

Special Issue 【專題論文】

Itō Jinsai and the Cross-Cultural Development of
Neo-Confucianism: The Ancient Meaning School
and the Rise of Restorationism
伊藤仁齋與理學的跨文化發展
——復古主義與日本的古義學派

Q. Edward WANG
王晴佳*

Keywords: East Asian Neo-Confucianism, Itō Jinsai, Chen Chun, Wang
Yangming,
Gomō jigi, Xingli ziyi

關鍵詞：東亞儒學、伊藤仁齋、陳淳、王陽明、《論孟字義》、
《性理字義》

* Professor of History, Rowan University; Changjiang Professor, Peking University.

Abstract

A case study of Itō Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* (The Meaning of Terms in the *Analects* and *Mencius* 論孟字義) and its relationship with Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi* (The Meanings of Neo-Confucian Terms 性理字義), this article traces and analyzes the cross-cultural development of Neo-Confucian learning in East Asia during the 17th and 18th centuries. This development was characterized by a restorationist interest, calling for a return to the original in Confucian study and circumventing the influence of the Cheng-Zhu School. The author argues that while Itō Jinsai and his Ancient Meaning School were often given the credit for pioneering the effort, this restorationism actually had already emerged in Ming China and Chōsen Korea, as shown, for instance, in the writings of Wang Yangming, his Mind-Heart School and Wang's critics such as Luo Qinchun. Thus, there was a certain connection between Jinsai's Ancient Meaning School and Ming Confucian learning, for through the Korean-Japanese War, Japanese scholars had gained access to many Confucian texts from both Korea and China, which possibly included Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi*. However, though Jinsai followed Chen's format in writing his *Gomō jigi*, he also departed from Chen because the two apparently were motivated by a different interest. The article also discusses the later development of this restorationism in the 18th century and concludes that though Jinsai's work was anterior to Qing evidential learning, it had little tangible bearing on Qing scholars such as Dai Zhen.

摘要

本文以伊藤仁齋的《論孟字義》與陳淳的《性理字義》之關係為中心，討論東亞儒學在十七、十八世紀的跨文化發展。這一發展以復古主義為特徵，希圖繞開程朱理學的傳統，回歸原典，直接研究古代儒學典籍。作者指出，雖然伊藤仁齋及其古義學派常被視為這一復古主義的先驅，但其實在明代中國和朝鮮王國，相似的復古主義理念和實踐已經出現。在王陽明的學派及其批評者羅欽順的著作中，均可見其端倪。所以，仁齋的古義學派與明代儒學之間，存在一定的聯繫。因為在十六世紀的日朝戰爭中，有不少中國和朝鮮的儒學著作，流入日本，其中就可能包括陳淳的《性理字義》。但是，雖然仁齋的《論孟字義》，沿襲了《性理字義》的形式，但其中的差別也十分明顯，因為著者的志趣明顯不同。文章還討論了文化復古主義在十八世紀的進一步發展，並指出雖然仁齋的思想早於清代考證學，但對清代學者包括戴震，並無多大直接的影響。

The Question

For students of Neo-Confucianism, it has been well known that during the 17th and the 18th centuries, there emerged a trend of restorationism, or revivalism, that gradually swept across East Asia. According to Wm. Theodore de Bary, this trend characterized an important change in the spread of Neo-Confucian learning from China to Korea and finally to Japan.¹ More importantly, as common wisdom goes, it was in Japan, the latest of the three that embraced Neo-Confucianism, where this restorationism first emerged. Indeed, the call for a return to the original Confucian canon, and to revive and restore classical Confucian learning in the pre-Han and Han period, seemed to be first made by Itō Jinsai (1627-1705), his confrere Yamaga Sokō (山鹿素行1622-85) and his critic and follower Ogyū Sorai (荻生徂徠1666-1728). While their approaches varied notably, what they preached and practiced amounted to a concerted endeavor to promote classical Confucianism, or Ancient Learning (*kogaku* 古学), and criticize, reject Neo-Confucianism from the Song onward. Their pursuit and agenda bore striking resemblance to that of "evidential learning" (*kaojuxue* 考據學) in early and mid Qing China of the 18th century. As an influential intellectual development, evidential learning called for a comprehensive and critical overhaul of the Chinese literary tradition. Its influence was not only resonated well into 20th century China, but also well present in Japanese historiography and intellectual life from the 18th century onward.² Since the Ancient Learning

1 The term "restorationist" is coined by William Theodore de Bary in his "Some Common Tendencies in Neo-Confucianism," in David Nivison and Arthur Wright (eds.) *Confucianism in Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 25-49, especially pp. 34-35. In his recent study of the rise of Neo-Confucianism in the Song period, YÜ Ying-Shih analyzes the attempt by Zhu Xi and others to restore the "Three Dynasties" (*sandai* 三代) in ancient China as a political and cultural ideal in the Neo-Confucian movement. See his *Zhu Xi de lishi shijie: Songdai shidai fu zhengzhi wenhua de yanjiu* (The Historical World of Zhu Xi: A Study of the Political Culture of Song Literati-Officials 朱熹的歷史世界：宋代士大夫政治文化的研究), 2 vols (Taipei: Yunchen wenhua chubanshe, 2003).

2 See, for example, Ōba Osamu 大庭脩's "Shin jidai no ni-chū bunka kōryū 清時代の日中文化交

School, which had risen in the 17th century, predated Qing evidential learning for about a century, scholars have speculated on the possibility of its being the precursor of evidential learning. They have argued that the Japanese Ancient Learning School had inspired Qing evidential scholars to launch their project.³

More specifically, since Itō Jinsai, the founder of the Ancient Meaning School—a branch of the Ancient Learning school, and Dai Zhen (戴震 1724-77), the prominent Qing evidential scholar, both studied attentively the *Mencius* and their approaches and methods in glossing and interpreting the text were similar, some Japanese scholars have speculated that Dai might have read Itō's work and copied his ideas and approach.⁴ Others however have disagreed, such as YŪ Ying-Shih 余英時, who argue that the rise of restorationism, or a shift of interest from spirituality to scholarship, amounted to a natural and logical development of Neo-Confucian learning in both Japan and China. Thus, that Jinsai and Dai Zhen took a similar approach to the study of the *Mencius* and other Confucian classics was simply a coincidence (*qiaohe* 巧合), even though this coincidence was a significant intellectual change in both countries.⁵ Consider that Jinsai's works,

流(The cultural exchange between Japan and China during the Qing period)," in Ōba Osamu and Wang Xiaoqiu 王曉秋 (eds.) *Reikishi* 歷史, *Ni-chū bunka kōryū shi sōsho* 日中文化交流史叢書, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Osamu Ohba, 1995), pp. 280-282 and John S. Brownlee, *Japanese Historians and the National Myths, 1600-1945* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1998), passim.

- 3 See, for example, Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga* 仁齋・徂徠・宣長 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1975), p. 16.
- 4 See Aoki Kaizō 青木晦蔵, "Itō Jinsai to Tai Tōgen" (Itō Jinsai and Dai Dongyuan 伊藤仁齋と戴東原), *Shibun* (斯文), 8:1 (1926), pp. 21-49; 8:2 (1926), pp. 16-43; 8:4 (1926), pp. 21-27; 8:8 (1926); pp. 25-30; 9:1 (1927), pp. 19-25; 9:2 (1927), pp. 21-31.
- 5 YŪ Ying-Shih, *Lun Dai Zhen yu Zhang Xuecheng* (On Dai Zhen and Zhang Xuecheng 論戴震與章學誠) (Hong Kong: Longmen shudian, 1976), pp. 185-196. A similar argument has been made by Zhu Qianzhi 朱謙之, Wang Jiahua 王家驊 and others. A brief discussion of their views is offered in Li Suping 李璉平's *Shengren yu wushi: zhongri chuantong wenhua yu xiandaihua zhi bijiao* (Sages and warriors: a comparative study of Chinese and Japanese cultural traditions and modernizations 聖人與武士：中日傳統文化與現代化之比較) (Beijing: Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe, 1992), p. 80. For the ebb and flow of intellectualism in Neo-Confucianism, see YŪ Ying-Shih, *Lishi yu sixiang* (History and Ideas 歷史與思想) (Taipei: Lianjing, 1976), passim.

the *Rongo kogi* (Ancient Meanings of the *Analects* 論語古義), the *Mōshi kogi* (Ancient Meanings of the *Mencius* 孟子古義) and more importantly, the *Gomō jiggi* (The Meaning of Terms in the *Analects* and *Mencius* 論孟字義) on which Dai Zhen allegedly patterned to work on his *Mengzi ziyi shuzheng* (An Evidential Study of the Meaning of the Terms in the *Mencius* 孟子字義疏證), were not published until the early 18th century in Japan, it seems less likely that Dai could have read and plagiarized Jinsai's ideas in writing the *Mengzi ziyi shuzheng*, a work which he himself regarded as the epitome of his scholarship. As studies have shown, back in those times, it usually took several decades for books to transfer from one country to another.⁶ However, whether or not Jinsai had influenced Dai Zhen, it remains important to explore how and why Itō Jinsai and Dai Zhen both took an interest in pre-Han Confucian texts such as the *Mencius* and adopted a similar hermeneutic method. In writing this article, I intend to trace and examine the causes for Jinsai to champion classical Confucianism and the possible connection between his restorationist outlook and the developments of Neo-Confucianism in both Ming China and Chōsen Korea.

