “Sometimes he listens to the discussions of monks in order to pick out the essentials, to report them [to Ieyasu] and even to remit them to Edo.”
- (*Idem*) “Sometimes he is present when the medicines [for Ieyasu] are prepared; he reads the *Heji[ju] fang*¹⁶¹ and explains it in order to enlighten the physicians.”
- (*Idem*) Nobuzumi enters into the service of the *bakufu*, in a position similar to that of Razan, and is stationed in Edo. He shaves his hair and takes the name Eiki 永喜.¹⁶²

letters to the elders of Macao, written on behalf of Masazumi, Fujihiro and Gotō Mitsutsugu 後藤光次 (1571-1625) respectively, all dated Keichō 16, *ibid.*, pp. 135-136.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. *supra*, n. 57; n. 58.

¹⁶⁰ Entries for Keichō 16 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 16; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 39.

¹⁶¹ The *Heji fang* will be the *Taiping huimin hejiju fang* 太平惠民和劑局方, a medical work in ten chapters, compiled by Chen Shiwen 陳師文 (Song). The Naikaku Bunko has in its possession a manuscript copy of this work, dating from the end of the Muromachi period.

¹⁶² Entries for Keichō 17 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 16; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 39. The entry in the *Gyōjō* for this year is more elaborate. Since the emphasis, too, is different, I will translate it here in full: “Continuously he served within the castle. He exhorted [Ieyasu] with biographical stories of ancient and modern times, both from China and Japan. He was consulted very often, and several times he advanced from his seat [to give his opinion]. During the conversations in the evening he often received drink or food. Sometimes even, when they were sitting together in front of the fire, he exposed the meaning of the Confucian books and [the philosophy of] Nature and Principle, and in many instances [what he said] agreed with Ieyasu's own ideas. If [Ieyasu] did not agree with something, he explained it a second and a third time. Even in cases that [Ieyasu had objections that] he could not clear away, he never met with [Ieyasu's] anger. Every now and then [Ieyasu] said to those around him: ‘We must certainly avail ourselves of his broad knowledge. Everyone of you must meet him.’ Ieyasu continuously was having physicians prepare medicines for himself. He also liked to listen to the discussions of monks. Razan, at his orders, assisted at [these discussions]. Razan's brother Nobuzumi for some years now had been travelling on orders of the *bakufu*. He now received the command to enter the

- (*Keichō 18*) In the winter of this year Razan accompanies Ieyasu on a hawking trip.¹⁶³
- (*Keichō 19*) Razan is ordered to write down his criticisms of the inscription of the bell of the Hōkōji 方廣寺. (This inscription provided Ieyasu with his *casus belli* for the campaign against Ōsaka.)
- (*Idem*) Razan asks to be allowed to open a school in Kyōto and to teach there. Ieyasu agrees to this, but nothing comes of it because of the Ōsaka campaign.
- (*Idem*) He follows the army in the winter campaign against Ōsaka.¹⁶⁴
- (*Genna 1*) He is ordered to supervise the printing of the *Junshu zhiyao*¹⁶⁵ 群書治要 and the *Dazang yilanji* 大藏一覽集,¹⁶⁶ and to supplement the missing chapters of the first work.
- (*Idem*) After the fall of Ōsaka in the fifth month, Ieyasu goes to Kyōto where he searches for “old Japanese records”¹⁶⁷ in the libraries of members of the court aristocracy. Razan is summoned from Sunpu to examine them and to supervise the copying.

service of Hidetada in Edo. He shaved his hair and changed his name to Eiki.”

¹⁶³ Entries for Keichō 18 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 16; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 39.

¹⁶⁴ Entries for Keichō 19 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 16; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 39. N.B. Razan's involvement in the incident of the bell of the Hōkōji is not mentioned in the *Gyōjō*. The story of the bell inscription and of the use that Ieyasu made of it, is too well known to need to be repeated here. For Razan's involvement in this affair, see the circumstantial accounts in Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 187-189, and in Nakamura Kōya, *Ieyasu no seiji keizai shinryō* 家康の政治経済臣僚, pp. 200-239. Both authors also give the texts of the inscription and of Razan's criticisms. As regards Razan's plans to establish a school, cf. *supra*, Ch. I, n. 213, and *infra*, n. 208.

¹⁶⁵ A compilation in fifty fascicles from the classics, the histories and the philosophers, made in the beginning of the Tang by Wei Zheng 魏徵. It contains maxims regarding the main points of government. The work was lost in China, but transmitted in Japan. The Japanese copy was complete, with the exception of the fourth, thirteenth and twenty-third fascicles (cf. Katsura, *Kanseki kaidai*, p. 556). According to the *Go-hon nikki fuchū* 御本日記府中, the only surviving Japanese copy, which Ieyasu had obtained, had been in the possession of the Kanazawa Bunko (cf. the excerpt from this work in *DNS* XII.24, pp. 258-259).

¹⁶⁶ A compilation (ten vols and one vol. index) of 1181 classified quotations from the *sūtra*'s. It was made by Chen Shi 陳實 (Ming). Cf. Mochizuki, *Bukkyō daijiten* X, pp. 587-588.

¹⁶⁷ According to the *Go-hon nikki fuchū* (*DNS* XII.24, p. 258) these old Japanese records were works like the *Rikkokushi*, the various Heian law codes, etc.

- (*Idem*) Ieyasu leaves Kyōto in the eighth month and Razan accompanies him.
- (*Idem*) When the rain forces Ieyasu to halt for three days in Minakuchi in Ōmi Razan reads to him the first chapter of the *Lunyu*.¹⁶⁸
- (*Genna 2*) Ieyasu falls ill in the first month of this year. On the eleventh day of the fourth month (25-5-1616), six days before he dies, Razan is summoned to his bedside.
- (*Idem*) After Ieyasu's death Razan sends his family back to Kyōto, while he himself goes to Edo. He receives leave and returns to Sunpu.
- (*Idem*) In Sunpu he divides the library of Ieyasu between Tokugawa Yoshinao 義直 (1600-1650; Ieyasu's ninth son and *daimyō* of Nagoya), Yorinobu 頼宣 (1602-1671; Ieyasu's tenth son and *daimyō* of Suruga, later of Kii) and Yorifusa 頼房 (1603-1661; Ieyasu's eleventh son and *daimyō* of Mito). The old Japanese records, however, and other rare books he sends to Edo.¹⁶⁹
- (*Genna 3*) Razan goes to Edo and takes part in the funeral procession that conveys Ieyasu's remains from Sunpu to Nikkō.¹⁷⁰

A number of these activities form part of what might be called Razan's career-pattern. It is interesting to see how closely this pattern is paralleled that of his brother Eiki. After he has been on probation for some time and — just like Eiki would do some years later — has travelled to Nagasaki,¹⁷¹ he is sent to Edo and appears before Hidetada who is, after all, as *shōgun* the titular head of the *bakufu*. When Hidetada has approved he is taken into regular employ and ordered to shave his head. He receives a fixed salary in the form of land and

¹⁶⁸ Entries for Genna 1 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, pp. 16-17; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 39.

¹⁶⁹ Entries for Genna 2 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 17; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 40.

¹⁷⁰ Entries for Genna 3 in *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 17; (*Gyōjō*) *ibid.*, *Furoku* 3, p. 40.

¹⁷¹ The *Nenpu* dates this trip to Nagasaki in Keichō 12. As we have seen, however, this journey probably took place in Keichō 10 or 11. Cf. *supra*, letter (6), and n. 157.

moves his family to Sunpu. After Ieyasu's death the administrative apparatus that had been maintained in Sunpu is dismantled. Since apparently it is not a foregone conclusion that he will be kept on the pay-roll, Razan sends his family back to Kyōto and, after he has been given leave to do so, winds up his part of Ieyasu's affairs. He does this in pursuance of Ieyasu's instructions but with Hidetada's *fiat*. To judge by the fact that he sent a number of books to Edo instead of dividing them among the *go-sanke* as Ieyasu had ordered, he had one eye on a future career within the ordinary bureaucracy of the *bakufu* in Edo when he did this.¹⁷² Then he retires to Kyōto to await reappointment. In the meantime his only official action is that he accompanies Ieyasu's remains to their final resting-place in Nikkō, as a loyal retainer should.

Razan's official position was that of keeper of the books in Ieyasu's library in Sunpu. It was as such that he was charged with the final division of these books. It was in this same capacity that previously he had been ordered to supervise the editing and printing of the *Junshu zhiyao* and the *Dazang yilanji* and had been summoned to Kyōto to assist Ieyasu in his last foray into the libraries of the court nobility.

Razan, however, also functioned as a member of the personal *entourage* of Ieyasu. This personal *entourage* must be distinguished, on the one hand, from the ordinary bureaucracy, in that its members catered to the personal needs of a *daimyō* or, in this case, a retired *shōgun*, and on the other hand from external specialists like *renga*-masters, tea-masters, monks, etc., in that they were in permanent employ. This *entourage* knew a certain degree of formal organisation and within it various groups can be distinguished. It is, however, very difficult to determine in which of these groups to place Razan.

In the introduction of his *Daimyō to otogi-shū* Kuwata Tadachika divides the personal *entourage* into three groups: the *otogi-shū* お伽衆, the

¹⁷² Razan's own writings are the only source both for the disposal of Ieyasu's books and for the final interview where Ieyasu supposedly instructed him how to divide them. The fullest

dōbō 同朋, and the *monoyomi* 物讀.¹⁷³ It was the main task of the members of the *otogi-shū* to function as conversational partners of their lords, to help them while away the time and to instruct them. To judge by lists of members of the *otogi-shū* of Hidetada and Ieyasu, nearly all of them were *bushi* or court aristocrats, so their social status was one cut above that of Razan.¹⁷⁴ On the other hand, Razan's brother Eiki is mentioned as one of the members of Hidetada's *otogi-shū*.¹⁷⁵ This implies that Razan's status, though lowly, would not have precluded him from becoming a member of the *otogi-shū* of the (ex)-*shōgun*.

Another category of personal attendants mentioned by Kuwata is that of the *monoyomi*. In the beginning of the Edo period the *monoyomi* had not yet degenerated into popular entertainers. For an audience of *bushi* they explained and expostulated on military literature, the *gunki-mono* 軍記物. Because the most eminent of the *gunki-mono* was the *Taihei-ki* 太平記, they were also known as *Taiheiki-yomi*. They had to be well read in the subject of military lore and in the relevant Chinese literature.¹⁷⁶ This parallel would explain why Razan, at his first meeting with Hidetada, was tested on his knowledge of Chinese military lore and why he had to read the *Sanlue* to Ieyasu quite as often as the *Lunyu*. Another indication that Razan might have been seen in this light is furnished by an entry in the *Ryūei bunin*, where Razan is said to be “the disciple of Tokumoto 徳本, a *samurai* from Kai.”¹⁷⁷ This

account is found in *Razan gaishū* 6, quoted in *DNS* XII.24, pp. 256-257.

¹⁷³ Kuwata Tadachika, *Daimyō to otogi-shū*, pp. 3-4.

¹⁷⁴ See the description in *Daitokuin-dono go-jikki* 大徳院殿御實記, *Furoku* 3: *TJ* II, pp. 282-283. The *Daitokuin-dono go-jikki* mentions *ibid.* the names of the members of Hidetada's *otogi-shū*, but neither in this list nor in the lists that Kuwata has compiled of the members of Ieyasu's and Hidetada's *otogi-shū* Razan's name occurs; see Kuwata, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-67 and pp. 71-88 resp..

¹⁷⁵ Eiki's name occurs in *Go-tōke kinen roku* 御當家記年録, which is quoted in *Tokugawa jikki* 徳川實記 and also in Kuwata, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.

¹⁷⁶ For more details see Kameda Jun'ichirō, “*Taiheiki-yomi ni tsuite*.” Kameda creates the impression that the institution originated in the Keichō-Genna period, but it must have been older.

¹⁷⁷ *Ryūei bunin* II, p. 273.

Tokumoto must be the “*rōnin* called Tokumoto” who, according to the *Nenpu*, “all the time came to the house of Rizai and Nobutoki and read the *Taiheiki*,” when Razan was eight years old.¹⁷⁸

The third group, the *dōbō*, formed the upper crust of the personal servants of a *shōgun*. The name and the institution originated in the Ashikaga period. If we compare the characteristics of these *dōbō* with Razan,¹⁷⁹ we find many parallels:

1. *Their appearance*: The *dōbō* shaved their heads and dressed like monks.¹⁸⁰
2. *Their status*: In the beginning the *dōbō* were not much more than menial servants and their status was much lower than that of the *bushi* who worked in the ordinary bureaucracy, but as time went by their status increased. They were allowed to live outside the palace.¹⁸¹
3. *Their work*: The *dōbō* were appointed by the *shōgun* himself; their position generally was inherited by their sons. One of the main responsibilities of the *dōbō* was to take care of the utensils, bibelots, art objects, robes, etc. of the *shōgun*.¹⁸²

Under the Tokugawa the position of *dōbō* still existed. The positions still were hereditary and the *dōbō* still wore Buddhist clothes. They were responsible for supplying the *shōgun*, visiting *daimyō*, and other dignitaries with tea, etc.,¹⁸³ but their status seems to have been lower than that of their name-sakes of the Ashikaga *bakufu*.

The thesis that Razan's position was similar to that of the *dōbō* of the Ashikaga Period has its attractions. It would fit in with at least part of Razan's

¹⁷⁸ *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 1, p. 1. According to the *Gyōjō*, this Tokumoto came from Kai (ibid., *Furoku* 3, p. 35).

¹⁷⁹ I base myself on the description of the *dōbō* of the Ashikaga *bakufu* given by Kōsai Tsutomu, “*Dōbō-shū shinkō*: Zeami *dōbō* setsu o megutte,” in *Zeami shinkō*.

¹⁸⁰ Kōsai, *op. cit.*, p. 78.

¹⁸¹ Kōsai, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-84, p. 79.

¹⁸² Kōsai, *op. cit.*, p. 80, p. 91.

¹⁸³ See Konakamura Kiyonori, *Nihon kanshoku seido enkakushi*, p. 274.

tasks (the step from keeper of the *shōgun's* treasures to keeper of the *shōgun's* books is not too great) and with his status and the circumstances of his employment, and it would explain why he had to wear a Buddhist garb and did not protest against it. The thesis also throws an interesting light on the origin of the position of the *jusha*. This position, an official function in the bureaucracy of the Tokugawa *bakufu*, originated in the second and third decades of the seventeenth century. The *Ryūei bunin* 柳營補任 distinguishes two categories of *jusha*: Razan and his descendants, but they only, are classified as *Naka-oku go-koshō jiseki jusha* 中奥御小姓次席儒者. In other words, their place of work was the *naka-oku*, i.e. the private quarters of the *shōgun*, lying between the *omote*, where the offices of the *bakufu* were situated, and the *ō-oku*, and amongst the personnel that worked there they were ranked after the *koshō*, the pages. *Their position is inherited*.¹⁸⁴ On the other hand, the positions of the “ordinary” *jusha* were not hereditary, and they fell into a different category from that of the Hayashi,¹⁸⁵ although their duties, of course, partially overlapped.

Whatever his exact position was, the sources stress that Razan “served inside the castle day and night,” accompanied Ieyasu on a hawking expedition, followed the army to Ōsaka and accompanied Ieyasu on his way back from Kyōto. His specific task within Ieyasu’s *entourage* seems to have been that of a reader. As such he performed on various occasions, e.g. when he read the *Han Shu*, the military classics and the *Lunyu*. He also performed a number of disparate services for which his educational background, erudition and fluency in writing Chinese fitted him, such as reporting on the discussions of the monks, criticising the bell inscription, supervising the preparation of medicines, drafting oath-formularies and writing Chinese letters to Fujian and Macao.

¹⁸⁴ *Ryūei bunin* II, pp. 273-274).

¹⁸⁵ For examples see *Ryūei bunin* V, pp. 163-167.

These various duties and activities fit together naturally. When we tabulate them as we find them mentioned in the *Nenpu* under the five headings of (1) activities incident to the career-pattern, (2) duties and activities as a librarian, (3) duties and activities as a member of Ieyasu's *entourage*, (4) duties and activities as a reader, and (5) various, we reach totals of seven, four, five, three and six respectively for the various categories. The only break in the pattern is Razan's request to be allowed to establish a school in Kyōto. If the story is true (there is considerable room for doubt), it means that at least once he tried to break away from the uncongenial environment in Sunpu and to arrange a job for himself that was more in keeping with his Confucian convictions.

Continuing states cannot be chronicled as easily as incidental events. Yet these figures illustrate the bias that is apparent in both the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō*. The most important object that the writers, Razan's sons, seem to have pursued was to impress their readers with the fact that their father had indubitably served under the great Ieyasu himself. They dwell on all the steps of his career and on all the odd jobs that he performed for his master. It is instructive to see how nearly all entries in the *Nenpu* for the years from Keichō 12 to Genna 2 concern Razan in his relation to Ieyasu,¹⁸⁶ and how the importance of his services is grossly inflated. Even more striking is the paucity of strictly Confucian activities. I count three at most: twice Razan reads from the *Lunyu* and once he asks Ieyasu's support for his project of establishing a school in Kyōto.

Apart from the entries in the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō*, however, there are other sources. The most interesting of these are samples of actual conversations between Ieyasu and Razan. One moving account, which tells us

¹⁸⁶ For these years we find only six entries that mention occurrences that bear no relation to Ieyasu. Five of these show us Razan as a family man (he visits his uncle and adoptive father Rizai, nurses him on his death-bed, marries and begets a son). The last entry mentions Razan's meeting with the members of the Korean embassy of 1607.

of Razan's reading from the *Lunyu* in Minakuchi (Genna 1), is contained in the diary Razan wrote about the journey he made in Genna 2 from Edo through Sunpu to Kyōto, the *Heishin kikō* 丙辰紀行:

(Minakuchi) On the fourth day of the eighth month of last year (26-9-1615) the *daishōkoku* left the castle on Nijō and the next day he stayed here. Because it kept raining continuously from that day on, he remained here for three days and late one night, when I, too, was in attendance, he told me to read from the chapter "*Xue er*" 學而 [of the *Lunyu*]. When therefore I had knelt and opened [the book], he himself read the passage "[If, in serving his parents,] he can exert his utmost strength; [if, in serving his prince,] he can devote his life."¹⁸⁷ Then he said: "Attention must be paid to the word "can." If one makes light of it, loyalty and filial piety will not be established easily. You must discuss [the question which of the two] is more important, "to exert one's strength for one's parents," or "to give one's life for one's lord." I also made an answer, quoting the old story of Zhao Bao 趙苞.¹⁸⁸ Now [that Ieyasu has died and I am again in Minakuchi,] I cannot get this out of my mind and unexpectedly [I weep, and have to] wring my sleeves.

Love grows from parents and children
And duty arises from lord and servant.
The rains of last year when I read for him,
And me, today, stained with tears.¹⁸⁹

Other accounts are the *bakufu mondō*: five instances of conversations with Ieyasu and one of a conversation with Hidetada, six in all. The conversation with Hidetada is about the authenticity of the *Sanlue*; it will have taken place during Razan's visit to Edo in Keichō 12. In view of its contents, it need not detain us here. The scraps of his conversations with Ieyasu are more

¹⁸⁷ Quotation from *Lunyu* I, 7. The translation is Legge's.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Morohashi X, 37171-307. Biography in *Hou Han Shu* 81. Zhao had been recommended for service because of "filial piety and incorruptibility" (one of the official avenues to government service during the Han; cf. Morohashi III, 6952-244). When his mother and his wife were captured by invading nomads, Zhao, as a loyal servant to the throne, attacked and defeated them, but his mother and his wife were killed.

¹⁸⁹ *Heishin kikō* (ZZGR XVIII, p. 1324). The Chinese poems of the *Heishin kikō* also in *Shishū* 1 (I,

to the point. Several of them are explicitly concerned with Confucian topics and in all of them Razan is shown as striking “proper Confucian attitudes.”

Among them we find the (in)famous discussion of the rights and wrongs of overthrowing one’s lord, supported by the cases of Cheng Tang 成湯 and King Wu 武王. They will bear translation in full¹⁹⁰:

One day the *bakufu* (= Ieyasu) made Razan read the *Wanshu tongzong* 萬書統宗.¹⁹¹ [In it] there was [a passage about] the so-called “Method of the Ten Generals” of Yuan Tiangang¹⁹² 袁天綱 and the “Divination [by means] of the Six Tigers” of Li Chunfeng 李淳風.¹⁹³ He pointed at this and said: “Can you explain this?” I answered that I could not. Again he pointed at the “[Method of] Divination by Throwing Coins”¹⁹⁴ and the “[Method of] Counting in the Hand,”¹⁹⁵ and asked whether I could explain those. I said that I could not. He ordered me to go home and to read the book. I answered: “Yes! I will tell you all in detail tomorrow.” Ieyasu said: “Good!” Now, Yuan’s and Li’s methods of divination have some [traits] that I cannot admire and, when compared to picking up the milfoil stalks, throwing coins is like a child’s play. Counting on one’s fingers alone is easy and one of the Six Arts (i.e. ritual, music, shooting, chariot driving, writing and arithmetic. WJB). When I said I could not explain them, it did so in order to put them in their place. However, should I stubbornly have declined [to answer Ieyasu’s questions], I would have refused to follow an order from my lord. [Therefore,] that I said that I would tell him tomorrow, was true and just.

[Ieyasu] said to Dōshun: “Do you, in the section ‘The stable burnt down’ of the chapter *Xiangdang* [of the *Lunyu*],¹⁹⁶ read ‘bu’ 不 as ‘fou’ 否,¹⁹⁷ or

pp. 1-10); the poem about Minakuchi *ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁹⁰ Text of the *bakufu mondō* in *Bunshū* 31 (I, pp. 340-343: “Bakufu no toi ni kotau”) and *NST* XXVIII, pp. 205-208. Cf. also *Tōshōgū go-jikki*, *Furoku* 22 (*TJ* I, pp. 344-345).

¹⁹¹ No details known.???????Naikaku Bunko??

¹⁹² Cf. Morohashi X, 34152-236. Yuan Tiangang was a famous diviner. He lived in the beginning of the Tang. I have not been able to establish what is meant by the “Method of the Ten Generals.”

¹⁹³ Cf. Morohashi VI, 14459-1459. Li Chunfeng (Tang) was a mathematician. I have not been able to establish what is meant by his “Divination by Means of the Six Tigers.”

¹⁹⁴ A simplified method of consulting the *Yijing*. Instead of milfoil stalks one uses coins, heads and tails corresponding to Yin and Yang.

¹⁹⁵ No details known.

¹⁹⁶ *Lunyu* X, 11. Legge translates: “The stable being burned down, when he was at court, on his return he said, ‘Has any man been hurt?’ He did not ask about the horses.”

what?" I answered that [the latter] was the theory of a certain Ono of our country (i.e. Ono no Takamura. WJB), who said that "He (= Confucius) had to ask about the men, but also had to ask about the horses." [Ieyasu] said: "This [interpretation] is not according to the commentary by Zhu Xi?" I said: "No. [Zhu Xi says that Confucius] esteemed the men and disdained the beasts. [That interpretation] is logical and as it should be. If it would have been the horses of the Marquis of Lu, he should have asked about them, but these are Confucius' own horses. After [we have read the phrase] 'He left court,' we know that they were Confucius' own horses. To read 'pu' as 'fou' is not [according to] Zhu Xi's intention. I think it is nothing but a forced interpretation of this Ono. The theory also occurs in the *Baichuan xuehai* 百川學海."¹⁹⁸

[Ieyasu] asked Dōshun: "Is at this time the Way still practised in China? What do you think about it?" I said that it was. "Although I have not yet seen it with my own eyes, I know [China] from the books. Now, the Way is not something obscure and secluded; it exists between lord and servant, father and son, man and wife, old and young, and in the intercourse between friends. At this time there are schools in China in each and every place, from the wards and alleys and from the country districts up to the cities and prefectures. In all these they teach the human relations. Their main [objective] is to correct the hearts of men and to better the customs of the people. Do they [not] then indeed practise the Way?" Thereupon the *bakufu* changed his countenance and spoke of other things. Dōshun, too, did not speak [about it anymore].

[Ieyasu] said to Dōshun: "The way has never been practised, now or formerly. Therefore, 'The course of the Mean cannot be attained'¹⁹⁹ and 'The path of the Mean is untrodden.'²⁰⁰ What do you think of this?" Dōshun answered: "The Way can be practised. What the *Zhongyong* says is, I think, something that Confucius said when he was complaining of the fact that the Way was not being practised. It does not mean that the Way truly cannot be practised. In the Six Classics there are many

¹⁹⁷ The reading *fou* occurs in older commentaries and is mentioned in *Lunyu zhengyi* 13.8b. Cf. also Yoshikawa, *Rongo* I, p. 328. Interpreted in this way, the passage should be translated: "He asked whether any man had been hurt, [and then] he asked about the horses."

¹⁹⁸ A Chinese *congshu* 叢書 in 177 fascicles, compiled by Zuo Gui 左圭 (Song).

¹⁹⁹ Quotation from the *Zhongyong*, ninth *zhang*. Legge translates: "The Master said, 'The kingdom, its states, and its families, may be perfectly ruled; dignities and emoluments may be declined; naked weapons may be trampled under the feet; — but the course of the Mean cannot be attained to.'"

²⁰⁰ Quotation from the *Zhongyong*, fifth *zhang*. Legge translates: The Master said, "Alas! How is the path of the Mean untrodden!"

[lamentations] like this. It is not only the *Zhongyong*.”

[Ieyasu] asked what was [meant by] “the Mean.” I answered: “The Mean (or Middle) is difficult to grasp. The middle of one foot is not the middle of one *jō* 丈 (i.e. a measure of ten feet. WJB). The middle of a room is not the middle of a house. The middle of a country is not the middle of the empire. All things have their own Middle. When one obtains their *li* (principle), then one certainly [has found] their Middle. Those who have only just begun their studies, though they want to know the Middle, yet never obtain it, precisely because they do not know the *li*. For this reason we have the maxim, [valid] now and formerly, that ‘the Mean is nothing but the *li*.’”

[Ieyasu] said: “Both the Mean and Expedience know good and bad. Tang and Wu as vassals overthrew their lords. [Their actions], though bad, were good. As the phrase goes, ‘In taking [the empire] they went against [the Way], and in keeping it, they followed [the Way].’²⁰¹ Therefore, ‘neither good nor bad’ is the apogee of the Middle.” I answered: “My opinion is different from this. May I be allowed to speak my mind? I think that the Mean is good, that it does not have one speck of evil. If of all things (*wu*) one obtains [their] *li*, and if all of one’s actions (*shi*) accord with [the standards of] righteousness, this is the Mean. If one regards the good as good and uses it and regards evil as evil and shuns it, this is also the Mean. If one knows what is correct and incorrect and differentiates between what is heterodox and orthodox, this is also the Mean. Tang and Wu followed Heaven and reacted to [the wishes of] mankind. They never had one particle of egoistic desires. On behalf of the people of the empire they removed a great evil. How can that be ‘good, though bad?’ Therefore [the actions of] Tang and Wu were [in accord with] the Mean; they are [instances] of expediency. The case is [quite different from] that of [Wang] Mang 王莽 (B.C. 33 - A.D. 23; he overthrew the Former Han dynasty. WJB) and [Cao] Cao 曹操 (155-220; he was responsible for the fall of the Later Han dynasty. WJB), who were nothing but brigands. As for [the phrase] that ‘In taking [the empire] they went against [the Way] and in keeping it they followed [the Way]’ — this is [applicable only to] actions such as lies, deceit and opportunistic plotting.

“It is not [my intention] to say that you are someone ‘together with whom a Sage is unable to weigh occurring events.’²⁰² Moreover, if

²⁰¹ This phrase is used in the *Shiji* to describe the actions of Tang and Wu. Cf. Morohashi XI, 38849-57.

²⁰² Reference to *Lunyu* IX, 30. Legge translates: “The Master said, ‘There are some with whom we may study in common, but we shall find them unable to go along with us on principles. Perhaps we may go on with them to principles, but we shall find them unable to get established in those along with us. Or if we may get so established along with them, we shall

you should want to go into it in more detail, it is all treated quite fully in the books. [Please, see for yourself] whether you find that, what others have read and what I say is the same or different. The men of old said that it was a warning when a heterodox theory had first entered [one's mind]. In truth, they had a [good] reason [for saying so]! Alas! Thousands of words, myriads of sayings, originally they are no more than the one word *li*." Thereupon [Ieyasu] said: "*Li*, [nothing but] *li*!" But ultimately he did not understand.

On the twenty-fifth day of the sixth month²⁰³ the *bakufu* said to Dōshun: "What [can you tell about] the "one that pervades all" of Zengzi 曾子 and Zigong 子貢?" Dōshun answered: "Zengzi speaks of it in regard to one's actions and Zigong in regard to one's knowledge.²⁰⁴ In the school of the Holy One there was no one except Yanzi 顏子 who was as intelligent as Zigong. Therefore [Confucius] tells him this." The *bakufu* asked again: "What is that so-called 'One that pervades all?'" Dōshun answered: "The heart of the Holy One is nothing but *li*. Now, always and everywhere that *li* runs through all things (*wu*) and all actions (*shi*) in the world; [according to this one *li*] he reacts to them and acts on them. Therefore it does not occur that he goes and does not obtain his place (i.e. acts, yet does not reach his aim. WJB). To give an example, it is like the movement of spring, summer, fall and winter, of warm and cold, day and night: though they are not identical, yet they are a cyclical stream of one [and the same] original matter 一元周流 that is not disrupted for one single moment.²⁰⁵ For that reason the actions (*shi*) in the world [may] be ten-, hundred-, thousand- or ten myriad-fold, but that with which the heart reacts to them is only the one, single *li*. With one's lord it is loyalty, with one's father filial piety, with one's friends trust, but neither *li* is different in origin."

find them unable to weigh occurring events along with us."

²⁰³ The year in which this conversation took place is not indicated. Cf., however, *infra*, n. 207.

²⁰⁴ Reference to *Lunyu* IV, 15 and XV, 3. The first passage concerns Zengzi. Legge translates: "The Master said, 'Shen 參, my doctrine is that of an all-pervading unity.' The disciple Tseng replied, 'Yes.' The Master went out, and the other disciples asked, saying, 'What do his words mean?' Tseng said, 'The doctrine of our Master is to be true to the principles of our nature and the benevolent exercise of them to others - this and nothing more.'" The second one concerns Zigong. Legge translates: "The Master said, 'Ci 賜, you think, I suppose, that I am one who learns many things and keeps them in memory?' Zigong replied, 'Yes — but perhaps it is not so?' 'No,' was the answer, 'I seek a unity all-pervading.'" The gloss that "Zengzi speaks of it with regard to actions, and Zigong with regard to knowledge" is given by Zhu Xi in his commentary to the second passage.

²⁰⁵ For the appropriateness of translating *yi yuan* with "one original matter" cf. the quotation from the *Lunyu huowen* 或問 given in the head-notes to this passage in *NST* XXVIII, p. 208: "Heaven and earth are one original *qi*."

The *bakufu* asked again: “Shen was slow-witted. What, then, was the reason that he came to hear [this doctrine of] ‘the One that pervades all?’” Dōshun answered: “If we consider Zengzi’s age at the time of Confucius’ death, he was nearly twenty. Could he really have been congenitally stupid and yet, in spite of his youthful age, have transmitted the Way of the Holy One? It seems to me that his temperament was affable and that therefore people slighted him and considered him dull. Methinks, he was sincere and never let off. He only appeared to be dull.”