Over the past few decades, thanks to Theodore de Bary's instrumental role in promoting the study of Neo-Confucianism, followed by scholars of both East Asia and Euro-America, we have gained a good knowledge and understanding regarding the cross-cultural development of Neo-Confucianism in East Asia. Important works have appeared that compare and analyze similar and different trajectories of development of Neo-Confucianism in China, Korea and Japan. Abe Yoshio 阿部吉雄, for example, published his works as early as the 1960s and offered a contour of the variances and connections among the schools of Neo-Confucian learning in the region.⁷ With respect to Itō Jinsai's Ancient Meaning

6 Nakayama Kyūshirō 中山久四郎, "Kōshōgaku gaisetsu" (An introduction to evidential learning 考證學概説), *Kinsei Nihon no jugaku* (Confucianism in early modern Japan 近世日本の儒學) (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1939), p. 729. Also, Robert Backus, "The Kansei Prohibition of Heterodoxy and Its Effects on Education," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 39, 1 (Jun., 1979), p. 70.

7 Abe Yoshio, "Development of Neo-Confucianism in Japan, Korea and China: A Comparative Study," *Acta Asiatica*, no. 19 (1970), pp. 16-39. A more extensive version of his is in Japanese:

School and its interactions with the cross-cultural developments in Ming China and Chōsen Korea, John Allen Tucker has provided us with a translation of Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* and discussed its resemblance to Chen Chun's (陳淳 1159-1223) *Xingli ziyi* (The Meanings of Neo-Confucian Terms 性理字義).⁸ A Song text, the *Xingli ziyi* reached Japan in the early 17th century via the Korean-Japanese War (1592-1593, 1597-1598), in which the Japanese army captured Confucian scholars and texts, written in Chinese, from Korea. In fact, as Tucker argues, the *Xingli ziyi* not only exerted great influence on Jinsai, but it also became a template, in the form of lexicography, for many Jinsai's contemporaries to work out Confucianist texts in Japan.⁹ Tucker's study thus connects Jinsai's work to the developments of Neo-Confucianism in China and Korea. It also raises interesting questions on the originality and significance of Jinsai's philosophy and methodology, and that of the Ancient Learning School in general, in reorienting Neo-Confucianism in East Asia. In this study, I will offer more discussions on the rise of Jinsai's Ancient Meaning School against the backdrop of various developments of Neo-Confucianism in Ming China and Chōsen Korea. I will also discuss the methodological similarities between Jinsai's Ancient Meaning School and the prototypical evidential research by Ming scholars, an area to which Tucker and others have paid less attention, in order to gain a better understanding of the origins and causes of the restorationist dynamics in the Neo-Confucian intellectual tradition.

Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen (Japan's Zhu Xi Neo-Confucianism and Korea 日本朱子学と朝鮮) (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppansha, 1965).

8 John Allen Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi and the Philosophical Definition of Early Modern Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). For a general discussion on the exegetical work by Chinese and Japanese scholars on the "Four Books," see Chun-Chien Huang 黃俊傑 (ed.) *Zhongri 'sishu' quanshi chuantong chutan* 中日'四書'詮釋傳統初探 (Taipei: Taiwan University Press, 2004).

9 In addition to his discussion of the connection between the *Gomō jigi* and the *Xingli ziyi* in his introduction to the English translation of the *Gomō jigi*, John Tucker has also examined other similar lexicographical works in his "Pei-hsi's 'tzu-i' and the Rise of Tokugawa Philosophical Lexicography", Ph. D. dissertation (Columbia University, 1990).

The Context

The questions regarding Itō Jinsai's indebtedness to Ming and Chōsen scholars in developing his philosophy and methodology were raised long before. From the 18th and through most of the 19th centuries, Japanese scholars readily identified and acknowledged that Jinsai's belief in the *qi* (氣 ether, generative force, or material force) ontology and his advocacy of Ancient Learning had been inspired by the works of Wu Tinghan (吳廷翰 1491-1559), of which both Jinsai and his son were fond. Dazai Shundai (太宰春台 1680-1747), for example, a disciple of Ogyū Sorai who also had considerable respect for Jinsai, observed that it was Wu Tinghan who inspired and enlightened Jinsai. This assessment, by and large, was concurred by Bitō Jishū (尾藤二洲 1747-1813) and Ōta Kinjō (大田錦城 1765-1825). In his comprehensive study of the Ancient Learning School published in 1902, Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 evaluated these views as well as the opposing view proposed by Shimada Chōrei (島田重礼 1838-98). He noted many similarities between Jinsai's and Wu Tinghan's ideas and considered the possibility that Jinsai might be indebted to Wu for developing his own ideas. But in the end, echoing Shimada, Inoue decided to commend Jinsai's originality (*dokusō sei* 獨創性) and argued that the similarities between him and Wu Tianhan were a mere coincidence (*ana* 暗合).¹⁰ In his comparative study of Itō Jinsai and Dai Zhen, YÜ Ying-Shih also notes Jinsai's indebtedness to Ming scholarship. Through an extensive textual analysis, Yü demonstrates that the *qi* theory prevailing from the mid-Ming was well present in Jinsai's view of the world and

10 Inoue Tetsujirō, *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku* (The Philosophy of the Ancient Learning school in Japan 日本古學派之哲學) (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1902), pp. 197ff. Inoue used the English word "suggest" in describing Wu's influence on Jinsai, namely Wu "suggested" the ideas to Jinsai. But he ultimately concluded that Jinsai's ideas were original. It should be noted that Inoue and his predecessor Shimada Chōrei's refusal of Jinsai being inspired by Ming scholars occurred in the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries when Japan had become more assertive about its own culture vis-à-vis Chinese culture after the Sino-Japanese War of 1895. Abe Yoshio, writing after WWII however, stated that it was unnecessary for Inoue Tetsujirō and others to deny the Ming influence, such as Wu Tinghan's works on Jinsai, See his *Nihon Shushigaku to Chōsen*, p. 524.

universe.¹¹ At the outset of his *Gomō jigī*, the text we shall focus on below, Jinsai indeed declared "a unitary generative force (*ichigenki*一元氣) pervades all heaven and earth. Sometimes it exists as *yin*, sometimes as *yang*."¹² This statement was almost a verbatim reiteration of Wu Tinghan's. Yet Wu was not the first, nor the only one who embraced this *qi* monism at his time. Many acclaimed Ming Neo-Confucians, including Luo Qinsun (羅欽順1465-1547) and Wang Tingxiang (王廷相1474-1544), whom Wu admired enormously, had advocated it earlier.