The *bakufu* again said: “Were the wars of Tang and Wu [instances of] expedience?” Dōshun answered: “My Lord is fond of medicine. Please let me illustrate [my point] with [an example from] this field. Cold one treats with heat and heat one treats with cold and thus the illness will be cured. This is for ordinary [cases]. If with heat one treats heat and with cold cold, it is called a ‘reverse treatment.’ Generally this means that one merely [succeeds in] keeping one’s man alive. It is not standard practice. This is a comparison [that explains what] the former Confucians [meant with] ‘expedience.’ [The purpose of] the actions of Tang and Wu was not to acquire the empire for themselves, but only to save the people.” The *bakufu* said: “If one is not a good physician, what [use] could one have for the ‘reverse treatment?’ I fear one will only kill one’s man.” Dōshun answered: “Right. If those above are not a Jie or a Zhou and those below not a Tang or a Wu, then one will commit the great sin of regicide; heaven and earth will not condone this. The people of the world use this (i.e. the concept of expedience. WJB) as an excuse [for their vile deeds] — like a lascivious man who has studied Hui of Liuxia.²⁰⁶ It is only a matter of the hearts of the people of the empire. If they turn to him, he becomes a ruler, and if not, he is a ‘mere fellow.’”²⁰⁷

Materials of this nature very usefully supplement the factual entries of the *Nenpu* and the *Gyōjō*, e.g. in the case of Razan’s reading of the *Lunyu* in Minakuchi. They do not add to the number or kinds of events and actions that I have tabulated on the basis of the *Nenpu*, but they do correct the way in which

²⁰⁶ Hui of Liuxia was noted for his continence. Cf. *supra*, n. 75, and the additional notes to this passage in *NST* XXVIII, p. 382.

²⁰⁷ Up to and including the conclusion, which merely restates Zhu Xi’s commentary, this whole discussion is, of course, a re-run of *Mengzi* I B, 8. In Legge’s translation: “The king ... asked, saying, ‘Was it so, that Tang banished Jie, and that King Wu smote Zhou?’ Mencius replied, ‘It is so in the records.’ The king said, ‘May a minister then put his sovereign to death?’ Mencius said, ‘... The robber and ruffian we call a mere fellow. I have heard of the cutting off of the fellow Zhou, but I have not heard of putting a sovereign to death, in this case.’”

the facts are represented there. If we take the stay in Minakuchi as an example, we see that it was not Razan who lectured on the *Lunyu*: Razan looked up the passage, but it was Ieyasu who read it and who asked several of those present to comment on it, amongst whom was Razan. The *bakufu mondō*, too, are helpful to put things into their right perspective. They show that Razan did anything but lecture: he answered various specific questions that Ieyasu asked him regarding China, Chinese books and the interpretation of the Confucian Classics. Only occasionally, for instance in the sections about *li* and “expedience,” they develop into real dialogues.

Though it is generally said that these dialogues refer directly to Ieyasu’s plans to destroy the Toyotomi,²⁰⁸ it seems to me that this opinion has to be reconsidered. It is not very likely that these questions were either asked or answered with this end in view. Various reasons can be adduced: first, the conversations took place on two separate occasions in the year Keichō 17 (1612),²⁰⁹ a full two years before Ōsaka was finally attacked; second, the point of the story has to be brought home by contrasting it with an anecdote about Seika who in similar circumstances refused to answer a similar question, but this anecdote must be considered as spurious²¹⁰; third, the attack on Ōsaka

²⁰⁸ See e.g. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 161-164.

²⁰⁹ The *Daitokuin-dono go-jikki* reports on the authority of the *Sunpu seiji roku* 駿府政事録 and other works that on the eleventh day, third month of Keichō 17 (10-4-1612) Razan was asked about the phrase “the course of the Mean cannot be attained” (op. cit. 18: *TJ* I, p. 579), and that on the twenty-fifth day of the sixth month (22-7-1612) Razan was summoned again and asked about “the one that pervades all of Zengzi and Zigong” and about “Tang’s banishing [of Jie] and Wu’s castigating [of Zhou].” (op. cit. 19: *TJ* I, p. 589) Cf. Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, p. 159.

²¹⁰ The anecdote is related in *Bukō zakki* 武功雜記 II, ???pp. 34-35. There it is said that Seika was asked this question when he stayed in Sunpu in the ninth month of Keichō 17. Such a visit, however, is not mentioned or alluded to anywhere in Seika’s *Gyōjō*, in Razan’s *Gyōjō* or *Nenpu*, or in Seika’s letters and poems. Moreover, it seems to be out of character. The *Bukō zakki* is a late source, completed in Genroku 9 (1696). For a description of the sources see Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 162-163, who also, *ibid.*, duly stresses the contrast between Seika and Razan. Some measure of support for a meeting between Seika and Ieyasu having taken place after Sekigahara can be found in the *Reizei kaden*, 冷泉家傳 which says that in Keichō 19 (*sic*) Seika lectured to Ieyasu on the *Daxue* (*DNS* XII.31, p. 481). In the absence, however, of other, more reliable evidence, not too much weight can be attached to this.

and the extermination of the Toyotomi was never defended in terms of references to Tang and Wu; fourth, Razan could hardly have answered the questions in any other way; what he is saying is, in fact, sound orthodox doctrine.

These two sections touch on fundamental questions that would occur to anyone who envisages the possibility of putting into practice Confucian ideology: it seems natural that a politician like Ieyasu would want to know whether the Way is actually being practised anywhere at the moment (hence his questions about China), and whether it can possibly be practised (hence his questions about the *Zhongyong*). Both times Razan's answers fail to satisfy him. Razan pretends that in China the Way has been established by indoctrinating the people with Confucian values through a state-sponsored system of universal education. Like any king Ieyasu changed countenance and spoke of other things. Perhaps he found that the answer was too blatantly connected with Razan's own plans to establish a school; perhaps he doubted that the results of education in China were such as Razan claimed. Anyhow, Razan had not answered his real question: can a politician possibly shape his conduct according to the Confucian norms?

In the *Zhongyong* correct conduct according to the norms is described with the word *zhong*, the Mean. As one of the Cheng brothers defined it

Being without inclination to either side is called *zhong*; admitting of no change is called *yong*. By *zhong* is denoted the correct course to be pursued by all under heaven; by *yong* is denoted the fixed principle regulating all under heaven.²¹¹

Razan identifies *zhong* with *li*, but Ieyasu is not convinced. He seems to take the word literally: to him it is the middle between two extremes, and in order to establish it measuring is necessary. This suggests to him the related concept

²¹¹ The translation is Legge's.

of weighing (*juan* 權), the same word that can also be used as a technical term in the sense of “expedience.” For this interpretation Ieyasu finds some support in the sixth *zhang* of the *Zhongyong* and in Zhu Xi’s commentary to this passage,²¹² but his conclusion, namely that in one’s conduct one has to avoid the extremes of good and bad, seems to be Ieyasu’s original contribution to Far-Eastern philosophy. It is, of course, an exaggerated formulation of an observation which many people could have made, namely that in practice it is not always possible to stick to the ethical norms, that bad acts can have good consequences and that, as a matter of fact, Confucians themselves applaud behaviour that does not agree with their own norms, e.g. in the cases of Tang and Wu.

Razan’s career after 1616 can be treated in the same way. Since the mechanics are clear, I will not furnish as many details as I have done for the first part of his official career. However, if I tabulate the number of actions, events etc. that are entered in the *Nenpu* and *Gyōjō*, the results for the various categories turn out to be as follows:

Cat. 1: 67 entries

Entries concerning Razan’s private life: the books he read, the researches and writing that he undertook *at his own volition*; births, deaths, illnesses etc. in his family; his teaching, school, and Confucius temple in Ueno.

²¹² The sixth *zhuan* reads (Legge’s translation): “The Master said, ‘There was Shun: ... He took hold of their two extremes, determined the Mean, and employed it in his government of the people.’” In his commentary to this passage Zhu Xi remarks: “With ‘both extremes’ are meant the most extreme of the various opinions [that Shun received]. Methinks, generally things all have two extremes, like small and big, thick and thin. Within the good, too, he took both extremes, measured [from them] and took the Mean. Only then he applied it. ... However, if the weighing and measuring [one does] by oneself, is not delicate and precise and without errors, how can one partake of this [method] (i.e. use it to good effect. WJB) ?” Cf. also Shimada’s remarks about this passage, *Daigaku Chūyō*, p. 189.

- Cat. 2: 29 entries
 Entries serving to show the status of Razan *and his family*: audiences with the *shōgun* of Razan and his brother and sons, enfeoffments, participation in pilgrimages to Nikkō, etc.
- Cat. 3: 11 entries
 Entries mentioning his attendance upon the *shōgun* in Edo, on journeys to Kyōto, on hunting trips.
- Cat. 4: 2 entries
 Entries mentioning his employment as a reader.
- Cat. 5: 21 entries
 Entries mentioning his employment as a political advisor.
- Cat. 6: 23 entries
 Sundry tasks: writing, editing, or compiling certain texts *at the request of the shōgun*, the redaction of foreign correspondence etc.

When we break down the totals of these six categories for the four decennia 1617-1626, 1627-1636, 1637-1646 and 1647-1657, we get the following distribution:

Category	1	2	3	4	5	6	3-6
Year							
1617-26	21	04	6	1	2	02	11
1627-36	11	05	4	0	8	05	17
1637-46	10	05	1	0	7	11	19
1647-57	25	15	0	1	4	05	10

From these figures and tabulations a number of conclusions can be drawn, both in regard to Razan's career and in regard to the way in which Gahō compiled the *Nenpu*. If we bring to mind a few key dates (1622 - Tokugawa Hidetada abdicates in favour of his son Iemitsu; 1632 - Hidetada dies; 1633 - Konchiin Sūden 金地院崇伝 (1569-1633) dies; 1651 - Iemitsu dies and is

succeeded by his twelve-year old son Ietsuna), and if we then compare these figures with those of the period of 1604 to 1616, we will notice that the number of entries concerning Razan's private life and activities has increased markedly (from 19% to 44% of the total) and that the occasions at which Razan had to perform as attendant or reader-in-waiting have dwindled into insignificance (8% of the total as against 26%). In other words, the nature of his employment had changed.

We also see that the figures for the four decennia of category 1 and the totals of the categories 3 to 6 mirror each other. Apparently, during the middle two decades when official business was pressing, Razan had no time to spare for private activities and Gahō had no need to mention them. The fifteen entries for category 2 during the last decade are also conspicuous. Most of these pertain to Gahō and to a lesser extent to his other son, Tokkōsai: Razan was busy consolidating the position of his house²¹³ and Gahō had every reason to mention these events.

I think that these figures should be read as follows. Evidently Razan had some difficulties in effecting his entry into Edo officialdom. After he had finished in Sunpu with the disposal of Ieyasu's library, he returned to live in Kyōto. His small fief north of the town was not repealed and as an ex-retainer of Ieyasu he had every right to attend the *shōgun's* retinue when it escorted Ieyasu's remains to Nikkō (Genna 3). His position as a stipendiary retainer of the *bakufu* also entailed the obligation of periodic visits to Edo; quarters, probably within the castle precincts, were duly appointed to him (Genna 4).

²¹³ In this respect the entries relating to Eiki and to Razan's efforts to have Eiki succeeded by his son Eiho 永甫 are telling (cf. *Nenpu*, entries for Kan'ei 15 and Kan'ei 20). Several years later, in Shōhō 3 (1646), the *shōgun* granted Eiki's former house and stipends to Gahō, while he gave Gahō's stipends to Razan's fourth son, Morikatsu 守勝, better known as Tokkōsai 讀耕齋. This is another case in point, for, as the *Nenpu* remarks, "Morikatsu had no ambition to become an official, and therefore, though he was now twenty-three years of age, he had never yet had an audience with the *shōgun*. But now the *shōgun* had heard his name and summoned him." A thoughtful father provides for all of his sons, and prebends should preferably be kept within the family.

He did not, however, settle his family in Edo until the tenth month of Kan'ei 11. The *Nenpu* mentions that he often was summoned to wait on the *shōgun* (Genna 4), but no details are given, so it cannot have been very important.²¹⁴ When in Kyōto, Razan spent his days teaching and meeting Seika. He regularly travelled to Edo and accompanied the *shōgun* on journeys to Kyōto (Genna 5, 9) and Nikkō (Genna 8), but he was only once employed for a specific task, namely the exposure of the forgery of Shōgaku Shōchō (dates unknown) of the Daitokuji (Genna 5).²¹⁵

This situation changed in Kan'ei 1 (1624), when the new *shōgun* gave Razan an audience and took him into his employ. His new duties were those of a reader-in-waiting: he read from the *Lunyu* and the *Zhenguan zhengyao* 貞觀政要, and talked about “the old things of Japan and China.” The *Nenpu* (entry for Kan'ei 1) mentions two things that are suggestive: the order to serve Iemitsu was transmitted to Razan by Sakai Tadayo 酒井忠世 (1572-1636) and Doi Toshikatsu²¹⁶ 土井利勝 (1573-1644); we can safely assume that they were the ones who had sponsored Razan in the first place. Second, Razan's position is described as being the same as Eiki's position with Hidetada, and Eiki was an official member of Hidetada's *otogi-shū*. Razan's duties, however, went further. He also acted as an advisor to the *shissei* 執政 and “went to the office of the Pear-Tree shade,” i.e. he had to do with judicial matters brought before the *bakufu* for arbitration.²¹⁷

²¹⁴ The *Gyōjō* does not mention any interviews with the *shōgun*.

²¹⁵ Story in *Daitokuin-dono go-jikki*, Genna 5, eighth month (*TJ* II, p. 175).

²¹⁶ Together with Aoyama Tadatoshi 青山忠俊 (1578-1643) Tadayo and Toshikatsu had been appointed by Hidetada (ninth month of Genna 1) to supervise the education of Iemitsu. When their charge had become *shōgun*, Tadatoshi was dismissed within two months, but Tadayo and Toshikatsu stayed on and remained highly important *bakufu* officials, filling the offices of *rōjū* 老中 and *tairō* 大老.

²¹⁷ *Shissei* is the standard Chinese rendering of *rōjū*. In the early days of Iemitsu's reign, however, the bureaucratic functions of *rōjū* and *wakadoshiyori* 若年寄 did not yet exist. With *rōjū*, therefore, are meant Hidetada's most important ministers, who stayed on after Hidetada's demise (e.g. Sakai Tadayo, Doi Toshikatsu and Sakai Tadakatsu 忠勝). They were supplanted in the course of the following six years (1632-1638) by Iemitsu's own men (e.g.

In other words, thanks to the high patronage he enjoyed (a third patron who should be mentioned is Itakura Shigemune 板倉重宗, 1586-1656, who introduced Razan at the imperial court in Genna 7),²¹⁸ Razan had obtained a double position as both a member of the entourage of the *shōgun* and as a bureaucrat within the hierarchy of the *bakufu*. Yet for the first few years his employment was not very eventful. He composed four works for the instruction of the *shōgun* (Kan'ei 3) and accompanied him on several hunting trips (Kan'ei 2, 3 and 5) and on journeys to Kyōto (Kan'ei 3) and Nikkō (Kan'ei 5). His knowledge of courtly lore and precedents was called upon twice, the first time in Kan'ei 3, when he took part in the deliberations concerning the conferment of rank on Hidetada's deceased principal wife O'e お江 (1583-1626),²¹⁹ the second time in Kan'ei 7, when he accompanied Sakai Tadayo and Doi Toshikatsu to attend the accession of Hidetada's granddaughter as Empress Meishō 明正 (1623-1629-1643-1696).²²⁰ The status that Razan and Eiki had within the *bakufu* was confirmed by the bestowal of the rank of *Hōin*

Matsudaira Nobutsuna, Abe Tadaaki, Hotta Masamori), who had first (1633) been organized in the so-called *rokunin-shū* and gradually usurped the functions and tasks of Hidetada's ministers. Cf. Totman, *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu*, pp. 207-208, and the literature cited there. The *bakufu* court, the *Hyōjōsho* 評定所, too, was still in the process of being organised: cf. Wigmore, *Law and Justice in Tokugawa Japan*, Pt. I, pp. 52-56.

²¹⁸ Shigemune was Kyōto *shoshidai* 所司代 from Genna 6 (1620) till Shōō 3 (1654). The occasion for his introduction of Razan was furnished by the publication of the *Kō-Sō jihō ruien* 皇宋事實類苑 in Genna 7 (1621). This book had been printed by order of the emperor in movable type. Through Shigemune Razan was ordered to add an punctuation to this edition (see *DNS* XII.38, pp. 260-263; *Bunshū* 54: II, p. 196).

²¹⁹ O'e's posthumous name is Sōgen'in 崇源院. She was a daughter of Azai Nagamasa 浅井長政 and a niece of Oda Nobunaga 織田信長. O'e died on the fifteenth day, ninth month of Kan'ei 3 (3-11-1626); biography in *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 8, entry under this date (*TJ* II, pp. 394-395). Her obsequies took place in the following month, on which occasion junior first rank was conferred upon her (cf. *TJ* II, p. 401; Razan's part in the deliberations at court is not mentioned here).