How important was Jinsai's acceptance of the *qi* ontology? How familiar was he with the developments in Ming Neo-Confucianism? And how did the *qi* theory influence his decision to call for a return to classical Confucianism, or Ancient Learning? To answer these questions, we may want to take a brief look at the rise of Neo-Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan (1603-1868). At the beginning of this period, Japan was unified under the bakufu government, which gave rise to new economic, commercial and cultural growth. It was regarded as a "golden age" for the advance of Confucianism because it was during this time that Confucianism, or Neo-Confucianism, gradually received recognition from the government and eventually replaced Zen Buddhism to become an official ideology. Indeed, while Confucius' *Analects* reached Japan as early as the 3rd century, Confucianism paled in comparison with the influence of Buddhism. During the 13th century when some of Zhu Xi's (朱熹1130-1200) works made their way to Japan, they were regarded as a variance of Chan/Zen Buddhism and housed mostly in Zen Buddhist monasteries. It was not until the end of the 16th century when Japan invaded Korea that a host of Confucian texts were (re)introduced to the country. Via the help of captive Korean Confucian scholars, some Japanese began to engage in a serious study of Confucianism that resulted in a conversion from Buddhism to Confucianism. Fujiwara Seika (藤原惺窩1561-1619) and his student Hayashi Razan (林羅山1583-1657) were prime

11 Yü, *Lun Dai Zhen yu Zhang Xuecheng*, pp. 186-187.

12 Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigī*, p. 71.

examples of this conversion, for both of them began as Buddhists only to renounce Buddhism after discovering Confucianism. As first generation *jusha* (儒者 Confucians) they, especially Razan, provided much needed political services to the bakufu government. In return, they received government patronage for their teaching and preaching of Confucian learning. Razan, for instance, established a Confucian school which was to take the name Sage's Hall (*Seidō* 聖堂) and played an instrumental role in promoting Confucian teaching in Tokugawa Japan.¹³

Thus, as Abe Yoshio notes, while the Korean-Japanese War seriously strained the two countries' relations, it "stimulated the reformation of thought in Japan."¹⁴ This "reformation" led Japanese to embark on a journey of discovering Confucianism, occasioning a golden age for the flourish of Confucian learning in the Tokugawa period. Since this discovery was via the teachings of Korean scholars and readings of the Confucian texts selected and glossed by Korean scholars, it inevitably bore influences of Korean Confucian scholarship, as revealed in Abe's study. Fujiwara Seika, for example, was fond of using the *Yanping dawen* (Conversations between Li Tong and Zhu Xi 延平答問), annotated and recommended by Yi T'oegye's (李退溪 1501-70), a leading Korean Neo-Confucian scholar. Both T'oegye and Seika emphasized the importance of "abiding in reverence and plumbing the principle" (C. *jujing qiongli*; J. *kyokei kyūri* 居敬窮理) because Li Tong (李侗 1093-1163), Zhu Xi's teacher, had stressed that quiet-sitting (C. *jingzuo*; J. *seiza* 靜坐) be the way to approach and realize sagehood. This emphasis was amplified by Yamazaki Ansai (山崎闇齋 1618-82) and his disciples in the Kimon 崎門 School, who put it into practice and pursued mental training for the purpose of fathoming *li* 理 (principle) in a

13 For the rise of Neo-Confucianism and the status of *jusha* in Tokugawa Japan, see John W. Hall, "The Confucian Teacher in Tokugawa Japan," in David S. Nivison and Arthur F. Wright (eds.) *Confucianism in Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 268-301. For the situation of Neo-Confucianism in Tokugawa period in general, see Marius Jansen, *China in the Tokugawa World* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992) and Peter Nosco (ed.), *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984).

14 Abe, "Neo-Confucianism in Japan, Korea and China," p. 17.

sudden, para-religious moment of epiphany. Yi T'oegye, a towering figure in teaching Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism in Korea, kept his heightened vigilance against other "heretic" factions in Confucian teachings. Ansai and his followers strove to achieve the same and establish and propagate their practices of Confucianism as the orthodoxy in Japan.

Of course, Seika did not only study the texts recommended by Yi T'oegye--he also read, for example, the works of Lin Chaoen's (林朝恩 1517-98), a Ming Confucian.¹⁵ Ansai and his Kimon pupils were also exposed to other propositions advanced by scholars in Ming China and Chōsen Korea. However, they shared Yi T'oegye's interest in upholding the Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucian orthodoxy and despised any texts that supposedly deviated from it. Yet the fact was that by the 17th century, there had been many notable changes occurring not only in Neo-Confucianism but also within the Cheng-Zhu School. The orthodoxy defined and defended by Yi T'oegye and his followers was simply one among many with respect to interpreting Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucian philosophy. What distinguished Yi and his disciples from others was that they privileged *li* as both an ontological and epistemological concept.¹⁶ Ansai and his Kimon School, with Seika as their precursor, could be regarded as an extension of this Korean school in Japan. However, through the course from the Song to the Ming, there had been an increased interest in the *qi* ontology among Chinese Neo-Confucians, modifying, if not opposing, the more traditional emphasis on observing the *li*. It was not only embraced by Luo Qinshun, an outspoken critic of Wang Yangming (王陽明 1472-1528) and his Mind-Heart School (*xinxue* 心學), but Wang himself and his disciples were not entirely against the *qi* either. Moreover, as mentioned

15 William Theodore de Bary, "Sagehood as a Secular and Spiritual Ideal in Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism," in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (eds.) *Principle and Practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), pp. 132-133.

16 As Key Yang and Gregory Henderson show in their article, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 18, 1-2 (1958-1959), pp. 81-101; 259-276, factionalism characterized the development of Neo-Confucianism in Chōsen Korea. To some extent, it was also the characteristic of Neo-Confucianism in Ming China. This characteristic seemed to have also appeared in mid and late Tokugawa Japan.

before, the *qi* theory also enthralled Wang Tingxiang and Wu Tinghan who were more or less independent in their thoughts. From the 16th century, observed Irene Bloom, thus the *qi* theory "represented a broadly based movement."¹⁷ In his extensive study of *qi* philosophy, Yamanoi Yū 山井湧 regarded its rise and currency as an important trend of development in Neo-Confucianism in Ming and Qing China.¹⁸ The popularity of the *qi* theory suggested that though Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, or *lixue* 理學 (the learning of the principle), was extolled as the official orthodoxy in the Ming, it had gradually lost its vitality and attraction among many Ming Confucian scholars. This fact has been noted by Chen Lai 陳來, who credits Yi T'oegye with reinvigorating the potency of the Cheng-Zhu School by stressing the obtainment of the *li*. Yet Yi's influence was seen mostly in Korea and Japan, not in China.¹⁹

If the divide between the *qi* and *li* theories weakened the strength of Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, Zhu Xi himself might as well be responsible for it. His own attitude toward *qi* and *li*, though unambiguous, was nevertheless dualistic. Zhu took both of them as important and inseparable concepts in constructing his cosmology, though he declared that *li* was prior to *qi*. Nonetheless, his dualism opened the door to different interpretations among his followers as well as his critics. In fact, in his *Xingli ziyi*, Chen Chun, Zhu Xi's last disciple, seemed to have accorded more attention and value to *qi* in expounding Neo-Confucian ontology. While championing the *qi* theory, Luo Qinsun thus never regarded his position as a deviation from Zhu Xi's philosophy. Instead, Luo considered

17 Irene Bloom, "On the 'Abstraction' of Ming Thought: Some Concrete Evidence from the Philosophy of Lo Ch'in-shun," in *Principle and Practicality*, p. 106. Li Suping has done a comparative study of the development of *qi* philosophy in Ming-Qing China and Tokugawa Japan. See her *Shengren yu wushi*, pp. 65-96.

18 Yamanoi Yū, "Min-Shin jidai ni okeru 'ki' no tetsugaku" (The philosophy of *qi* in the Ming-Qing period 明清時代における「気」の哲学), *Tetsugaku zasshi* 哲学雑誌, 46, 711 (1951), pp. 82-103.

19 Chen Lai, *SongMing lixue* (Neo-Confucianism in the Song and Ming 宋明理學) (Shenyang: Liaoning jiaoyu chubanshe, 1991), p. 343.

himself, as well as by his many contemporaries, a defender of the Cheng-Zhu tradition against the inroads made by the Wang Yangming School in Ming China.

Hayashi Razan occupied a similar position to Luo Qinshu's in Tokugawa Japan. A principal patron of Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, he nonetheless showed a keen interest in the *qi* theory. He was very fond of Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi*, and to some degree, also Luo Qinshun's *Kunzhiji* (Notes on Knowledge Painfully Required 困知記), both of them were among the texts imported to and well received in Japan. His interest in the *qi* theory, note Irene Bloom and Theodore de Bary, suggested the influence of Luo Qinshun and other Ming and Chōsen scholars; the latter might include Yi Yulgok (李栗谷 1536-84), who began as a student of Yi T'oegy'e's only to become a chief proponent of the *qi* theory later in Korea. Connected loosely with Razan and his Kyoto School, Itō Jinsai's interest in the *qi* theory seemed to have drawn on both Chinese and Japanese influences. Jinsai not only read the *Kunzhiji*, but he also used, as we shall discuss below, the *Xingli ziyi* as a model for writing the *Gomō jigi*.²⁰ In a word, at the time when Jinsai began his career, the *qi* theory already became a viable and popular alternative to Confucian scholars for their appreciation and propagation of Neo-Confucianism in East Asia.