²²⁰ Meishō's father, Emperor Go-Mizunoo 後水尾, had abdicated in the eleventh month of Kan'ei 6 (1629). Meishō acceded to the throne in the ninth month of Kan'ei 7, twelfth day. For the circumstances surrounding Go-Mizunoo's abdication and Meishō's accession see Webb, *The Japanese Imperial Institution*, pp. 111-112. Razan attended the ceremony in the company of the envoys of the *shōgun*, Sakai Tadayo and Doi Toshikatsu, and wrote an eye-witness account of it, the *Kan'ei go-sokui ki* 寛永御即位記.

upon them (last day of Kan'ei 6), and the *shōgun* showed a measure of appreciation of Razan's interest in education in Kan'ei 7, when he presented Razan with a plot of land on the Shinobu-ga-oka (Ueno) and 200 *ryō* in order to "establish a school."²²¹

In the winter of Kan'ei 9 (1632) the *daimyō* of Owari, Tokugawa Yoshinao, presented Razan with a building for a Confucius Temple, and with portraits of the Confucian saints. In the second month of the following year (Kan'ei 10) the *sekisai* ceremony was held there for the first time. Razan's school received further support from the Tokugawa when in the third month of the following year (Kan'ei 11) he was given one of the main halls of the palace of the late Tokugawa Tadanaga 忠長 (1606-1634), who had committed suicide in the last month of Kan'ei 10. The present was said to have been made in appreciation of the services that Razan and his brother had rendered in drafting the regulations of the temples in Nikkō, of the Zōjōji and of the yearly observances in these temples.²²² Several months earlier Razan had received the honour of a visit of the *shōgun* (Kan'ei 10/7/17: 21-8-1633), when the *shōgun* inspected Razan's Confucius Temple on his way back from the Kan'eiji. Eiki was also present at this occasion.²²³

²²¹ See *Nenpu* under Kan'ei 7 (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 2, p. 22) and *Gyōjō* (ibid. 3, p. 42). See also "Bu-shū Senseiden no ki" 武州先聖殿記 (*Bunshū* 15; I, pp. 164-165); "Bu-shū Senseiden keishi" 武州先聖殿經始 (*Bunshū* 64; II, pp. 321-322). Cf. also *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 16 (Kan'ei 7/12/"this winter": *TJ* II, p. 500), quoting as sources the *Kan'ei shoka keizu den* and the *Tōbu jitsuroku* 東武實錄, and *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki*, *Furoku* 6 (*TJ* III, p. 743), where the whole story is recapitulated, quoting Razan's *Nenpu* as the source. Cf. also *Shōhei-shi* 2, entry for Kan'ei 7 (*Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* VII, p. 14), where reference is made to a letter by Razan to Ishikawa Jōzan of Shōō 3 (1654); letter in *Bunshū* 7 (I, pp. 91-96). In this letter (op. cit., p. 91) Razan claims that he received the land to build a Confucius Temple, not a school.

²²² Cf. *infra*, n. 225. See *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 26, entry under Kan'ei 11, "this year": *TJ* II, p. 668; cf. *Shōhei-shi* 2, entries for Kan'ei 9 till 11 (*Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* VII, pp. 14-15).

²²³ Cf. *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 2, p. 23 and ibid. 3, p. 43; cf. *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 23, entry under Kan'ei 10/7/17: *TJ* II, p. 604; cf. *Shōhei-shi* 2, entry under Kan'ei 10/4/17 (*Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* VII, p. 14). Cf. also "Daiga Senseiden ni iru" 台駕入先聖殿 (*Bunshū* 64; II, p. 322). The *Nenpu* and the tradition of the school (cf. *Shōhei-shi*, loc. cit.) give the seventeenth day of the fourth month, the anniversary of Ieyasu's death, as the date of this visit. In that case, the object of Iemitsu's visit to the Kan'eiji would have been the Tōshōgū, which was part of the temple complex. The *TJ*, however, and the "Daiga Senseiden ni iru" give the seventeenth (not the

When Hidetada dies (Kan'ei 9) the members of Iemitsu's personal staff necessarily become more important and Razan's career, too, starts to liven up. Hidetada is hardly dead when Razan is dispatched to Kyōto in order to confer with the court about the posthumous name that is to be given to Hidetada. His income, too, is increased around this time (Kan'ei 9), and finally, in the tenth month of Kan'ei 11 (1634), Razan moves his family to Edo.

In Kan'ei 10 Konchiin Sūden had died, and a number of his functions (foreign correspondence, the drafting of documents, advice regarding precedents and etiquette) had fallen to Razan. As a result, his talents in this direction came to be called on more frequently. He gives his opinion regarding the rules according to which the marriage ceremony of an adoptive daughter of Iemitsu is to be conducted (Kan'ei 10)²²⁴; he helps to draft the regulations of the temples in Nikkō and of the Zōjōji 増上寺 (Kan'ei 11)²²⁵; he gives his opinion in the dispute between Sō Yoshinari 宗義成 (1603-1656) and the steward of his palace in Edo (Edo *rusui* 留守居) Yanagawa Shigeoki 柳川調興 (dates unknown) (Kan'ei 12),²²⁶ as well as in the quarrel between the Outer and the Inner Shrine in Ise about the order of worship (Kan'ei 13); he takes

eighteenth, as the *Shōhei-shi* has it) of the *seventh* month as the date of the visit. Since according to *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 22, entry under Kan'ei 10/4/17 (*TJ* II, pp. 595-596), Iemitsu on this day visited the Tōshōgū inside the castle and not the one in the precincts of the Kan'eiji, the seventeenth of the seventh month seems to be the likelier date.

²²⁴ The marriage ceremony took place in Kan'ei 10/12/5 (4-1-1634). The marriage and Razan's involvement in it are mentioned in *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 23, entry for this date (*TJ* II, p. 613), but not in either the *Nenpu* or the *Gyōjō*. Cf., however, the entry in the *Henchoshomoku* (*Shishū* II, *Furoku* 4: p. 57) where a *Himegimi konrei ki* 姫君婚禮記 is listed (now lost). Cf. also Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 282-283, on the causal connection between the demise of Sūden and Razan's activities in this direction.

²²⁵ A mission to Nikkō on which Razan accompanied Sakai Tadakatsu must have been preparatory to the promulgation of the regulations, though this connection is not mentioned anywhere in the *TJ*. The mission was said to be for the purpose of "measuring the temple lands" (cf. *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 24, entry under Kan'ei 11/3/25: *TJ* II, p. 627). The documents in which the landholdings were confirmed and the regulations laid down were approved by the *shōgun* on the second day of the fourth month (op. cit., pp. 629-630). The regulations of the Zōjōji were handed to its abbot on the twenty-third of the fifth month (cf. *TJ* II, p. 632, where part of the regulations are quoted).

²²⁶ For a description of this affair see Toby, "Reopening the question of *Sakoku*," *JJS* III, 2, pp. 345-348. Cf. also *supra*, Ch. II, n. 149; n. 150.???

part in the deliberations regarding the many hundreds of letters patent (*shuinjō* 朱印狀) that are given to Shintō and Buddhist priests (Kan'ei 13). When the Korean embassy arrives in the twelfth month of Kan'ei 13, Razan holds written conversations with several of its members, takes part in the decisions on matters of protocol, and writes the official letters on behalf of the *shōgun* and the high officials of the *bakufu*.

The main events during this period are, however, the promulgation of the *Buke shohatto* 武家諸法度 (Kan'ei 12/6/21: 3-8-1635) and of the *Shoshi hatto* 諸士法度 (Kan'ei 12/12/12: 19-12-1635). Razan has made the first drafts of both codes, he has been present at the ensuing deliberations of the *bakufu* officials and the *shōgun*, and he reads the texts aloud at the ceremonial occasions where the respective codes are officially proclaimed.²²⁷

From the end of Kan'ei 13, however, until the next Korean embassy arrives in Kan'ei 20, Razan is much less in the picture. He no longer seems to be involved in deliberations on matters of actual policy. For the past few years he has already made various compilations on Iemitsu's orders, e.g. the *Wa-kan hōsei* 和漢法制 (Kan'ei 12) and the *Wa-Kan kōsei jumin roku* 和漢荒政恤民錄 (Kan'ei 13), and he has written occasional pieces about the journeys of the *shōgun* to Kyōto (Kan'ei 11) and Nikkō (Kan'ei 13),²²⁸ but from now on his tasks all seem to be of this nature. In Kan'ei 14 he is asked by Hotta Masamori²²⁹ 堀田正盛 to make a selection of sayings from the classics and to

²²⁷ For details see Hori, *Hayashi Razan*, pp. 287-289. The text of Razan's version of the *Buke shohatto* is included in *Bunshū* 58 (II, pp. 244-246). The commentary Razan wrote on the nineteen articles of this code, "drawing on old codes of Japan and China," was lost in the fire of 1657.

²²⁸ The *Wa-Kan hōsei* and the *Kōsei jumin roku* were both lost in the fire of 1657 (cf. *Henchoshō-moku*, *Shishū* II, *Furoku* 4, p. 57). The description of the visit the *shōgun* made to Kyōto, the *Kan'ei kōjutsu go-nyūroku no ki* 寛永甲戌御入洛記, can be found in *Bunshū* 21 (I, pp. 236-241) and the description of the visit to Nikkō, the *Tōshō Daigongen shinbyō saie ki* 東照大権現新廟齋會記, in *Bunshū* 23 (I, pp. 253-265).

²²⁹ Hotta Masamori was a member of Iemitsu's *rokunin-shū* (cf. *supra*, n. 217). Masamori was well connected: his principal wife was a daughter of Sakai Tadakatsu and his mother, Kasuga no Tsubone 春日局, had been Iemitsu's wet-nurse and was residing in the *Ō-oku* of Edo castle.

discuss them in front of the *shōgun*. Razan and Eiki have some preparatory discussions, waiting for a day to be appointed, but because “the pressing amount of official business” and the outbreak of the Shimabara Rebellion the project comes to nothing. During the next few years Razan only writes some reports (*kanmon* 勘文) in connection with the newly opened herbarium (Kan’ei 15), an explanation in Japanese of Neo-Confucian metaphysics (Kan’ei 16) and an account of the ceremonies held in Ieyasu’s mausoleum in Nikkō in Kan’ei 17.²³⁰

In the second month of Kan’ei 18 the *bakufu* orders the genealogies of all warrior families to be compiled. Ōta Sukemune 太田資宗 (1600-1680)²³¹ is put in charge of the project, but the work of collecting, collating, and writing is done by Razan and Gahō, helped by a number of other erudites and scribes.²³² While still engaged in editing and writing this *Kan’ei shoka keizu den* 寛永諸家系圖傳, Razan is ordered to compile a number of other genealogies and tables for the *shōgun*, which he does together with his sons.²³³

²³⁰ The *kanmon* have disappeared, as has the Japanese explanation of Neo-Confucian metaphysics, the *Mukyoku taikyoku setsu* 無極太極說. The account of the ceremonies in Nikkō will be the *Tōshō Daigongen nijūgokai go-nenki ki* 東照大權現二十五回御年記, of which, according to the *KSM*, still one manuscript is extant.

²³¹ Ōta Sukemune is variously referred to as the *bugyō* 奉行 (*Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 46, entry under Kan’ei 18/2/7: *TJ* III, p. 217) and the *sōsai* 總裁 of the project (op. cit. 55, entry under Kan’ei 20/9/25: *TJ* III, p. 332; *ibid.*, entry under Kan’ei 20/10/21: *TJ* III, p. 334; op. cit., *Furoku* 6: *TJ* III, p. 743). Sukemune was a nephew of Ieyasu’s concubine Katsu 勝 (1578-1642). Later on he also became her adopted son, an honour he shared with Tokugawa Yorifusa (1603-1661), Ieyasu’s son and the first *daimyō* of Mito. He was one of the six members of Iemitsu’s *rokunin-shū*, appointed in Kan’ei 10 (1633).

²³² *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 46 (Kan’ei 18/2/7; *TJ* III, p. 217). cf. also *supra*, Ch. I, the biographies of Nawa Kassho and Hori Kyōan. How the work was divided between the various collaborators is told in Razan’s preface (*Kan’ei shoka keizu den jo* 序 in *Bunshū* 48: II, pp. 112-113). The principles for the compilation were laid down by Razan and Gahō in the *Kan’ei shoka keizu den no jiyū* 示諭 (*Bunshū* 57: II, pp. 233-236) and the *Seiwa Genji keizu den no jōrei* 條例 (*ibid.*: II, pp. 236-243).

²³³ These were the *Kamakura shōgun kafu* 家譜 (1 *kan*; presented to the *shōgun* on Kan’ei 18/8/28), the *Jindai keizu* 神代系圖 (1 *kan*; presented on Kan’ei 18/9/24), the *Kyōto shōgun kafu* (1 *kan*; presented on Kan’ei 18/10/6), the *Oda Nobunaga fu* (1 *kan*; presented on Kan’ei 18/12/7) and the *Toyotomi Hideyoshi fu* (3 *kan*; *batsu* dated on the second month of Kan’ei 19, 1642). All these works are still extant.

The *Shoka keizu den* was finished and presented to the *shōgun* on Kan'ei 20/9/25 (6-11-1643). The following year Razan was ordered to begin a compilation of Japanese history of a much wider scope than anything he had done up till then, the *Honchō hennen roku* 本朝編年録. It took him about one year to complete the first instalment of this work, covering the period from Emperor Jinmu till Empress Jitō 持統 (645-686-697-702); he presented it to the *shōgun* at the end of Shōhō 1.²³⁴ Razan eventually reached the reign of Emperor Uda 宇田 (867-887-897-931), but the work had to be finished by Gahō, who completed it in Kanbun 10 (1670). Upon completion it became known as the *Honchō tsugan* 本朝通鑑.

In Kan'ei 20 another Korean embassy arrived in Edo, and for the first time in several years Razan was again involved in the affairs of state, although he played a less important role than at the former occasion. His tasks were mainly clerical: he wrote the drafts of Iemitsu's reply to the Korean king and of the letters of several high *bakufu* officials to the Board of rites.²³⁵

His knowledge of lore and precedents, too, was called on again: in the ninth month of the same year he and Gahō together accompanied Sakai Tadakatsu and Matsudaira Nobutsuna²³⁶ 松平信綱 (1596-1662) to attend the abdication of Empress Meishō and the accession ceremonies of Emperor Go-Kōmyō 後光明 (1633-1643-1654). The next year (Shōhō 1) Razan advised the *shōgun* on the various new era names that court had submitted to the *bakufu*.

²³⁴ Cf. the *batsu* for this part (*Bunshū* 55: II, p. 206). In the undated *batsu* that he wrote for the next instalment, covering the period from Emperor Monmu 文武 till Emperor Junna 淳和, Razan says that he had had Gahō compile the first part (Emperor Jinmu till Empress Jitō) and Tokkōsai the second part (Emperor Monmu till Emperor Saga 嵯峨), while he had dealt himself with the period covering the second half of the reign of Emperor Saga and the reign of Emperor Junna, on the basis of the materials already verified by Tokkōsai (*Bunshū* 55: II, pp. 206-207).

²³⁵ For references see *supra*, Ch. II, n. 152.???

²³⁶ Matsudaira Nobutsuna had been in Iemitsu's personal service since the latter's birth. He was a member of the original *rokunin-shū* (appointed in Kan'ei 5) and became *rōjū* in the following year. He was the commander of the *bakufu* forces that quelled the Shimabara rebellion in 1638.

He also chose the taboo name (*imina* 諱) of Iemitsu's heir Ietsuna (1639-1680), whose *genbuku* 元服 ceremony, which took place in the following year, he described.²³⁷

Razan played a minor role in two other matters that caused some commotion in Shōhō 2 (1645), namely the particulars of the various promotions and ranks that at one time or other the court had bestowed upon Ieyasu and Hidetada, and a quarrel between the monks of the Kōyasan. Gahō, however, did most of the actual work and he was the one who travelled to and fro between Edo, Nikkō, Sunpu, and the Kōyasan.²³⁸ Minor calls for his advice were also made during the next several years, e.g. by Matsudaira Nobutsuna and Sakai Tadakatsu, but due to ill health Razan left most of the work to Gahō. His ill health and advanced age — he was sixty-four at the time — also brought him the signal privilege of being carried part of the way into the palace inside a palanquin.