But different from Ming China, wherein the Wang Yangming School's Mind-Heart learning at a time gained an upper hand over the Cheng-Zhu School, Razan's interest in *qi* and Seika and Ansai's interest in *li* represented two branches of the *Shushigaku* (Zhu Xi's learning 朱子学), hence both extended Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism in Japan. In other words, since the Wang Yangming (*Yōmeigaku* 陽明学) School did not have a large following until the late Tokugawa period, Confucian factions all seemed to have derived from the Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucian tradition in Japan. Jinsai's advocacy of the *qi* theory and Ancient Learning was no exception. If the emphases on *qi* or *li* represented "two strains of Neo-Confucian thought" in *Shushigaku*, both of them had

20 Irene Bloom, "Philosophy of Lo Ch'in-shun," p. 112; Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, passim.

important implications in ontology and epistemology.²¹ Jinsai's call for a return to classical Confucian canons extended the epistemology of the *qi* theory. It was an outgrowth of his methodological application of the *qi* theory in the study of Confucianism. In her study of the *qi* philosophy of Luo Qinchun, Irene Bloom has observed a connection between the advocacy of the *qi* theory and the interest in empirical study. "For empiricism," Bloom writes, "has no proper object until full and independent reality is accorded to concrete things, and its method is inevitably thwarted until the problem of causality is approached as distinct from the concerns of ethics."²² This connection helped explain Jinsai's interest in book knowledge, or Ancient Learning. It also helped, as Bloom has touched upon, to explain the similarity of restorationism between Jinsai's Ancient Learning School and Qing evidential learning, because many evidential scholars, most notably Dai Zhen, were proponents of the *qi* theory.

The Text

To examine Jinsai's relation with Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism and how this relationship prepared him to call for Ancient Learning, we may want to compare the *Gomō jigū* with its model—the *Xingli ziyi*. As a Song text authored by Zhu Xi's disciple, the *Xingli ziyi* provided an indispensable guide for the Japanese in studying Confucianism. It also introduced them to the tradition of lexicographical writing in Confucian learning. After Razan annotated and supplied it with a *kanbun* 漢文punctuation, the *Xingli ziyi* was studied and copied by other scholars. But their opinions varied from one to another. Following Yi T'oegye's criticism, for example, Ansai and his disciples grew to

21 Cf. William Theodore de Bary, "Sagehood as a Secular and Spiritual Ideal in Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism," pp. 137f. A more detailed discussion is in his *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981), pp. 187-216.

22 Irene Bloom, "Philosophy of Lo Ch'in-shun," p. 76.

dislike the *Xingli ziyi*, deeming it "shallow" and "uninteresting."²³ They produced texts that patterned on its style, whereas were critical of its content. Yamaga Sokō, Jinsai's comrade in founding the Ancient Learning School, wrote the *Seikyō yōroku* (Essence of the Sagely Confucian Teachings 聖教要録), using a similar format to promote the study of original Confucian canons.²⁴

Thus, it seems hardly surprising that Jinsai also adopted the format of the *Xingli ziyi* in writing the *Gomō jigī*. Since the *Xingli ziyi* was written in a vernacular style, it ought to be particularly attractive to Jinsai. For, first of all, as a second generation *jusha*, Jinsai, according to Yoshikawa Kōjirō 吉川幸次郎, had a superb linguistic talent that enabled him to become very proficient in both written and spoken Chinese. His predecessor Hayashi Razan, by contrast, actually had some trouble understanding colloquial Chinese.²⁵ Secondly, derived from his lectures to students, the *Xingli ziyi* adopted a conversational style, aiming to reach the general public. This style must have attracted Jinsai because his *Gomō jigī* was written avowedly for the *chōnin* 町人, or the townspeople.²⁶ It was thus not coincidental that Jinsai decided to model on Chen Chun's style and format in writing the *Gomō jigī*. Chen's work helped him to accomplish his intended purpose for the *Gomō jigī* as well as to demonstrate his language proficiency and a better understanding of the work than Razan and others did.

The *Gomō jigī* was also structured similarly to that of the *Xingli ziyi*. Chen Chun in the *Xingli ziyi* discussed 26 key terms in Neo-Confucianism, such as Dao, *ming* (命 mandate; destiny), *de* (德 virtue), *qing* (情 feelings), *li* and *xing* (性 mind, nature), almost all of them reappeared in the *Gomō jigī*, with only slight variations and few exceptions. There were also a dozen of new additions in the

23 See Okada Takehiko, "Practical Learning in the Chu Hsi School: Yamazaki Ansai and Kaibara Ekken," *Principle and Practicality*, p. 237.

24 Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigī*, pp. 20-22.

25 Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 7-8.

26 Actually, Chen Chun's writing was known to be accessible to the common people. This quality was recognized by the editors of Chen's *Beixi daquanji* (Great collections of Chen Chun 北溪大全集) (Taipei: Siku quanshu, reprint, n.d.). See preface, vol. 1.

Gomō jigi. Having eliminated a few from the *Xingli ziyi*, Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* came to a total of 30 terms. In addition, Jinsai's writing of the *Gomō jigi* clearly suggests a connection between the two texts. Not only did Jinsai cite and criticize Chen Chun's work a few times in the *Gomō jigi*, but he also, as the *Jinsai Nikki* (Jinsai's Diary 仁齋日記) revealed, used the *Xingli ziyi* as a text for his lectures in the *Kogidō* 古義堂, a school he established in Kyoto, beginning in 1682. His writing of the *Gomō jigi* coincided with his teaching, which was completed in the following year.²⁷

However, that the *Gomō jigi* resembles the *Xingli ziyi* in their selections of terms alone does not suffice to support the claim, made by some Japanese scholars, that Jinsai's text simply "follow" (*tōshū* 踏襲) Chen Chun's, unless we understand the word *tōshū* strictly in stylistic terms.²⁸ Commenting on Chen Chun's selections in his *Xingli ziyi*, Wing-Tsit Chan pointed out that we cannot credit Chen Chun for choosing these terms. "In fact," Chan wrote, "not a single one can be considered his own." This is because not only had most of these terms appeared in the Confucian classics, but they also acquired a new meaning and importance via the work of the Song Neo-Confucians, ranging from Zhou Dunyi (周敦頤 1017-73), the Cheng brothers, Zhang Zai (張載 1020-77) to Zhu Xi, Chen Chun's teacher.²⁹ Chan's observation is incisive because it helps us to see and identify more clearly the differences and similarities between Chen Chun and Itō Jinsai, as well as between Jinsai and Dai Zhen. In other words, we cannot

27 Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, p. 4, note 3. It should be noted that the version of the *Xingli ziyi* Jinsai used in his lectures was most likely not the same one we see today, the *Beixi ziyi* 北溪字義 by Chen Chun (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983), nor the one used by Wing-Tsit Chan in his translation, *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained (The Pei-hsi tzu-i)* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986). For a detailed discussion on their differences, see John A. Tucker's dissertation, "Pei-hsi's 'tzu-i' and the Rise of Tokugawa Philosophical Lexicography." Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* is included in Inoue Tetsujirō and Kanie Yoshimaru 蟹江義丸 (eds.) *Nihon rinri ihen* (Collected Works on Japanese Ethics 日本倫理彙編) (Tokyo: Ikuseikai, 1901), vol. 5, pp. 9-73.

28 Kimura Eiichi 木村英一 is the one who said that Jinsai followed (*tōshū*) Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi* in writing the *Gomō jigi*. See Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, p. 7, note 11. But the word "tōshū" can be also understood as "to pattern on," which will stress the similarity between Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* and Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi* in format, not necessarily in content.

29 Wing-Tsit Chan, *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained*, p. 13.

make a claim about Jinsai's emulation of Chen Chun simply because their works appeared to have the same format, just as we cannot suspect that Dai Zhen copied Jinsai because the two chose to discuss the same group of concepts.

Indeed, while adopting the form of lexicography, Jinsai considered Chen Chun more a foe than a friend. First, though the key terms discussed in their works overlapped one another, they were arranged in a very different order. In translating the *Xingli ziyi* into English, Wing-Tsit Chan noted that Chen Chun established a hierarchical order of importance in his arrangement of the terms. To be sure, this hierarchy was not exactly the same as that of Zhu Xi's *Zhuzi yulei* (Classified Conversations of Zhu Xi 朱子語類), but it nevertheless showed Chen's "commitment" to his teacher's interpretative framework.³⁰ This commitment was manifest in Chen's division of the two chapters in the *Xingli ziyi*. In the first chapter, he chose to discuss the terms that related most closely to one's moral cultivation, such as *xing*, *xin* (心), *qing*, *cheng* (誠 sincerity) and *jing* (敬 reverence), mirroring the Song Neo-Confucian emphasis on introspection. The second chapter, by contrast, dealt mostly with extroverted terms that, though outside one's mind, had a direct impact on one's introspective progress. These terms were Dao, *li*, *taiji* (太極 supreme ultimate), *liyue* (禮樂 rites and music) and so on. Thus, the structure of the *Xingli ziyi* reflected and extended Zhu Xi's dualistic approach to Confucianism.

Jinsai's *Gomō jigi*, by contrast, does not follow this dualistic structure, nor does it show a discernible pattern either. His arrangement of the two chapters in the *Gomō jigi* actually shows a certain randomness, which may be deliberate given his intention to challenge Zhu Xi's dualism. In his first chapter, he discusses not only the extroverted terms like Dao, *li*, but also the introverted terms like *xing*, *qing* and *xin*. In the second chapter, although he discusses *jing* and *cheng*, he has also added other new terms such as *xue* (學 learning), *shengxian* (聖賢 sages and worthies), *wangba* (王霸 true kings and hegemon)

30 Ibid., pp. 12-22. Also, Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, p. 23.

and those about the Five Classics. This randomness indicates, on the one hand, that Jinsai may want to make a direct connection between one's introspection with the external, material force in nature. On the other hand, his additions in the second chapter on the Five Classics and the *xue* show his intention to rest the understanding of Confucianism on the study of the Confucian canons, thus manifesting an empirical and scholarly approach. In sum, the structure of Jinsai's *Gomō jigi* suggests two things. One is Jinsai's effort to undermine and unravel the Song Neo-Confucian discursive system. The other is his interest in intellectualism, or book knowledge, which corresponded squarely to his advocacy of Ancient Learning, or classical Confucianism.

The second difference between the two texts is shown in Jinsai's modifications of the existing terms in the *Xingli ziyi*. By comparing the *Xingli ziyi* with the *Zhuzi yulei*, Wing-Tsit Chan noticed that different from Zhu Xi, or more precisely, amplifying Zhu's interest in the Source (*yuantou*源頭) of *li* and Dao, Chen Chun developed a tendency to locate the Source in nature, or in Heaven. In his *Xingli ziyi*, pointed out by Chan, the terms *tianli*天理, *tiandao*天道, and *tianming*天道 appeared frequently.³¹ Together with his augmented interest in the *qi*, Chen definitely showed a naturalist approach to the interpretation of Confucianism. It emphasized vitalism and organism in the universe. In the *Gomō jigi*, Jinsai extended this naturalist approach by establishing such categories as *tiandao* and *tianming*, which were important but not treated as independent categories in the *Xingli ziyi*. Yet Jinsai's intention was not simply to follow Chen Chun's interest in the Source. Rather, he sought to dismantle the Song Neo-Confucian metaphysics by separating *tian* from Dao, or *tian* from *ming*. More accurately, his intention was to separate the sphere of the heaven from that of humanity. In his opinion, the word *tiandao* simply described the change in the *tian*, such as the increase or decrease of either the yin or the yang. And the yin and yang were manifestations of the *qi*, the unitary generative

31 Wing-Tsit Chan, *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained*, pp. 20-21.

force, in the universe. In the same vein, Jinsai criticized Chen Chun's explanation of *ming*. He refused to accept Chen's dualism that *ming* could be understood either in terms of *qi* or in terms of *li*. This further proved his intention of separating the spheres between heaven and humanity.

With respect to the terms of Dao and *li*, Jinsai follows Chen Chun by taking the naturalist approach, defining Dao as "the path that people should follow in daily ethical conduct," which sounds very similar to Chen's (as well as Zhu Xi's) definition that Dao "is the principle [*li*] people should follow in their daily affairs and human relations."³² But the difference is also quite obvious: unlike Chen, Jinsai does not want to equate Dao with *li*, which shows his clear intention to challenge the Song Neo-Confucians' metaphysics. He cites Chen Chun's discussion of Dao, in which Chen argued that according to Confucius, the alternation between yin and yang represents the origin of Dao. But Jinsai disagrees with Chen's argument. He simply disbelieves that there is a direct connection, as argued by Song Neo-Confucians, between Dao of heaven, or *tiandao*, and Dao of humanity, or *rendao* 人道. That is, "the three ways [Daos] of heaven, earth, and humanity," emphasizes Jinsai, "must not be mixed up and treated as one!" In other words, while the Dao of humanity might pattern on the Dao of heaven, it nonetheless operates in a different sphere.³³ By separating the Dao of heaven and the Dao of humanity, he strikes out the metaphysical ingredient of Song Neo-Confucianism and stresses his point that the Dao of humanity is nothing but a natural path that everyone follows in their daily life. This path, argues Jinsai, exists indeed for everyone, not only for the kings and nobles but also for the merchants, servants and even the handicapped, because, as he quotes Mencius, that Dao is just like "a great road" on which everyone treks.³⁴

32 Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, p. 95; Wing-Tsit Chan, *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained*, p. 105.

33 Tucker, *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi*, pp. 94-95.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 96.

If Jinsai's discussion on Dao, or Daos, reveals a sense of egalitarianism that derived from his *chōnin* background, his decision to distinguish Dao and *li* reinforces this position. By stating that *li* and Dao are basically the same thing, as Chen Chun explains in the *Xingli ziyi*, the Song Neo-Confucians emphasizes the need to approach either Dao or *li* through self-cultivation of the mind—viz. honoring the virtuous/moral nature (*zun dexing* 尊德性), and knowledge acquisition—viz. studying the way to attain Dao (*dao wenxue* 道問學). In so doing, Song Neo-Confucians regard themselves as teachers of the masses. Jinsai does not refute the importance of moral cultivation and book knowledge. However, given his own commoner's background, he dislikes the way in which the Song Neo-Confucians assumed the role as the teacher for the masses, which to Jinsai may show their condescension on the commoner, or the ordinary people. Since Dao to Jinsai is "the path people should follow in daily ethical conduct, it does not exist simply because it was taught. Nor does it exist simply because it corrects human tendencies. Rather it naturally exists."³⁵ In other words, he believes that if people live naturally, their lives would reveal and display the Dao. Dao is not something that has ever departed from their daily lives, nor does its attainment require some outsider's help and guidance.

By contrast, Jinsai contends, *li* is not so natural and intimate to human lives. Instead of capturing the "reproductive and transformative mysteries of living things" as Dao is, *li* "is a dead-word." It only refers to "the rational order of inanimate things," hence having little to do with real life. Moreover, Jinsai points out, the reason for the Song Neo-Confucians to privilege *li* is that they, while hoping to counter the influence of Buddhism and Daoism, have nevertheless bogged down in the traps of Buddhism and Daoism. *Li*, finds Jinsai, was used more often by Zhuangzi 庄子, but seldom by Confucius. He also refers to Mencius' ideas of *li* and *yi* (義righteousness) to criticize Cheng Yi (程頤1033-1107) because Cheng states that the former is in things whereas the latter

35 Ibid., p. 95.

describes the order of the things that can be appreciated by the mind, or "in the self." However, argues Jinsai, Mencius does not divide *li* and *yi*. In fact, Mencius believes that they both naturally appeal to the human mind. Thus, Jinsai asks, "How can anyone, then, credibly suggest that principle belongs only to things while righteousness resides solely in the self?"³⁶ That Jinsai raises this question is consistent with his naturalistic argument that no extraordinary effort is required for anyone to seek and attain Dao or *li*. But it is inconsistent with his earlier statement about *li* being a "dead-word," referring only to an order in things, not in humans. But this inconsistency can be explained away by his eagerness to dismantle the Song Neo-Confucian metaphysics, as we discussed above. He simply rejects that there is a metaphysical thing, either Dao or *li*, that exists beyond the reach of the people yet commands their lives and demands that they search for it.