There followed five years of inactivity in any official function, only broken by the pilgrimage the *shōgun* made to Nikkō in Keian 1 (1648). Razan took part in this pilgrimage and described it in his *Tōshōgū sanjūsankai ki* 東照宮三十三回記, of which Gahō made a Japanese version.

In Shōō 1 (1652) and Meireki 1 (1655) Razan as usual took place in the deliberations regarding the new era names. In the latter year he also made a series of sixty-six poems in praise of famous Chinese officials as well as a collection of one hundred poems by one hundred Chinese poets, a Chinese companion of the *hyakunin issū*. Through Abe Tadaaki 阿部忠秋 (1602-1675) he received a supposedly fireproof storehouse from the *bakufu* for his books, the roof of which was covered with copper plates.

²³⁷ Cf. *Shishū* 31 (I, pp. 330-331): "Kōshin rōkai Shunsai ni shimesu." The description of the *genbuku* ceremony, the *Go-genbuku ki*, is still extant in several manuscripts, both in a Japanese and in a Chinese version.

²³⁸ Gahō went to Ieyasu's mausolea in Nikkō and in Sunpu (Kunō-zan) to copy the relevant documents. To the Kōya-san he went as an assistant of Andō Shigenaga 安藤重長 (1600-

In Meireki 1 another Korean embassy came to Japan, and as usual Razan drafted the official correspondence. Ietsuna, who in Keian 4 (1651) had succeeded his father Iemitsu, had by now reached the age of thirteen. For his instruction Razan compiled, at Abe Tadaaki's request, the *Daigaku Wa-ji kai* 大学和字解 and the *Jōgan seiyō genkai* 貞觀政要諺解; this latter work was a translation of the popular "mirror of kings," the *Zhenguan zhengyao*.

Razan's last official action was a lecture on the first chapter of the *Daxue*, which he delivered to the young *shōgun* on the twelfth day of the twelfth month of Meireki 2 (26-1-1657). This was an appropriate conclusion of his career. Some forty days later, on Meireki 3/1/23 (7-3-1657), he passed away. Because of his frail health he had not been able to weather the shock that the loss of all of his books and manuscripts in the great fire that had raged through Edo since the eighteenth, had caused him.

Conclusions

The conclusions from the above may be summarized as follows. Razan's entry into the service of Ieyasu was mainly the result of Seika's efforts, but when Seika saw that the nature of Razan's employment was different from what he had envisaged his attitude became rather ambivalent. Razan, too, was not really enthusiastic about the circumstances in which he was employed or the jobs that he was given to do. He felt that he was compromising his convictions and could not act like a Confucian should. If he had not yet thought of it, Nakae Tōju was there to point it out to him and to everybody else who wanted to hear it.

Because he had been employed as a member of Ieyasu's personal staff and because his brother Eiki was already fulfilling a similar position with

1657), who as *jisha byugyō* 寺社奉行 was responsible for settling the quarrel.

Hidetada, he was in limbo for some time between Ieyasu's death and Iemitsu's investiture as *shōgun*, when he became a *protégé* of Iemitsu. During the first few years of Iemitsu's personal reign after Hidetada's death in 1632 he figures rather prominently, but from Kan'ei 16 onwards his tasks and assignments tend to fall more and more within the categories of "courtly lore and precedents" (the choice of era names, posthumous names etc., as well as the descriptions he made of important functions and ceremonies in which the emperor or the *shōgun* took part; these descriptions of course had a precedential value), "the drafting of documents and official correspondence" (this explicitly after the demise of Konchiin Sūden), and "historical compilation." Occasionally his encyclopaedic knowledge of other fields is called upon, but one gets the impression that literature and Confucianism rated a rather low priority with the *bakufu* and the *shōgun*, notwithstanding the fact that from time to time the *shōgun* showed some interest or officious officials thought that he should be interested.

The *bakufu* did not take up Razan's interest in education, and by and large his school remained a private affair. Land and money to build a school, or rather: a Confucius Temple, were given him by the *shōgun*, probably as part of the general build-up of the Ueno area, but both the scope of the buildings and the money given to him did not even begin to compare with the care and wealth lavished on Tenkai's 天海 Kan'eiji (Tōeizan) 寛永寺・東叡山, the new headquarters of the Tendai sect that were being built in the same time, in the area adjacent to Razan's temple and school.

Iemitsu visited the temple in Kan'ei 10 (1633). In the following years, beginning in Keian 4 (1651), the buildings were several times repaired, enlarged and rebuilt with grants from the *bakufu*, sometimes even under its supervision, but the first regular, institutional subvention was given, not to the school or to the Confucius Temple, but to the official historiographical bureau of the *bakufu* (Kōbunkan 弘文館) that was established there in Kanbun 4

(1664) under Gahō's direction. This bureau was charged with the completion of the *Honchō hennenroku* (= *Honchō tsugan*).²³⁹ The Hayashi had to wait till Genroku 1 (1688) for the next visit of a *shōgun* to the temple.²⁴⁰

Not only the visits of the *shōgun* and the support by the *bakufu*, but also the various visits and gifts of the *daimyō* are meticulously chronicled in the *Shōhei-shi* 昌平志, but they do not add up to an officially supported academy. The Hayashi had to wait till the days of Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信 and the *Kansei igaku no kin* 寛政異學の禁 before the *bakufu* finally accepted claims as the following:

The Heavenly Lord who Shines in the East
Established order and esteemed Confucianism;
Humanity spread and morality was increased²⁴¹;
He hated purple taking away the lustre of vermillion²⁴²;
He deplored that the Junna and Shōgaku Academies
Had vanished without a trace²⁴³;
He was about to build a school,

²³⁹ For references regarding Iemitsu's visit cf. *supra*, n. 208. For occasional *bakufu* subventions for the enlargement and repairs of the buildings until the time of Tsunayoshi's visit see *Shōhei-shi* 2, entries under Keian 4 (1651), Manji 3 (1660), Kanbun 12 (1672) and Enpō 2 (1674). According to *Shōhei-shi* 2, entry under Kanbun 4, the Bureau for Historiographical Compilation (*Shikan* 史館) was opened on Kanbun 4/11/1 (18-12-1664). The finished *Honchō tsugan* was presented to the *shōgun* on Kanbun 10/6/6 (22-7-1670; *Genyūin-dono go-jikki* 40: *TJ* IV, p. 73). The usual rewards were given on the nineteenth of the same month (*ibid.*: *TJ* IV, p. 74). On Kanbun 10/10/23 the *bakufu* announced that it would continue the subvention for ninety collaborators, originally awarded only for the duration of the compilation (cf. *Shōhei-shi* 2, entries under Kanbun 7 and 10).

²⁴⁰ Cf. *Shōhei-shi* 2, entry under Genroku 1/11/21 (13-12-1688); *Jōken'in-dono go-jikki* 常建院殿御實記 18 (same date; *TJ* VI, p. 27). The *Shōhei-shi* relates how a few months before the visit took place Hayashi Nobuatsu 信篤 (1644-1732) had been summoned by Tsunayoshi, who told him of his wish to visit the Confucius Temple. Tsunayoshi ordered him to ascertain the details of the visit of his father Iemitsu, which had to serve as a precedent (cf. *Shōhei-shi* 2, loc. cit.).

²⁴¹ Cf. Morohashi I, 352-259. The phrase refers to transforming the people through education.

²⁴² Quotation from *Lunyu* XVII, 16. This section, in Legge's apt phrase, expresses "Confucius's indignation at the way in which the wrong overcame the right."

²⁴³ The Junna 淳和院 and Shōgaku 奨学院 Academies were private clan schools, established in the ninth century (cf. *Koji ruien: Bungaku-bu* II, pp. 1309-1312). The mention of these two institutions in this context has an added poignancy, because the head of the Minamoto clan, and later the *shōgun*, *ex officio* was intendant (*bettō* 別当) of both academies.

But his long-cherished desire was not fulfilled.²⁴⁴

Razan's employment by the *bakufu* can be evaluated either from the point of view of the *bakufu* and its needs, or from that of Razan and his pretensions. Razan's pretensions and frustrations have been amply dealt with in this chapter. The fact that Razan was frustrated, and that the *bakufu* had only a limited interest in and use for Confucianism, has not escaped the attention of other scholars.²⁴⁵ If one, nevertheless, wants to maintain that Confucianism was a relevant factor and that it should be taken into account in examining the *bakufu's* policies, one is necessarily reduced to the kind of paradoxical language that Kinugasa Yasuki uses when he remarks that Razan's Zhu Xi-ism showed

emblematically what form the feudal power structure of the Edo period should take on, but that it seems quite possible to suppose that for the same reason it will hardly have been of practical use in shaping the practical policies of the *bakufu*.²⁴⁶

The only basis statements like this one have is the supposedly close and direct relation between an ideology and its socio-political context. If one does not hold this preconceived opinion, however, and approaches the problem from the point of view of the *bakufu*, the picture changes dramatically. When we ask ourselves the question what the needs of the *bakufu* were, what the problems were with which the first three *shōgun* had to contend, and that they had to solve in order to consolidate their rule, most scholars will agree that they can be classified under three headings: first, to exterminate or bring into line all potential centres of opposition; second, to build up a bureaucratic

²⁴⁴ Quoted from *Shōhei-shi* 2, entry for Kan'ei 9 (1632). This hymn was sung at the occasion of a visit of Tokugawa Mitsukuni 光圀 to the school in Genroku 1 (1688).

²⁴⁵ Cf. e.g. Bitō, *Nihon hōken shisōshi kenkyū*, pp. 28-36, or Wajima, *Shōhei-kō to hangaku*, pp. 80-86.

machinery with which to rule the country; and third, to find ways to legitimize this rule.²⁴⁷

The possible centres of opposition were:

- The *daimyō*: They were kept in line by a number of policies (changes of fief, obligatory attendance in Edo, levies for the upkeep of castles and public works, approval of marriages and succession, the bestowal of various honours, all intended to divide and rule, and to keep the *daimyō* in permanent financial straits) and by an ubiquitous network of surveillance. Even after the extermination of the Toyotomi, who until 1615 had been the most obvious rallying point for malcontent *daimyō*, as a group they were still the potentially most dangerous adversaries of the *bakufu*, because of their access to military power.
- The imperial court: On its own the court did not pose a threat to the *bakufu*, but from the beginning it formed a potential rallying point, a potential focus of opposition. Since the *bakufu* did not want to do away with the court, the course that was chosen was the implementation of a number of policies tending to isolate the court from the *daimyō* (it was forbidden for *daimyō* to enter Kyōto; all official contacts with the court were monopolized by the *bakufu*), to prevent or at least to keep in hand the factions and factional struggle amongst the court officials (obligatory approval of marriages, abdications and accessions, intermarriage of imperial house with the Tokugawa), and to keep the purse strings tight (sources of income of the imperial family and of the court nobles were granted and administrated by the *bakufu*).
- Disgruntled *samurai* and *rōnin*: As long as these were unorganised, they merely had some nuisance value. After the fall of Ōsaka and the suppression of

²⁴⁶ Cf. Ch. I, n. 1

²⁴⁷ For a systematic argument along these lines see Nakamura Kōya, *Nihon kinseishi no seikaku* III, p. 11 sqq. Nakamura is not the only one to pose the problem in these terms. Most historians, in this context to be distinguished from intellectual historians, follow a similar line

the Shimabara Rebellion they did not show any tendency to rally to a cause. Stiff policing was thought to be sufficient. The *bakufu* and the various *daimyō* did not even think it necessary to do something obvious like developing alternative career opportunities.

- Citizens (*chōnin*): The big city merchants whose independent wealth and foreign contacts might constitute a threat were slowly throttled and enmeshed in a network of *bakufu* run and *bakufu* licensed monopoly trade. Liable to sudden levies and extortions, they were content if they could maintain their not uncomfortable position within the existing power structure.
- Farmers: Like the *samurai* they lacked the necessary organization to constitute a serious threat for either the *bakufu* or the *daimyō*. Their frequent uprisings were all short-lived, localized affairs and had only some nuisance value.
- Religious groups: Before the Edo period these had furnished the necessary focus and leadership for the organization of malcontent *chōnin* (e.g. in the case of the Hokke *ikki* 法華一揆 in Kyōto in the 1530's) or of the peasantry (e.g. the Ikkō-shū 一向宗 or, to a lesser extent, Christianity). The effort of the *bakufu* to forbid and uproot the most popular and intransigent of these sects, sc. Christianity, the Ikkō-shū, and the Fujufuze-ha 不受不施派 of the Hokke-shū, and to organise the other sects along strictly centralist lines under the direct supervision of the *bakufu*, need not be dwelt on. Organized religion was given its own niche within the power structure through the system of obligatory registration of the whole population at the parish temple (*terauke seido* 寺請制度).

The bureaucratic machinery the *bakufu* finally devised was geared first of all to monitoring and suppressing the various groups of potential trouble-makers I have listed above, thus ensuring the superiority and safety of the

of reasoning. For recent examples see e.g. Asao Naohiro, "Shōgun seiji no kenryoku kōzō."

Tokugawa House. Its other tasks were to wring as much revenue as possible from the Tokugawa domains (*tenryō* 天領), in order to pay for the upkeep of the bureaucracy and the military organization of the *bakufu*, and for the grand state in which the *shōgun* not only wanted, but had to live, as a visible sign of his political and social superiority. Its third function was that of final court of appeal in litigations. This organization was built up during the first few decades of Tokugawa rule and functioned fairly efficiently during the following centuries. Its main feature is the intermingling of public and private spheres, i.e. of its function as a public administration of the country and as the private organization of the Tokugawa House. This intermingling, however, was not worse than in other, similar cases, and is more understandable, since the Tokugawa ruled two thirds of the country only indirectly and had to rely on their own financial and military resources.²⁴⁸

The legitimation of *bakufu* rule, the cloaking of power with the vestments of authority, proceeded in various ways. The authority of the Tokugawa *versus* their own hereditary retainers, the *hatamoto* 旗本 and *fudai daimyō* 譜代大名, of course, depended on the time-honoured personal relation of liege lord to sworn vassal. In course of time the other lords, the so-called *tozama daimyō* 外様大名, were also drawn into this network of feudal, personal loyalties, as they were made to swear oaths of allegiance and were sworn to uphold the laws of the *bakufu*. The position of the Tokugawa at the apex of the feudal pyramid of loyalties and their exercise of a great number of

²⁴⁸ This description is of course very sketchy. At all points queries and refinements could and should be added. I think, however, that in broad outlines the description is valid. Since an outline is all that is needed here, I have refrained from adding notes, references and further discussions. For an introduction to these problems the reader is referred to Totman, *Politics in the Tokugawa bakufu*, which furnishes an extensive bibliography, and to general histories of the Edo period, e.g. Kurita Motoji, *Edo jidaishi, jō*. For further reading, amongst the multitude of studies on the history of the Tokugawa period, the reader may first consult the relevant volumes of the *Iwanami Kōza Nihon Rekishi*, Asao Naohiro, “‘Shōgun kenryoku’ no sōshutsu,” and Toby, “Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*.” The best factual study of the organization and working of the Tokugawa *bakufu* is Fujino Tamotsu, *Bakuhatsu taisei shi no kenkyū*.

powers and privileges were formally consecrated by their investiture with the office of *shōgun*. The usurpation by the *bakufu* of the management of foreign relations added even more splendour and weight to this office. The deification of Ieyasu as Tōshōgū Daigongen and his enshrinement in Nikkō was a third way of legitimizing the position of the Tokugawa. If yet a critic would arise who was not personally entangled in the web of feudal loyalties and not impressed by imperial appointments or the argument that the forefather of the house now was the object of divine worship, he could be silenced by a fourth and final argument, namely that the Tokugawa had succeeded in pacifying the empire and securing the people's livelihood.