There is yet a third difference between the *Gomō jigi* and *Xingli ziyi*, which is shown in the additions made by Jinsai to the *Gomō jigi*. Of these additions, the "The Mind's Four Beginnings" (*Siduan zhi xin* 四端之心), "Moral Intuition and Abilities" (*Liangzhi liangneng* 良知良能), "Learning" (*xue*), and the ones on the Five Classics seem the most important, for they point to the connection between Jinsai and his Ming predecessors and counterparts, as well as to the aim and practice of the Ancient Learning School. By creating these new categories for discussion, Jinsai reveals not only his egalitarian interest but also the way with which he pursues the interest. His inclusion of the categories of the "Mind's Four Beginnings" and the "Moral Intuition and Abilities" shows his indebtedness and commitment to Mencius' theory that human nature is naturally and intrinsically good. In fact, these categories, or concepts, were discussed and used initially by Mencius to propose and expound his theory on good human nature. Mencius' theory appeals to Jinsai because by asserting a good human nature, it enables him to downplay the role of Confucian scholars in helping the commoners to reach

36 Ibid., pp. 101-105.

sagehood. For Jinsai, since human nature is intuitively good, it opens the door to virtually everyone to better and improve themselves so long as they have the desire and resolve.

Jinsai's decision to create and include these Mencian categories in his *Gomō jigi* suggests his intention of returning to the original Confucian canon. However, as John Tucker rightly questions, whether he actually arrives at this understanding solely on his own is another matter.³⁷ Mencius' postulation of the mind's four (good) beginnings was not only well known, but it also received considerable attention among Song Neo-Confucians. In order to emphasize the importance of moral cultivation of the mind, Zhu Xi, for instance, links these four beginnings to *qing* rather than to *xin*, which Jinsai mentioned and disputed in the *Gomō jigi*.³⁸ Yet a more immediate cause for Jinsai to criticize Zhu Xi might be that Yi T'oegye expanded on Zhu's view of *qing* and developed his own "Four Beginnings and Seven Emotions" (*siduan qiqing* 四端七情) theory, which further separated the four beginnings of virtue from *xin*. Yi's theory was rather well known at Jinsai's time, upheld dearly by Yamazaki Ansai and the Kimon scholars, or the *bête noire* of Jinsai's Ancient Meaning School.

Likewise, Jinsai's interest in the "moral intuition" also connected his study with the development of Neo-Confucianism in Ming China. For though it was coined by Mencius, the term "moral intuition" was made famous by Wang Yangming only in the Ming and associated closely with his Mind-Heart Learning. Stressing the need of mental training, Wang had called for the "extension of moral intuition" (C. *zhi liangzhi* 致良知; J. *ryōchi o itasu* 良知を致す). In creating the category of "Moral intuition and abilities," Jinsai mentioned Wang Yangming and his thesis. However, he accused Wang of distorting their original meaning defined in the *Mencius*. The "moral intuition" and "moral

37 In fact, Tucker believes that Jinsai relied more on Song Neo-Confucians than on ancient Confucian texts. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

ability," he argued, were interconnected according to Mencius, whereas Wang only wanted to "extend moral intuition," overlooking the "moral ability."³⁹

But just as Wang Yangming "extended moral intuition" to promote his Mind-Heart Learning, Jinsai wanted to balance it with "moral ability" because he had a different priority. This was shown in his creation of the category "Learning," by which he campaigned for the need of extending one's natural ability and engaging oneself in the study of Confucian canons. Though different in interest, Jinsai and Wang Yangming both emphasized the importance of furthering one's inborn quality, either as conscience or as ability. In contrast to Wang's idealism, Jinsai's was empirical and materialistic. If Wang Yangming's interest in extending one's moral intuition led him to meditation, Jinsai's interest in strengthening one's moral ability led him to scholarship, or the pursuit of intellectualism. Jinsai argued that the best way (if not the only way) to develop and nourish the four good beginnings of human nature was through the process of learning. "Human nature," Jinsai wrote, "is morally good, but if that goodness is not developed a person will not be decent to their parents. Yet we cannot simply rely on the inherent goodness of human nature: learning is indispensable. How can we fully realize infinite virtues with a finite nature if not by learning?" After the "Learning" category, Jinsai in the *Gomō jigū* also created categories on the "Five Classics," in which he shared his thoughts and studies of them with his readers. Thus, Jinsai not only advocated the need of learning, he also showed where the learning should be focused on—the Five Classics. Indeed, it was the Ancient Learning that he was calling and looking for.

39 Ibid., p. 160.

The Methodology

If the comparison between the *Xingli ziyi* and *Gomō jigi* connected Jinsai to the Cheng-Zhu tradition of Neo-Confucianism, it also showed how he ultimately departed from that tradition and formed his own position by interacting with post-Song developments of Neo-Confucianism in both Ming China and Chōsen Korea. Clearly, Jinsai did not come to the realization entirely on his own that one needed to return to the original. Rather, it was more a reaction to the later developments in the Neo-Confucianism of his time, especially to the factionalism he witnessed in interpreting Confucian texts. By founding the Ancient Learning School, Jinsai himself was also guilty of starting a new faction in Neo-Confucianism. But this was probably not his original intention. By promoting the importance of Ancient Learning, it is likely that he actually wanted to offer a solution to the disputes among various Neo-Confucian schools in understanding the Confucian teaching, for prior to establishing the *Shushigaku* in Tokugawa Japan, Neo-Confucianism had already evolved into a diverse intellectual tradition in China and Korea. Once the *Shushigaku* took hold in Japan, there also quickly appeared different strains of thought under its fold. Jinsai's creation of the Ancient Meaning School thus mirrored the diverse and complex development of Neo-Confucianism in East Asia.

In previous sections, we have alluded that Jinsai's endorsement of the *qi* theory was related to his *chōnin* upbringing, which prompted him to seek an egalitarian way for reaching sagehood. The *qi* theory was also an important reason for Jinsai to advocate an empirical approach to classical study in order to transcend the metaphysics of the Song Neo-Confucians. However, all these considerations remain on the theoretical level. In order to trace Jinsai's route to his discovery of the value of classical Confucian canon, we may need to consider some more concrete reasons, for Jinsai did not come to a full understanding of the value of Ancient Learning all at once. In his study of the *Mencius*, as we were

told, he not only used Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi*, but he also consulted Sun Shi's (孫奭962-1033) *Mengzi yinyi* (The Phonetic Meanings of the *Mencius* 孟子音義), an earlier, Northern Song gloss of the *Mencius*. Both were post-Han works. That Jinsai paid attention to Sun Shi's study was understandable, for it had been regarded as an authoritative exegesis of the *Mencius*, commissioned and sanctioned by the Song Emperor Zhenzong (真宗r. 997-1021). In 1061, Sun Shi's *Mengzi yinyi* was, along with other classics and their glosses, engraved on stone and erected in front of the state university in the capital Kaifeng. It was through Sun Shi's work that Jinsai might have got to know Zhao Qi's (趙歧?-210) exegesis of the *Mencius*, a Han commentary, which Sun had consulted while working on his.

Though these two texts were written in different times parted by almost a thousand years, Zhao's and Sun's exegeses of the *Mencius* shared one commonality in methodology, which was their philological approach. This commonality was clearly indicated by their titles: as Sun Shi's work purported to explain the meaning of the *Mencius* via a study of the phonetics, Zhao Qi's work, entitled *Mengzi zhangju* (The chapters and sentences in the *Mencius* 孟子章句), offered annotations and exegesis to explain the statements made by Mencius, a typical exercise of Han Confucian scholarship. This similar methodological approach also suggested that while Sun Shi's *Mengzi yinyi* was a part of the Neo-Confucian project on reviving Confucian teaching, it too was built on the Han and Tang tradition in studying Confucianism. This tradition focused more on exegetical analysis of Confucian canons than on developing philosophical interpretation of their meanings; the latter, needless to say, was to characterize the hermeneutics of Song Neo-Confucians, epitomized by Zhu Xi's systematic reorganization and interpretation of classical Confucian texts. In his study of the *Mencius*, Zhu consulted Zhao's and Sun's exegeses. But he did not hold them in high regard. In his *Zhuzi yulei*, Zhu criticized Zhao Qi's exegesis as "awkward and obscure." As for Sun Shi's work, he even doubted that it was done by a Song

scholar because, in his view, it "did not explain the referents and institutions (*mingwu zhidu*名物制度) [in the *Mencius*], but merely revolved around Zhao Qi's work and rehashed his theories."⁴⁰ Obviously, Zhu Xi disliked both of them not because their exegeses were in poor quality, but because these were not interesting to him. His criticism of them could be viewed as a watershed in the transition from Han exegetical learning to Song philosophical learning.⁴¹

We don't know the exact extent to which Jinsai studied Sun Shi's work and how he thought of its style. Given the fact that he used Chen Chun's *Xingli ziyi* as a template for his *Gomō jigi*, it might suggest that he was more drawn to the Song philosophical study of Confucianism, or simply that the *Xingli ziyi* was more accessible to him at the time. Insofar as his style was concerned, he seemed to have tried to combine both philosophical discussion and philological study. At any rate, observed Yoshikawa Kōjirō, Jinsai's awareness, and possible study, of Sun Shi's *Mengzi yinyi* was an important triggering event,⁴² which set off his search for the "ancient meaning" (*kogi*古義) in Confucian texts. That is, having exposed to the divergent ways in studying Confucianism (e.g. Han learning vs. Song learning), Jinsai came to the decision to transcend the Han-Song strife and seek to fashion his own approach. This possibility was confirmed by his own confession. Explaining how and why he called for and embarked on the study of original Confucian canons, Jinsai wrote that having read Zhu Xi's many works, he began as a follower of Song Neo-Confucian and even wrote books in its fashion. In a later time when he was in his early thirties, he got to know Wang Yangming's and Luo Rufang's (羅汝芳 1515-88) critiques of Song Neo-

40 See Zhu Xi, *Zhuzi yulei* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1986), chapter 19.

41 For an analysis of the various interpretations of the *Mencius*, see Chun-Chieh Huang's *Mencian Hermeneutics: A History of Interpretations in China* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001) and his many Chinese publications on the subject.

42 Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, p. 12. However, Yoshikawa made a mistake in naming Sun Shi's book. Instead calling it *Mengzi yinyi*, he called *Mengzi zhengyi*孟子正義 (*Mōshi seigi*). He probably confused Sun's book with Jiao Xun's 焦循 *Mengzi zhengyi*, which was influenced by Sun's book.

Confucianism. However, instead of helping him in his study and understanding, he became quite perplexed as to what schools of theory he should follow. Ultimately, he came to the decision of casting aside all these derivative works and studying only the *Analects* and *Mencius*. After doing so, he was able to note that his early writings had borne influences of Buddhism and Daoism and that his understanding had deviated from the essential and authentic meaning of classical Confucianism.⁴³

Jinsai's own recollection confirms that his exposure to different interpretations of Han and Song Confucian learning was a cause for his call for Ancient Learning. It also shows that he kept abreast of the later development of Neo-Confucianism during the Ming period. He was clearly aware of the anti-Cheng-Zhu sentiment among the Ming Confucian scholars, as exemplified by Wang Yangming's Mind-Heart School. Meanwhile, Jinsai was also aware of Yi T'oegye's and other Korean scholars' defense of Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism against the challenge of the Wang Yangming School. Having grown increasingly impatient with the overblown factionalism in developing Neo-Confucianism, Jinsai turned to Ancient Learning, or restorationism, in the hope of ending this fanfare of his time. And he was not alone. To certain extent, his restorationist interest was also shared by his opponent, the Kimon scholars and their predecessor Yi T'oegye, for they all cast doubts on and pushed aside commentary works on Zhu Xi and maintained that one should only adhere to Zhu Xi's own works. But the key difference was that the Kimon scholars had no intention of going beyond Zhu Xi, nor did their adherence to Zhu Xi necessarily encourage further intellectual inquiry.

43 Cited in Inoue, *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, pp. 205-206. Jinsai's mention of Luo Rufang 羅汝芳 (whose courtesy name was Jinxi 近溪 as referred to by Jinsai), a third generation scholar of Wang Yangming's Mind-Heart Learning, suggests, again, his familiarity of the later development of Ming Neo-Confucianism.

If the restorationist sentiment appeared in different Confucian schools in both Korea and Japan, was it also observable in the Neo-Confucian learning of Ming China? The answer is a definitive yes. To identify the restorationist sentiment in China, we have more accustomed to the notion that it only rose and flourished in the Qing Dynasty, marked by the interest of evidential learning in restoring the pristine form of Confucianism via Han or pre-Han exegetical learning. However, the same interest had not only appeared and but also been pursued to a considerable degree among Ming Confucian scholars. Indeed, if there was a restorationist project in Ming China, it was motivated by something quite comparable to that behind Jinsai's pursuit--they were energized by the similar interest in extending creatively and critically the Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucian tradition.⁴⁴ If Jinsai's decision to go directly to the *Analects* and *Mencius* stemmed from an intention to settle once and for all the interpretative disputes among various Confucian schools in his time, Luo Qinchun, a figure whose ideas bore on Jinsai, had reached the same conclusion nearly two centuries earlier. In view of the different takes on the nature of *li* between Cheng Yi and Lu Xiangshan (陸象山1139-93), Luo had experienced the same confusion and looked for a way out, as Jinsai did. His solution was, similar to Jinsai's: "If we don't seek verification in the classics, and choose to rely everything only on our own mind, it must go astray."⁴⁵ Zhu Shunshui (朱舜水1600-82), a late Ming scholar exiled in Japan during Jinsai's time, also expressed the same interest in studying the classics. It has been noticed that given his admiration for Zhu, Jinsai's call for a return to classical Confucianism might have reflected Zhu's influence.⁴⁶

44 De Bary has long alerted us that empirical study had appeared in the late Ming and that Qing antimetaphysical tendency was an expansion of later Ming empiricism. See William Theodore de Bary (ed.), *Self and Society in Ming Thought*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), p. 24.

45 Cited in Yü, *Lishi yu sixiang*, pp. 101-102.

46 In her "The Practical Learning of Chu Shun-shui (1600-1682)," Julia Ching briefly discussed, citing Inoue Tetsujirō, the similarity of Zhu's ideas and that of the Ancient Learning school, see

Restorationism, therefore, was an important, accepted strain in Ming Neo-Confucian thoughts, readily traceable also in the Wang Yangming School. Wang Yangming and his followers formed their position on two grounds. First, they considered it unpractical for the Cheng-Zhu scholars to champion the idea of maintaining *tianli* (the principle of heaven 天理) and eradicating *renyu* (humanly desire 人欲) because it failed to correspond to real life. Second and more important, Wang Yangming and his predecessor Chen Baisha (陳白沙 1428-1500) saw that even if the idea was good and noble, the Cheng-Zhu scholars did not offer an appropriate and effective way to practice it. Prior to the founding of the Ming, the Four Books selected and glossed by Zhu Xi had already been established as an official version of interpretation of Confucianism. It was demanded that students master and incorporate them in composing the eight-legged essays for taking part in the civil service examinations in the Ming. This tedious and humdrum exercise, in the eyes of Wang Yangming, was no use for the purpose, expounded by Zhu Xi himself, of attaining Dao via book learning. A more useful and important exercise, suggested by Chen Baisha yet propagated by Wang Yangming and his disciples, should be mental training, which could be achieved through introspective meditation in quiet-sitting.

Chen and Wang's advocacy of "meditative sitting" (*C. zuochan*; *J. zazen* 坐禪) as a way to approach sagehood clearly suggested the influence of Buddhism, or Chan Buddhism. However, as YÜ Ying-Shih and Irene Bloom have noted,

Principle and Practicality, pp. 189-230, especially pp. 212-215. Li Suping 李魁平 has elaborated on the possible connection between Zhu Shunshui's exile in Japan and the development of the Ancient Learning school. See her *Zhu Zhiyu pingzhuan* (A critical biography of Zhu Shunshui 朱之瑜評傳) (Nanjing: Nanjing daxue chubanshe, 1998), pp. 222-244. Chang-Yi Tung 童長義 has furthered the argument in his "Cong shiqi shiji zhongri jiaoliu qingshi kan Zhu Shunshui yu Riben guxuepai" (Zhu Shunshui and the Japanese Ancient Learning school in the context of Sino-Japanese relations of the 17th century 從十七世紀中日交流情勢看朱舜水與日本古學派), in Ming-Shi Kao 高明士 (ed.) *Dongya wenhuaquan de xingcheng yu fazhan: rujia sixiang pian* (The formation and development of the East Asian cultural sphere: essays on Confucianism 東亞文化圈的形成與發展：儒家思想篇) (Taipei: Taiwan daxue lishixi, 2003), pp. 157-180.