If we consider against this background Razan's activities as I have described them in the second half of this chapter, he appears to be ubiquitous. He helps in monitoring the various Buddhist sects, he helps drafting oaths and regulations, he helps in managing the relations of the *bakufu* with the imperial court and of Japan with foreign countries, he helps in the *bakufu* court of law. Though he does not seem to have been involved in the first discussions about the way in which Ieyasu should be deified,²⁴⁹ later on his descriptions of the ceremonies in Nikkō provide precedents for the way in which the Tōshōgū

²⁴⁹ Before he died Ieyasu had said that he wanted his remains to be buried on the Kunō-zan (Sunpu), his obsequies to be performed in the Zōjōji (Edo) and his tablet to be deposited in the Daijuji 大樹寺,??? the family temple of the Tokugawa in Mikawa. Moreover, after the first anniversary of his death, "a small hall had to be built in Nikkō, his spirit had to be induced to dwell there, and he would from there protect the Eight Provinces of the Kantō" (*DNS* XII.24, p. 207). Ieyasu, however, had not specified according to which rites he wanted to be worshipped. A quarrel among his religious advisors was the result. The main contestants were Bonshun 梵舜 and Tenkai. Some consultations were held in Edo, in which a minor role was played by Hayashi Eiki. On Genna 2/6/11 Tenkai and Eiki were dispatched to Kyōto and the matter was referred to the imperial court. On the sixth of the seventh month the discussions began at court and, after an intervention by Tenkai, the court decided — on the thirteenth — on the appellation of *gongen*. Then Bonshun gave up and said that Tenkai could also decide on the name under which Ieyasu was to be worshipped (*ibid.*, pp. 237-242). Yet it took another two months before — on the sixteenth of the ninth month — the imperial messengers and Tenkai left Kyōto to report the court's decision to the *shōgun* (*ibid.*, pp. 598-599; p. 605). On the twenty-sixth day of the tenth month we already find Tenkai in Nikkō, measuring the ground in preparation of building the temple (*ibid.*, p. 683).

Daigongen should be worshipped.

Here, however, lies the crux: Razan helps, he is involved, but he does not originate, and in many of the more important matters his advice is not even asked for. In the matter of Ieyasu's deification Tenkai carried the day; in the matter of the bell of the Hōkōji he is invited to say his piece, but compared with Tenkai or Sūden he plays a minor role; the *Buke shohatto* are included in his *Bunshū*, but are we really to understand that Razan drew up the articles, defended them and got his proposals accepted? Would it not rather have been the same as with Sūden who in Genna 1 (1615) was ordered to draw up a first version of the *Buke shohatto*?

From the time this house (i.e. the Tokugawa) had come to power [Ieyasu] had not yet found the leisure to formulate a code for his reign and to impose it on the whole of the realm. He thought that, therefore, the people within the Four Seas would be in doubt [which laws] to obey. On this occasion, in Genna 1 when he was in the capital, he summoned Konchiin Sūden and had him deliberate on such matters. [Sūden] consulted the old texts of the older and more recent law codes (*ritsuryō* 律令) of China and Japan and also, closer to [his own time], the statutes (*shikimoku* 式目) of the military houses from the Kamakura and Muromachi [*shōgun*] onwards, and he drew up thirteen articles. On the seventh day of the seventh month (30-8-1615) all *daimyō* were summoned to the castle in Fushimi. [Ieyasu] had Honda Sado-no-kami Masanobu tell them that now new laws would be proclaimed and then ordered Sūden to read them.²⁵⁰

As this example of Sūden again indicates, the system and the policies of the Tokugawa *bakufu* were inspired first of all by old Japanese precedents and political lore, laid down in works like the *Azuma kagami*, printed on Ieyasu's orders in 1605,²⁵¹ or the *Go-seibai shikimoku*. The attention paid to the Seven

²⁵⁰ Translated from *Daitokuin-dono go-jikki*, *Furoku* 3 (*TJ* II, p. 280). Cf. also *Sunpu-ki*, entries for Keichō 20/intercalary 6/24 (18-8-1615: Sūden is ordered to draft the code); Keichō 20/7/2 (Sūden brings his draft to the *shōgun*); Keichō 20/7/7 (Sūden reads the code to the assembled *daimyō*).

²⁵¹ See Wajima, *Shōhei-kō to hangaku*, p. 22.

Military Classics — printed by Ieyasu in 1600 and again in 1606 — and the *Zhenguan zhengyao* — printed in 1600²⁵² — was just as great as, if not greater than, the attention given to the Four Books. Razan probably lectured and commented more often on the first category of books than on the second, at least to the *shōgun*. Even if Razan would have been more important and would demonstrably have occupied a more important position in the decision making process of the *bakufu*, it would still not be right to call these activities Confucian. The fact that Razan claimed to be a Confucian does not give us leave to hallow everything he did with this name.

The same applies to the various jobs he undertook for the *shōgun* personally, like writing explanations of Chinese works, reports on herbariums and medicine, and commemorative pieces on auspicious events. Even his historiographical compilations, especially the *Kan'ei shoka keizu den* and the *Honchō hennen roku*, do not — to my knowledge — show any specific Confucian bias. The works seem to have been ordered by the *bakufu* for their practical value in establishing the pedigrees of the warrior families, and possibly in order to confirm the status of the Tokugawa dynasty.

The basis for the argument that Neo-Confucianism was the ideology of the *bakufu* rests on three assumptions: a) in the Edo period Neo-Confucianism, a young, vigorous, innovative school of thought, had replaced Buddhism as the centre of intellectual debate; b) the *bakufu* employed Neo-Confucian scholars; c) Neo-Confucian Classics and ethics were the basis of *samurai* education.

The first assumption is self-fulfilling. If one assumes that Buddhism in the Tokugawa period has nothing worthwhile to offer and consequently ignores it, the contrary will never be proven. As regards the other two, the *bakufu* certainly employed Neo-Confucian thinkers, but hardly in their capacity as Confucian thinkers. In *samurai* ethics many Confucian influences

²⁵² See Wajima, *Shōhei-kō to hangaku*, pp. 20-21; p. 23.

can be found, but, on the other hand, many common practices (appointments by rank and descent and not by merit, self-mutilation, non-agnatic adoption) went against the most basic ideals of Neo-Confucianism.

The *bakufu* invested a large amount of effort in the organization of the Buddhist religion, but only spasmodically did it show some interest in Confucianism. In the form of the *terauke* system the *bakufu* actually made use of Buddhism in a way it never made use of Confucianism. The *bakufu*, the Tokugawa House and the *daimyō* all lavished immeasurably greater sums of money on temples and shrines than on Confucian temples and schools. At least in the beginning of the Tokugawa period Buddhist priests rose to positions of great influence. All this was not a matter of cold calculation. For instance in the following edict of Iemitsu — drafted by Razan — a note of sincerity may be detected:

Our divine ancestor (= Ieyasu) ruled the empire through the civil and military arts and held all within the Four Seas in his hand. In the leisure his myriad worries left him he occupied himself with Buddhism and turned himself to Tenkai for salvation. He once said: "If I have any spiritual [power], I will make my ancestors famous, I will give protection to my descendants and I will make my house last forever." Thus were his words. He passed on these intentions to Daitokuin-dono (= Hidetada) and [Hidetada] memorialized the emperor, gave a divine name and a divine rank [to Ieyasu] and ordered Tenkai to induce [his spirit] to come [to Nikkō] and dwell there. Considering this, since this is the ancestral mausoleum of our house, my (= Iemitsu's) veneration is deep indeed. It is in order to prevent that ever in coming generations [his worship] will be disrupted, that I have revised the temple laws, the servants, etc. and allotted land [to the temples and shrines]. Therefore, the imperial chief abbot, the religious supervisor, the monks, the separate subsidiary temples, the Shintō priests and the servants, [all] must observe the regulations. The administration of the temple will be according to Tenkai's instructions.

All of you must acknowledge these words, assiduously exert yourselves for the preservation of the state and excel in the sincere wish to [ever] improve [the fortunes of] Buddhism.²⁵³

²⁵³ Edict in *Taiyūin-dono go-jikki* 24, entry under Kan'ei 11/4/2 (29-4-1634; *TJ* II, pp. 629-

This may be a strange note on which to end a book on the introduction of Neo-Confucianism in Japan. It is a useful reminder, however, of the context in which the introduction of Neo-Confucianism took place.

The writing of this book has given me the opportunity to undertake research in several fields that are generally not studied in conjunction. This has been useful, because in this way I have been able to acquaint myself with many aspects of the history and functioning of Neo-Confucianism in Japan. It has also been frustrating in that I often did not have the time and opportunity to concern myself more deeply with specific problems that I came across in the course of my research.

The main use of this book lies for me in the fact that in writing it I have been able to survey the field. I have been able to identify problems that are still waiting for clarification and to outline possible approaches that I intend to follow up later. I have also been able to test a method of studying intellectual history that in taking cognizance of bibliographical and historical studies attempts to stick close to the facts. I hope that other scholars, too, will find themselves sufficiently interested in the facts I have presented, the conclusions I have drawn, and the method I have demonstrated to enter into this field. I also hope that I will profit from their research, and that they will correct the mistakes that no doubt abound in the present work.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

630). Cf. *supra*, n. 210.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

Abe, *Chōsen* :

Abe Yoshio, *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen*

Abe, “Daigaku Chūyō” :

Abe Ryūichi, “Honpō chūsei ni okeru Daigaku Chūyō no kōshō denryū ni tsuite”

Abe, “Ron Mō” I, II :

Abe Ryūichi, “Muromachi izen hōjin senjutsu Rongo Mōshi chūshakusho kō,” 1, 2

Ashikaga, *Jukyō* :

Ashikaga Enjutsu, *Kamakura Muromachi jidai no jukyō*

Bunshū :

Hayashi Razan, *Razan-sensei bunshū*

CG :

Chōsen gakuho

DNS :

Dai-Nihon shiryō, Shiryō Hensanjo comp.

Goodrich, *Ming Biography* :

Goodrich, L. Carrington, ed., *Dictionary of Ming Biography*

GR

Gunsho ruijū

Imanaka, *Seiritsu* :

Imanaka Kanji, *Kinsei Nihonseiji shisō no seiritsu*

Inoue, *Shushigakuha* :

Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nihon Shushi-gakuha no kenkyu*

JJS :

Journal of Japanese Studies

Kanyangnok :

Yi Ŭrho, *Sin Sukchu, Haedong chegukki; Kang Hang, Kanyangnok*

Kanyōroku :

Ōmura Tomonosuke, *Kakkan-sensei jikki, Kanyōroku, Tō-kei zakki*

Kawase, *Ashikaga* :

Kawase Kazuma, *Shintei zōho Ashikaga Gakkō no kenkyū*

KSM :

Kokusho sōmokuroku

MN :

Monumenta Nipponica

NR :

Nihon Rekishi

NST XXVIII :

Ishida Ichirō & Kanaya Osamu, eds, *Fujiwara Seika, Hayashi Razan*

Ōe, *Shisho* :

Ōe Fumiki, *Honpō Shisho kuntei narabi ni chūkai no shiteki kenkyū*

Ōta I, II :

Ōta Heisaburō, ed., *Fujiwara Seika shū*

Shishū :

Hayashi Razan, *Razan-sensei shishū*

Sillok :

P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe, ed., *Chosŏn wangjo sillok*

Tōyō Bunko:

Pak Chonmyon, *Kan'yōroku. Chōsen jusha no Nihon yokuryūki*

TJ :

Tokugawa Jikki

Wajima, *Jugaku* :

Wajima Yoshio, *Chūsei no jugaku*, 1965

Zokkai :

Shintō hiden setchū zokkai

ZZGR :

Zoku-zoku gunsho ruijū

Abe Ryūichi 阿部隆一, "Honpō chūsei ni okeru Daigaku Chūyō no kōshō denryū ni tsuite" (Gaku Yō no koshōhon narabi ni hōjin senjutsu chūshakusho yori mitaru)," *Shidō Bunko ronsō* I (1962).

Abe Ryūichi, “Muromachi izen hōjin senjutsu Rongo Mōshi chūshakusho kō,” 1, 2, *Shidō Bunko ronsō* II (1963); III (1964).

Abe Yoshio 阿部吉雄, “Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku to Chōsen (Kyō Kō no isho jūrokushu no shinchōsha ni chinande),” *CG* XII (1958).

Abe Yoshio, comp., *Ilbon karp'an Yi T'oegye chōnjip*, 2 vols, Seoul: T'oegyehak Yōnguwōn, 1975.

Abe Yoshio, *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen*, 2nd ed., Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1971.

Abe Yoshio, “Nis-Sen-Min ni okeru shuri-ha shuki-ha no keifu to sono tokushitsu (*Konchiki Tenmeizusetsu Jishōroku* o megutte),” *CG* XIV (1958), pp. 423-442.

Abe Yoshio, “Ri Taikai no tetsugakuteki shuyōgaku to Nihon Jugaku,” *CG* LXXXI (1976).

Abe Yoshio, “Razan no Jugaku to Chōsen,” *CG* X (1956).

Araki Yoshio 荒木良雄, *Azuchi Momoyama jidai bungaku shi*, Tōkyō: Kadokawa Shoten, 1969.

Asao Naohiro 朝尾直弘, “‘Shōgun kenryoku’ no sōshutsu,” *Rekishi hyōron* 241 (1970); 266 (1972); 293 (1974).

Asao Naohiro, “Shōgun seiji no kenryoku kōzō,” in *Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi* X, Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1975.

Ashikaga Enjutsu 足利衍述, *Kamakura Muromachi jidai no jukyō*, Tōkyō: Nihon Koten Zenshū Kankōkai, 1932.

Aston, W.C., *Nihongi, Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697*, London/New York, 1924.

Baison saihitsu 梅村載筆, in *Zuihitsu taikan* 隨筆大觀 III, Tōkyō: Kokusho Shuppan Kyōkai, 1910; *Nihon zuihitsu taisei* 日本隨筆大成, First Series, I, rpt, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1975.

Ban Kōkei 伴蒿蹊, *Kinsei kijin den*, Mori Senzō, ed., Iwanami Bunko, 6th impr., Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1972.

Bary, W. Theodore de, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Berling, *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Bitō Masahide 尾藤正英, *Nihon hōken shisōshi kenkyū*, Rekishigaku Kenkyū Sōsho, 4th impr., Tōkyō: Aoki Shoten, 1973.

Boku Chonmyon, *Kanyōroku*: see Pak Chongmyōng

Boot, W.J., “Hayashi Razan as a Confucian philosopher,” in Nish, Ian & Charles Dunn, eds, *European studies on Japan*.

Boot, W.J., “Yi T’oegye and Japan” (with Korean transl.: “Yi T’oegye gwa Ilbon”), *T’oegye Hakpo* XXXI (1981); republ. *Korea Journal* XXII, 2 (1982).

Brower, Robert H., “The Reizei family documents,” *MN* XXXVI (1981).

Brüll, L., "Prinzip (*ri*) und Materie (*ki*) -- Ein Beitrag zur Metaphysik des Hayashi Razan," *Japanisches Kulturinstitut, Jahrbuch I* (1970).

Bukō zakki, see Matsuura Shigenobu

Chamberlain, B.H., *Translation of Ko-ji-ki or "Record of Ancient Matters,"* 2nd edn, W.G. Aston, ed., Kōbe: J.L. Thompson, 1932.

Chan, Wing-tsit, transl. & ann., *A Sourcebook in Chinese Philosophy*, Princeton Paperback, 4th impr., Princeton N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1973.

Chan, Wing-tsit, transl. & ann., *The Platform Scripture, the Basic Classic of Zen Buddhism*, 4th impr., New York: St. John's University Press, 1975.

Chan, Wing-tsit, transl. & ann., *Reflections on Things at Hand. The Neo-Confucian Anthology compiled by Chu Hsi and Lh Tsu-ch'ien*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Cheng Yichuan 程伊川, *Yichuan-xiansheng wenji*, in *Er Cheng quanshu*.

Cheng Mingdao 程明道, *Mingdao-xiansheng wenji*, in *Er Cheng quanshu*.

Chengshi cuiyan 程氏粹言, in *Er Cheng quanshu*.

Chŏng Chiun 鄭之雲, *Ch'ŏnmyŏng tosŏl*, in Abe Yoshio, comp., *Ilbon kakp'an Yi T'oegye chŏnjip II*

Chŏng Hŭidŭk, (Wŏlbong) 鄭希得·月峯, "Wŏlbong haesangnok," *CG XXIII* (1962); *XXV* (1962).

Chow Yih-ching, Paul, *La philosophie morale dans le Néo-Confucianisme (Tcheou Touen-yi)*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1974.

Chunqiu jingzhuan yinde 春秋經傳引得: *Combined indexes to Ch'un-ch'iu, Kung-yang, Kuliang and Tso-chuan*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series Suppl. 11, 4 vols, Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1966.

Chuci jizhu 楚辭集注, Taipei: Yiwen Yinshuguan, 1956.

Dai-Nihon shi 大日本史, Japanese printed edn, s.a.

Dobson, W.A.C.H., *Mencius, a New Translation Arranged and Annotated for the General Reader*, London: University of Toronto Press / Oxford University Press, 1963.

Duthu, J.B., "Hayashi Razan, un Confucianiste du XVII^e siècle," *Mélanges japonaises* XXIII, XXIV (1909).

Elison, George S., *Deus Destroyed. The Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan*, Cambridge, Mass., 1973.

Er Cheng quanshu 二程全書, *Sibu beiyao*, 3 vols, 2nd impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1969.

Fang, Chaoying, *The Asami Library: A Descriptive Catalogue*, Berkeley / Los Angeles, 1969.

Feng Youlan 馮友蘭, *Zhongguo zhexue shi*, 2nd impr., Kyōto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1973.

Forke, A., *Geschichte der alten chinesischen Philosophie*, Hamburg: Friederichsen, 1927.

Forke, A., *Geschichte der mittelalterlichen chinesischen Philosophie*, Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1934.

Forke, A., *Geschichte der neueren chinesischen Philosophie*, Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter, 1938.

Franke, Herbert, ed., *Sung biographies*, Münchener Ostasiatische Studien Bd. 16, 1-3, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976.

Fujimoto Yukio 藤本幸夫, "Sō-ke Bunko-zō Chōsen-bon ni tsuite ('Tenna sannen mokuroku' to genzonbon wo taishō shitsutsu)," *CG IC* (1981); *C* (1981)

Fujimoto Yukio, "Tōkyō Kyōiku Daigaku zō Chōsen-bon ni tsuite," *CG LXXXI* (1976).

Fujino Tamotsu 藤野保, *Bakuhan taisei shi no kenkyū. Kenryoku to kōzō no kakuritsu to tenkai*, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1961.

Fujiwara Seika 藤原惺窩, *Daigaku yōryaku*, in Ōta II; *NST XXVIII*.

Fujiwara Seika, *Seika bunshū*, in Ōta I.

Fujiwara Seika, *Seika-sensei bunshū*, in Ōta I; *ZZGR XIII*, pp. 43-131.

Fujiwara Yoshimichi 藤原吉迪, *Suiyō shōroku*, in *Nihon zuihitsu taisei*, 1st series, VI, rpt, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1975.

Funabashi Hidekata 舟橋秀賢, *Keichō nikken-roku I, Shiryō sanshū*, Tōkyō: Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, 1981.

Furuta Hikaru 古田光 & Koyasu Nobukuni 子安信邦, eds, *Nihon shisōshi tokuhon*, Tōyō

Keizai Tokuhon Shiriizu 42, Tōkyō: Tōyō Keizai Shinpōsha, 1979.

Gernet, Jacques, *Chine et Christianisme. Action et réaction*, Paris: Gallimard, 1982.

Giles, H.A., *A Chinese biographical dictionary*, London / Shanghai / Yokohama, 1898.

Kiyō Hōshū 岐陽方秀, *Funi ikō* 不二遺稿, in *Gozan bungaku zenshū* III.

Goodrich, L. Carrington, ed., *Dictionary of Ming Biography*, 2 vols, New York / London, 1976.

Graf, O., *Kaibara Ekiken. Ein Beitrag zur japanischen Geistesgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts und zur chinesischen Sung-Philosophie*, Leiden, 1942.

Graham, A.C., *Two Chinese philosophers: Ch'eng Ming-tao and Ch'eng Yi-ch'uan*, London, 1958.

Gunsho kaidai 群書解題, Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, comp., 12 vols, 3d impr., Tōkyō: Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, 1981-1982.

Gunsho ruijū 群書類從, 18 vols, Keizai Zasshisha, comp., Tōkyō: Keizai Zasshisha, 1903-1904.

Guwen guanzhi 古文觀止, 4th impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1970.

Han Fei Zi jishi 韓非子集釋, Chen Chiyau 陳奇猷, ed. & ann., Zhongguo Zhexue Congshu, Taipei: Heluo Tushu Chubanshe, 1975.

Han Shu 漢書, 12 vols, 3d impr., Peking: Zhonghua Shuju, 1975.

Hanguk Taepaekkwajasajŏn Wiwŏnhoe 韓国大百科事典委員会, comp., *Hanguk Taepaek kwa sajŏn*, 2nd edn, Seoul: Ŭryu Munhwasa, 1972.

Hara Nensai 原念齋, *Sentetsu sōdan*, in *Nihon tetsugaku shisō zensho* XX, 2nd edn, Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1981; in Tōyō Bunko 574, Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1994.

Haruyama Jin'ei 春山仁榮, "Koji satsuyō no sappan mokuroku ni tsuite," *Tōhō Gakuhō* XXX, 2 (1943).

Hayakawa Junsaburō 早川純三郎, ed., *Shintō sōsetsu*, Tōkyō: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1911.

Hayashi Gahō 林鵝峰, *Gahō Rin-gakushi zenshū*, Japanese printed edn of 1689; rpt Kinsei Juka Bunsū Shūsei XII (1-2), Tokyo: Perikansha, 1997.

Hayashi Razan 林羅山, *Daigaku Dōshun shō*, MS copy of Kokkai Toshokan.

Hayashi Razan, *Daigaku genkai*, MS copy of Naikaku Bunko.

Hayashi Razan, *Daigaku-shō kō*, Japanese printed edn of 1789.

Hayashi Razan, *Dōmō-shō*, Japanese printed edn of 1666.

Hayashi Razan, *Honchō jinja kō*, Washio Junkei, comp., in *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* I.

Hayashi Razan, *Nozuchi*, in Kokubun Chūshaku Zensho XII.

Hayashi Razan, *Razan zenshū*, 4 vols (vols I-II: *Razan-sensei bunshū*; vols III-IV: *Razan-sensei shishū*), Kyōto Shiseki Kai 京都史蹟會, comp., Kyōto: Heian Kōko Gakkai, 1920-1921.

Hayashi Razan, *Rongo Wa-ji kai*, MS copy of Sonkeikaku Bunko.

Hayashi Razan, *Santoku-shō*, in *NST* XXVIII; *ZZGR* X, pp. 66-90.

Hayashi Razan, *Seika-sensei gyōjō*, in *NST* XXVIII; *ZZGR* III, pp. 395-399; *Bunshū* 40 (II).

Hayashi Razan, *Seiri jigi genkai*, Japanese printed edn of 1659.

Hayashi Razan, *Shin-Eki gō kan*, MS copy of Naikaku Bunko.

Hayashi Razan, *Shintō denju*, in *NST* XXXIX, pp. 11-57; Hayakawa, ed., *Shintō sōsetsu*, pp. 14-46.

Hayashi Razan, *Shintō hiden setchū zokkai*, MS copy of Naikaku Bunko.

Hayashi Razan, *Shunkan-shō*, in *NST* XXVIII; *ZZGR* X, pp. 42-65.

Hayashiya Tatsusaburō 林屋辰三郎, *Suminokura Soan*, Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1978.

Henthorn, William E., *A History of Korea*, New York: Free Press, 1971.

Hitomi Chikudō 人見竹洞, *Ishikawa Jōzan nenpu*, in Seki Giichirō, comp., *Nihon jurin sōsho* III.

Hoang, P., *Concordance des chronologies néonémiques chinoise et européenne*, 2me éd., Variétés Sinologiques 29, Taichung: Kuangchi Press, 1968.

Honda Wataru 本田濟, *Eki*, Shintei Chūgoku Kōten Sen I, 9th impr., Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1972.

Honsa-roku 本佐録, in *NST* XXVIII.

Hori Isao 堀勇雄, *Hayashi Razan*, Jinbutsu Sōsho 118, 2nd ed., Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1973.

Hori Kyōan 堀杏庵, *Chūzan nichiroku*, in *ZZGR* IX.

Hou Han Shu 後漢書, 12 vols, 2nd impr., Peking: Zhonghua Shuju, 1973.

Huang Zongxi 黄宗羲, *Huang Lizhou wenji*, Peking: Zhonghua Shuju, 1959.

Huang Zongxi, comp., *Ming ru xuean*, 2nd impr., Taipei: Shijie Shuju, 1965.

Huang Tsung-hsi et al., comp., *Sung Yuan xuean*, rpt, Taipei: Guangwen Shuju, 1971.

Ijichi Sueyasu 伊地知季安, *Kangaku kigen*, in *ZZGR* X.

Imanaka Kanji 今中寛司, *Kinsei Nihon seiji shisō no seiritsu*, Tokyo: Sōbunsha, 1972.

Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎, *Nihon Shushi-gakuha no kenkyū*, 28th impr., Tōkyō: Fuzanbō, 1945.

Inuzuka Inami 犬塚印南, *Shōhei-shi*, in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* VII.

Ioriya Iwao 庵途巖, “Ōmura Yūko to Fujiwara Seika,” *NR* 365 (1978).

Ishida Ichirō 石田一良, “Hayashi Razan: Muromachi jidai ni okeru Zen-Ju itchi to Fujiwara Seika Hayashi Razan no shisō,” in Sagara Tōru et al., eds, *Edo no shisōka-tachi*.

Ishida Ichirō, ed., *Shisōshi 2, Taikei Nihonshi sōsho* XXIII, Tōkyō: Yamakawa Shuppansha,

1976.

Ishida Ichirō, "Tokugawa hōken shakai to Shushi-gakuha no shisō," *Tōhoku Daigaku Bungakubu kenkyū nenpō* XIII (1962).

Ishida Ichirō, "Zenki bakuhan-taisei no ideorogii to Shushi-gakuha no shisō," in *NST* XXVIII.

Ishida Ichirō & Kanaya Osamu 金谷治, eds, *Fujiwara Seika, Hayashi Razan, Nihon shisō taikei* XXVIII, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1975.

Ishige Tadashi 石毛忠, "Sengoku Azuchi-Momoyama jidai no shisō," in Ishida Ichirō, ed., *Shisōshi* II.

Ishige Tadashi, "*Shingaku gorin-sho* no seiritsu jijō to sono shisōteki tokushitsu (*Kana shōri, Honsa-roku rikai no zentei to shite*)," in *NST* XXVIII.

Ishihara Michihiro 石原道博, "*Geppō kaijiroku* ni tsuite," *CG* XXIII (1962).

Ishikawa Ken 石川謙, *Sekimon-shingaku shi no kenkyū*, Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1938.

Itō Tasaburō 伊東多三郎, "*Tenshō nikki* to *kana shōri*," *NR* 196 (1964).

Jihen 慈遍, *Toyoashihara shinpū Wa-ki*, in *ZZGR* I.

Kaikō sōsai 海行摠載, 4 vols, Chōsen Kosho Kankōkai 朝鮮古書刊行會, comp., Keijō: Chōsen Kosho Kankōkai, 1914.

Kameda Jun'ichirō 亀田純一郎, "Taiheiki-yomi ni tsuite," *Kokugo to kokubungaku* VIII, 10 (1931).

Kamei Takashi 亀井孝, ed., *Gogaku shiryō to shite no Chūka Jakubokushi shō*, Ōsaka: Seibundō, 1977.

Kamimura Kankō 上村観光, comp., *Gozan bungaku zenshū*, 3 vols, Tōkyō: Shōkabō, 1908.

Kamstra, J.H., *Encounter or Syncretism, the Initial Growth of Japanese Buddhism*, Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Kana seiri 假名性理 (= *Chiyo motogusa*) in Ōta II; ZZGR X; *Nihon no shisō* XVII.

Kanaya Osamu 金谷治, "Fujiwara Seika no Jugaku shisō," in NST XXVIII.

Kanbun gakusha sōran 漢文学者総覧, Nagazawa Kōzō 長澤孝三, comp., 2nd impr., Tōkyō: Kyūko Shoin, 1980.

Kangakusha denki oyobi chojutsu shūran 漢学者伝記及び著述集覧, Ogawa Tsuramichi 小川貫道, comp., rpt, Tōkyō: Meicho Kankōkai, 1980.

Kangakusha denki shūsei 漢学者伝記集成, Takebayashi Kan'ichi 竹林貫一, comp., Tōkyō: Seki Shoin, 1928.

Karlgren, Bernhard, *The Book of Odes. Chinese text, transcription and translation*, Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1950.

Katsura Isoo 桂五十郎, *Kanseki kaidai*, rpt, Tōkyō: Nihon Tosho Sentā, 1979.

Kawase Kazuma 川瀬一馬, *Gozan-ban no kenkyū*, 2 vols, Tōkyō: The Antiquarian Booksellers Association of Japan, 1970.

Kawase Kazuma, *Nihon shoshigaku no kenkyū*, Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1971.

Kawase Kazuma, *Shintei zōho Ashikaga Gakkō no kenkyū*, Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1974.

Keene, Donald, *World Within Walls. Japanese Literature of the Pre-Modern Era, 1600-1868*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1976.

Keian Genju 桂菴玄樹, *Keian-oshō kahō Wa-kun*, in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* V, pp. 424-431.

Kim Ha-tae, "The Transmission of Neo-Confucianism to Japan by Kang Hang, a Prisoner of War," *Transactions of the Korean Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* XXXVII (1961).

Kimura Mitsunori 木村光徳, *Tōju-gaku no seiritsu ni kan-suru kenkyū*, Tōkyō: Kazama shobō, 1971.

Kinugasa Yasuki 衣笠安喜, *Kinsei Jugaku shisōshi no kenkyū*, Sōsho Rekishigaku Kenkyū, Tokyo: Hōsei Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1976.

Kira monogatari 吉良物語, in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō* V.

Kiyohara Nobukata 清原宣賢, *Mōji-shō*, MS copy of Kyōto University.

Kodama Kōta 児玉幸多, ed., *Kinseishi handobukku*, 3d impr., Tōkyō: Kondō Shuppansha, 1975.

Kokan Shiren 虎關師鍊, *Genkō shakusho*, *Kokushi taikei* XIV, Tōkyō: Keizai Zasshisha, 1906.

Kokan Shiren, *Saihoku-shū*, in *Gozan bungaku zenshū* I.

Kokubun Chūshaku Zensho 国文注釈全書, Muromatsu Iwao 室松岩雄, comp., 20 vols, Tōkyō: Kokugakuin Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1907-1910.

Kokusho sōmokuroku 国書総目録, 9 vols, Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1963-1976.

Konakamura Kiyonori 小中村清矩, *Nihon kanshoku seido enkakushi*, Tōkyō: Tōgakusha, 1935.

Kōsai Tsutomu 香西精, “Dōbō-shū shinkō - Zeami dōbō setsu wo megutte,” in Kōsai, *Zeami shinkō*.

Kōsai Tsutomu, *Zeami shinkō*, 4th impr., Tōkyō: Wanya Shoten, 1972.

Kugyō bunin 公卿補任, *Kokushi taikei* IX-XI, 3d impr., Tōkyō: Keizai Zasshisha, 1906.

Kuksa P’yōnch’an Wiwōnhoe 國史編纂委員会, ed., *Chosŏn wangjo sillok* 朝鮮王朝實錄, Seoul: Tongguk Munhwasa, 1964-1967.

Kumagai Reisai 熊谷荔齋, *Gogyō genkai*, in *Reisai shibunshū*, MS of Kyōto Furitsu Sōgō Shiryōkan.

Kuno, Yoshi S., *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent. A Study in the History of Japan, with Special Reference to her International Relations with China, Korea, and Russia*, 2 vols, Berkeley / Los Angeles, 1937, 1940.

Kurita Motoji 栗田元次, *Edo jidaishi, jō*, 3 vols, *Sōgō Nihonshi taikei* XVII-XIX, Tōkyō: Naigai Shoseki K.K., 1939-1940

Kusumoto Masatsugu 楠本正繼, *Sō Min jidai jugaku-shisō no kenkyū*, 2nd impr., Kashiwa: Hiroike Gakuen Shuppanbu, 1964.

Kuwata Tadachika 桑田忠親, *Daimyō to otogi-shū (zōho shinpan)*, Tōkyō: Yūseidō, 1969.

Legge, James, *The Ch'un Ts'ew, with the Tso Chuen, The Chinese Classics V*, Pts 1-2, Hongkong / London, 1872.

Legge, James, *The I Ching, The Sacred Books of the East XVI*, 2nd edn, rpt, New York: Dover Publications, 1963.

Legge, James, *The Li Ki, The Sacred Books of the East XXVIII*, Oxford, 1885.

Legge, James, *The works of Mencius*, rpt, New York, 1970.

Legge, James, *Shu Ching, Book of History. A modernized edition of the translation of James Legge*, Clae Waltham, ed., Chicago, 1971.

Legge, James, *The Texts of Taoism*, 2 vols, rpt, New York, 1962.

Liao, W.K., *The complete works of Han Fei Tzu; a Classic of Chinese Legalism*, 2 vols, London, 1939-1959.

Liu Ts'un-yan, "Lin Chao-en: Master of the Three Teachings," *T'oung Pao* LIII (1967).

Lu Xiangshan 陸象山, *Hsiang-shan quanji, Sibū beiyao*, 2nd impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1970.

Lunyu zhengyi 論語正義, Liu Baonan 劉寶南, comp., *Sibū beiyao*, 4th impr., Taipei:

Zhonghua Shuju, 1974.

Lu-yu yinde 論語引得, *A Concordance to the Analects*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Suppl. no. 16, rpt., Taipei: Chinese Materials and research Aids Service Center, 1972.

Maeno Naoaki 前野直彬, ed., *Tōshi-sen* I, Iwanami Bunko, Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1978.

Mano Senryū 間野潜龍, "Mindai ni okeru sankyōshisō (toku ni Rin Chōon o chūshin to shite)," *Tōyōshi kenkyū* XII, 1 (1952).

Margouliès, George, *Le kou-wen chinois: recueil de textes avec introduction et notes*, Paris: Geuthner, 1926.

Maruyama Masao 丸山真男, *Nihon seiji:shisōshi kenkyū*, 17th impr., Tōkyō: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1971.

Matsuda Kō 松田甲, "Fujiwara Seika to Kyō Suiin no kankei," *Rekishi chiri* LIII, 1, 2, 4 (1929).

Matsudaira Sadanobu 松平定信, *Kagetsu sōshi*, Iwanami Bunko, 4th impr., Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1972.

Matsunaga Sekigo 松永尺五, *Irin-shō*, in *NST* XXVIII.

Matsunaga Teitoku 松永貞徳, *Taion-ki*, in *ZGR* XIII.

Matsura Shigenobu 松浦鎮信, *Bukō zakki*, *Zoku shiseki shūran* XXIII-XXIV, Tōkyō: Kondō Kapansho, 1894.

McMullen, I.J., "Non-agnatic Adoption: A Confucian Controversy in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Japan," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* XXXV (1975), pp. 133-189.

McMullen, I.J., "Rulers or Fathers? A Casuistic Problem in Early Modern Japanese Thought," *Past and Present* 116 (1987, 8), pp. 56-97.

Mengzi yinde 孟子引得, *A Concordance to Meng Tzu*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Suppl. no. 17, rpt, Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1973.

Miki Sakae 三木榮, "Yōan'in zōshochū no Chōsen isho," *CG* I (1951).

Minamoto Ryōen 源了円, "Fujiwara Seika to Hayashi Razan: Kinsei shotō no gakugei," *Bungei kenkyū* LXXXVII (1978).

Minamoto Ryōen , *Tokugawa shisō shōshi*, Chūō Shinsho, Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1973.

Mingjen zhuanji ciliao zuoyin 明人傳記史料索引, 2 vols, Kuo-li Chung-yang T'u-shu-kuan, comp., Taipei: Kuo-li Chung-yang T'u-shu-kuan, 1965.

Ming Shi 明史, 28 vols, Peking: Zhonghua Shuju, 1974.

Miyake Hidetoshi 三宅英利, "Tokugawa seiken shokai no Chōsen-shinshi," *CG* LXXXII (1977).

Miyake Masahiko 三宅正彦, "Edo jidai no shisō," in Ishida Ichirō, ed., *Shisōshi* 2.

Naba Toshisada 那波利貞, "Meiwa gannen no Chōsenkoku shūkō tsūshinshidan no torai to wa ga kuni no gakusha bunjin to no kanboku-jō ni okeru ōshū shōwa no ichirei ni tsukite," *CG* XLII (1967), pp. 1-48.

Naikaku Bunko kanseki bunrui mokuroku 内閣文庫漢籍分類目錄, Naikaku Bunko, comp., Tōkyō, 1956

Naitō Shunpo 内藤雋補, "Bunroku Keichō no eki ni okeru hiryo Chōsenjin no ibun ni tsuitei tsuite," 1, *CG XLIV* (1967); "id. (shūkyōka no baai) ," 1, *CG IL* (1968).

Naitō Shunpo, "Jinshin teiyū no eki ni okeru hiryo Chōsenjin no sakkan mondai ni tsuite, jō. (Chōsen shiryō ni yoru)," *CG XXIX* (1963).

Naitō Shunpo, "Keichō teiyū eki hiryo gakujiin-kan no gayū ni tsuite," *CG LXXI* (1974).

Nakamura Hidetaka 中村榮孝, "Hōsa Bunko *Chōsen-bon* tenkansho kaisetsu," *CG XIII* (1958).

Nakamura Hidetaka, *Nihon to Chōsen*, Nihon Rekishi Shinsho, Tōkyō: Shibundō, 1966.

Nakamura Hidetaka, "Zen-kindai Ajia gaikōshi-jō no Tokugawa seiken ('Nihonkoku taikun' gaikō seiritsu to sono shūmatsu)," *CG XLV* (1967).

Nakamura Kōya 中村孝也, *Nihon kinseishi no seikaku*, Tōkyō: Banrikaku, 1941.

Nakamura Kōya, *Ieyasu no seiji keizai shinryō*, Tōkyō: Yūzankaku Shuppan, 1978.

Nan Shi 南史, 6 vols, Peking: Chung-hua shu-chh, 1975.

Nawa Kassho 那波活所, *Kassho ikō*, MS of Kyōto Daigaku.

Nawa Rodō 那波魯堂, *Gakumon genryū*, Japanese printed edn of 1799.

Nihon kyōikushi shiryō 日本教育史資料, 9 vols, rpt, Motoyama Yukihiro 本山幸彦, ed., Kyōto: Rinsen Shoten, 1970.

Nish, Ian & Charles Dunn, eds, *European studies on Japan*, Tenterden, Kent: Paul Norbury Publications, 1979.

Nishida Nagao 西田長男, "Fujiwara Seika den hoi zokuchō," in *Nihon shintōshi no kenkyū* VI, Tōkyō: Kōdansha, 1979, pp. 103-120.

Ōe Fumiki 大江文城, *Honpō jugakushi ronkō*, Osaka: Zenkoku Shobō, 1944.

Ōe Fumiki, *Honpō Shisho kunten narabi ni chūkai no shiteki kenkyū*, Tōkyō: Seki Shoin, 1935.

Okami Masao 岡見正雄 & Ōtsuka Mitsunobu 大塚光信, eds, *Shōmono shiryō shūsei*, 7 vols, Ōsaka: Seibundō, 1971-1976.

Pak Chongmyōng 朴鐘鳴, transl & ann., *Kan'yōroku. Chōsen jusha no Nihon yokuryūki*, Tōyō Bunko 440, Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1984.

Rand, Christopher Clark, *The Role of Military Thought in Early Chinese Intellectual History* (dissertation Harvard, 1977)

Sagara Tōru 相良亨, *Kinsei Nihon ni okeru Jukyō undō no keifu*, Tetsugaku Zensho, Tōkyō: Risōsha, 1965.

Schmidt, E., *Die Ersten Hoch- und Privatschulen Japans im Lichte zeitgenössischer Gesetze und Verfügungen*, doct. diss., München, 1956.

Seki Giichirō 関儀一郎, comp., *Nihon jurin sōsho*, 14 vols, rpt, Tōkyō: Hō Shuppan, 1978.

Shijing 詩經, *a concordance to the Shih Ching*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series, Suppl. no 9, rpt., Tōkyō: The Japan council for East Asian Studies, 1962.

Shimada Kenji 島田虔次, *Daigaku Chūyō*, Chūgoku Koten Sen IV, 7th impr., Tōkyō: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1972.

Shimada Kenji, *Shushigaku to Yōmeigaku*, Iwanami Shinsho, 6th impr., Tōkyō: Iwanami Shoten, 1971.

Shimizu Sadao 清水貞雄, *Shintō-shi*, 5th impr., Tōkyō: Kōseikaku, 1939.

Shōhei-shi 昌平志, see: Inuzuka Inami.

Shoke-ten zu 諸家點圖, in: *GR XVII*, p. 950-972.

Sōng Akhun 成樂熏, transl. & ann., *Yi Hwang, Hanguk ŭi sasang taejŏnjip X*, Seoul: Tonghwa Ch'ulp'ansa, 1972.

Spae, Joseph H., *Itō Jinsai, a philosopher, educator and Sinologist of the Tokugawa period*, Peking, 1948.

Sugiura Masaomi 杉浦正臣, *Jugaku genryū*, in *Nihon kyōikushi shiryō VIII*.

Suzuki Hiroshi 鈴木博, *Shūeki-shō no kokugogakuteki kenkyū*, 2 vols, Ōsaka: Seibundō, 1974.

Taira Shigemichi 平重道, *Kinsei Nihon shisōshi kenkyū*, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1969.

Taira Shigemichi, "Kinsei no shintō shinsō," *NST* XXXIX (*kaidai*).

Takahashi Miyuki 高橋美由紀, "Hayashi Razan no Shintō shisō," *Kikan Nihon shisōshi* V (1977).

Takahashi Shunjō 高橋俊乗, *Nihon kyōiku bunka shi*, Tōkyō: Dōbun Shoin, 1933.

Takano Tatsuyuki 高野辰之, "Ide yo, Reizei-ke denpon *Manyōshū* (Fujiwara Seika-hitsu *Manyōshū* dankan izu)," *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* IX, 6 (1932).

Takano Tatsuyuki, *Kobungaku tōsa*, Tōkyō: Ōokayama Shoten, 1934.

Takigawa Josui 瀧川恕水, *Sekigo-dō Shōzan Kyōken-sensei zenshū*, in *ZZGR* XIII.

Tamagake Hiroyuki 玉懸博之, "Matsunaga Sekigo no shisō to Kose Hoan no shisō," *NST* XXVIII.

Teng Ssu-yü, transl. & ann., *Yen Chih-t'ui, Family Instructions for the Yen Clan (Yen-shih chia-hsün)*, Leiden, 1968.

Teraishi Masamichi 寺石正路, *Nangaku-shi*, Tōkyō: Fuzanbō, 1934.

Toby, Ronald P., "Reopening the Question of *Sakoku*: Diplomacy in the Legitimation of the Tokugawa *Bakufu*," *JJS* III, 2 (1977).

Tokugawa Jikki 徳川實記, *Kokushi taikei*, rpt, 10 vols, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1981-1982.

Tomoeda Ryūtarō 友枝龍太郎, "Ri Taikei no shi-shichi ronben to ridō-setsu," *Han* VIII, 5/6 (1979).

- Tomoeda Ryūtarō, *Shushi no shisō keisei (kaiteiban)*, Tōkyō: Shunshusha, 1979.
- Totman, Conrad D., *Politics in the Tokugawa Bakufu, 1600-1843*, Harvard East Asian Series 30, Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
- Tsuchihashi, P. Y., *Japanese chronological tables from 601 to 1872*, Tokyo: Sophia University Press, 1952.
- Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, *Nihon bukkyō shi*, rpt, 10 vols, Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten, 1969-1970.
- Urabe Kanenao 卜部兼直, *Shintō yūrai ki*, in Hayakawa, comp., *Shintō sōsetsu*, p. 1.
- Utsunomiya Ton'an 宇都宮遯庵, *Nihon kokon jinbutsu shi*, 7 kan (Japanese printed edn of 1669).
- Vos, F., *Die Religionen Koreas, Die Religionen der Menschheit*, Bd. 22, Stuttgart, 1977.
- Wajima Yoshio 和島芳男, *Chūsei no jugaku*, Nihon Rekishi Sōsho 11, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1965.
- Wajima Yoshio, *Shōhei-kō to hangaku*, Nihon Rekishi Shinsho, Tōkyō: Shibundō, 1966.
- Wajima Yoshio, "Kinsei ni okeru Sō-gaku juyō no ichimondai (Razan no kōsho ni kansuru kokuso ikken o megutte)" in: Mori Katsumi-hakase Koki Kinenkai, ed., *Shigaku ronshū Taigai kankei to seiji bunka, dai-san*, Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1974.
- Washio Junkei 鷺尾順敬, comp., *Nihon shisō tōsō shiryō* 日本思想闘争資料, 10 vols, rpt, Tōkyō: Meicho Kankōkai, 1969-1970.

Watarai Ieyuki 度會家之, *Ruijū jingi hongen*, ZZGR I.

Webb, Herschell, *The Japanese Imperial Institution in the Tokugawa Period*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.

Wenck, Günther, "Sugawara no Michizane; Mythos und historische Gestalt," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Bd. 102, 2, Wiesbaden, 1952.

Wigmore, John Henry, *Law and Justice in Tokugawa Japan. Materials for the History of Japanese Law and Justice Under the Tokugawa Shogunate 1603-1867*, 9 vols, Tōkyō: Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai, 1967-1972 (continued: Tōkyō: The Japan Foundation, 1975-1986).

Xi Kang 嵇康, *Xi Zhongshan ji* 嵇中散集, Sibū congkan: jibu, vol. 587.

Xingli jingyi 性理精義, Li Guangdi 李光地 et al., comp., *Sibu beiyao*, 2nd impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1968.

Xingli daquan 性理大全, Hu Guang 胡廣 et al., comp., Liu Jiuwo, ed., 27 vols, Dawendang, s.a.

Yasuda Jirō 安田二郎, *Chūgoku kinsei shisō kenkyū*, 2nd edn, Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō, 1976.

Yi Ūrho 李乙浩, transl. & ann., *Sin Sukchu, Haedong chegukki; Kang Hang, Kanyangnok, Hanguk myōngjō taechōnjip*, Seoul: Taeyang Sōjōk, 1973.

Yi Wōnsik 李元植, "Meiwa-do (1764) no Chōsenkoku shinshi (Sei Daichū to no hitsudan shōshūshi-kan o chūshin ni)," *CG LXXXIV* (1977).

Yi Wōnsik, "Edo jidai ni okeru Chōsenkoku shinshi no iboku ni tsuite (bokuseki mokuroku)," *CG LXXXVIII* (1978).

Yijing yinde (fu biao xiao jingwen) 易經引得(附標校經文), *A Concordance to Yi Ching*, Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Series, Suppl. No. 10, Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1973.

Yoshida Kanetomo 吉田兼俱, *Shintō taii*, in Hayakawa, comp., *Shintō sōsetsu*, pp. 8-13.

Yoshikawa Koretari 吉川惟足, *Shintō taii chū*, in Hayakawa, comp., *Shintō sōsetsu*, pp. 141-146.

Yoshizawa Yoshinori 吉澤義則, "Wa ga kuni ni okeru Gaku Yō Shu-chū no ni-bunryū," in *Kokugo setsurei*, Kyōto: Ritsumeikan Shuppanbu, 1931.

Yuasa Yukihiro 湯淺幸孫, *Kinshi-roku*, 2 vols, Chūgoku Bunmei Sen IV-V, Tōkyō: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1972-1974.

Zhang Zai 張載, *Zhangzi quanshu, Sibu beiyao*, 2nd impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1968.

Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤, *Tongshu, Sibu beiyao*, 4th impr., Taipei: Zhonghua Shuju, 1974.

Zhu Xi 朱熹, *Shijing jizhuan*, 4 vols, Shanghai: Yiwēn Shangwū Yīnshūguān, 1929.

Zhu Xi, *Sishu changju jizhu*, Taipei: Yiwēn Shangwū Yīnshūguān, 1969.

Zoku gunsho ruijū 續群書類從, 86 vols, Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha, 1897-1912 (vols 1-19); continued by Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, 1923-1987 (vol. 20-66).

Zoku-zoku gunsho ruijū, 17 vols, Zokugunshoruijū Kanseikai, comp., Tokyo: Kokusho Kankō, 1906-1909.