Ming Neo-Confucians faced a different task than their predecessors did in the Song. They were no longer so pressed as before by the need of combating Chan Buddhism. This was because, Yü points out, Chan Buddhism itself declined in popularity in the Ming; or more precisely, there had occurred a transition from nihilism to intellectualism within Chan Buddhism.⁴⁷ As a result, states Bloom, Ming Neo-Confucians, such as Luo Qinshun and Wang Yangming, "both show signs of having come more fully to terms with Buddhism at a philosophical level than their predecessors in the Sung [Song], Yüan, and early Ming ever had."⁴⁸ In other words, they felt more freely to either incorporate (as in Wang Yangming's case) Buddhist practice into their teachings or to accord more attention to the value of everyday life; the latter was supported by both Wang and his critic Luo Qinshun.

Yet in developing his Mind-Heart learning, Wang Yangming resorted to restorationism and revived the teachings of Lu Xiangshan, a contemporary and critic of Zhu Xi. For in his debate with Zhu Xi on the issue of book learning vs. mental training, Lu posed a very interesting and damaging question to his adversary: If book learning was so important for reaching sagehood, then what books had the ancient sages read? Indeed, according to conventional Confucian wisdom, most sages had appeared before Confucius compiled and edited the Five Classics. Thus Lu Xiangshan's criticism of Zhu Xi lent strong support to Wang Yangming's call for mental training as a viable alternative to book learning. Moreover, Wang Yangming's restorationism did not lead him only to a discovery of the works outside of the Cheng-Zhu School. He went further back to the pre-Han period to find additional support and believed that his advocacy of Mind-Heart Learning corresponded to the idea of Mencius. First, Mencius drew Wang's attention to *xin*, a concept pertaining to benevolence, righteousness, propriety and

47 Yü, *Lishi yu sixiang*, pp. 134-135.

48 Irene Bloom, "Philosophy of Lo Ch'in-shun," p. 91. William Theodore de Bary has also noted that the task of confronting Buddhism and Daoism became less pressing in the Ming than in the Song. See *Self and Society in Ming Thought*, p. 5f.

knowledge and other innate qualities of human nature. Thus Wang developed his theory of "extending moral intuition," namely to extend and enlarge these inborn qualities of the *xin*. Second, Wang was inspired by Mencius' statement that "All things are already complete in us. There is no greater delight than to be conscious of sincerity on self-examination," which became the basis for his argument that "the learning of the classics is the same as the learning of heart-mind."⁴⁹ In other words, the study of the classics was for the purpose of tempering and improving the mind.

Wang's preference for mental training to book learning eventually turned his Mind-Heart School into, mostly in the hands of his disciples, an example of anti-intellectualism that prized spirituality over scholarship. Yet Wang Yangming himself hardly ignored classical study. In fact, he adopted a similarly restorationist approach to challenging Zhu Xi by searching for an ancient version of the *Great Learning* (*Daxue* 大學). His purpose was to reject and replace Zhu Xi's interpretation, offered by Zhu in his then widely accepted *Daxue zhangju* (The chapters and sentences of the *Great Learning* 大學章句).⁵⁰ It was not accidental that the exegetical issue regarding the *Great Learning* later also interested Itō Jinsai. It was likely that Wang's criticism of Zhu Xi had drawn Jinsai's attention to the text. Different from Wang Yangming, though, Jinsai challenged directly the authenticity of the *Great Learning* as a text penned by Confucius himself. But the two shared the same restorationist interest and used the same philological methodology. What prompted Wang to challenge Zhu Xi's version of the *Great Learning* was his antiquarian interest in safeguarding its originality, whose language, according to him, actually read more smoothly than did the latter versions. Jinsai doubted Confucius' authorship of the *Great Learning* because he compared it with other contemporaneous Confucian texts

49 *The Works of Mencius*, James Legge (trans.) (New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1970), pp. 450-451. Also, Ching-Chang Lin 林慶彰, *Mindai jingxue yanjiu lunji* (Essays on the study of Ming classical learning 明代經學研究論集) (Taipei: Wenshizhe, 1994), p. 74.

50 Lin, *Mingdai jingxue*, pp. 61-77.

and found many differences and inconsistencies in language and terminology between them.

By Wang Yangming's time, not only were there different schools of interpretations of Confucian canons, but there were also different genres and styles in scholarly activities. In his letter to a friend, Wang divided scholarship into three genres: evidential learning (*xungu zhixue* 訓詁之學), antiquarian learning (*jisong zhixue* 記誦之學) and literary learning (*cizhang zhixue* 詞章之學).⁵¹ He himself, however, was not to follow either of them but to transcend them in order to grasp the essence of Confucianism. This intention led him to campaigning Mind-Heart Learning. It seemed that Itō Jinsai was also aware of these different genres of scholarship. And like Wang Yangming, as noted by Inoue Tetsujirō, he "did not want to pursue evidential learning, nor literary learning, but regarded the explication of Dao and meaning (*dōgi* 道義) as his task. Though he annotated the Four Books, his purpose of doing so was solely for illuminating Dao and meaning."⁵² Jinsai's interest led him to the call for Ancient Learning. Yet though the end results were different, Yangming and Jinsai both pursued their goals with the same restorationist approach and shared their interest in transcending Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism. By comparing the trajectories of Neo-Confucianism in Ming China and Tokugawa Japan, de Bary states that Japanese Neo-Confucianism "exhibit many of the same trends and characteristics seen in the thought and scholarship of the Ming period. Beyond testifying to the remarkable replicative powers of the Japanese, these shared characteristics are suggestive of underlying continuities and a pattern of growth within the Neo-Confucian system which asserted themselves even in the very different historical circumstances of Tokugawa Japan."⁵³

51 Wang Yangming, *Wang Yangming quanji* (Complete works of Wang Yangming 王陽明全集) (Taipei: Wenyou shudian, 1980), p. 43.

52 Inoue, *Nihon kogakuha no tetsugaku*, p. 179.

53 De Bary, *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy*, p. 210. His statement echoes YÜ Ying-Shih's observation in the latter's study of Dai Zhen and Itō Jinsai in *Lun Dai Zhen yu Zhang Xuecheng*, pp. 194-

If Wang Yangming's rebellion against the orthodoxy Cheng-Chu School of Neo-Confucianism inspired Itō Jinsai, there were others who pursued the same restorationist interest in the Ming. In the field of literary learning, for example, Wang Yangming's contemporaries Li Mengyang (李夢陽 1473-1529), He Jingming (何景明 1483-1521) and their followers Li Panlong (李攀龍 1514-59) and Wang Shizhen (王世貞 1526-90) introduced the "revival of antiquity" (*fugu* 復古) movement, hoping to revive and emulate the Han composition style. The influence of their endeavor reached Japan and reflected in Ogyū Sorai's call for *kobunjigaku* (ancient semantic learning 古文辞学).⁵⁴ Together with Jinsai's *kogigaku*, Sorai's *kobunjigaku* implemented the agenda of the Ancient Learning School. In the field of evidential learning, there were also many prominent scholars, ranging from Yang Shen (楊慎 1488-1568) and Chen Di (陳第 1541-1617) to Jiao Hong (焦竑 1541-1620) and Hu Yinglin (胡應麟 1551-1602). They supported the agenda of transcending Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy and looked for inspiration in the exegetical works of Han scholars. They also applied a wide range of methods including geography, history, epigraphy and, more importantly, philology in the study of the classics. Indeed, philology seemed to figure centrally in Ming evidential scholarship, for the scholars frequently applied the methods of phonology, phonetics, etymology and paleography in their exegeses and glosses of classical texts.⁵⁵ Moreover, this interest in evidential research was reflected in the civil service examinations of the late Ming. Around 1500, finds Benjamin Elman, the standard of evidential learning was regularly used by the examiners to screen and sift successful candidates for the examination. The standard comprised criteria that checked the applicants' ability to ascertain facts with evidence, the way in which they presented the evidence and their intent on

196.

54 See Yoshikawa Kōjirō, *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 118-126.

55 See Ching-Chang Lin, *Mingdai kaojuxue yanjiu* (A study of Ming evidential learning 明代考據學研究) (Taipei: Xuesheng shuju, 1986) and *Mingdai jingxue*.

restoring antiquity.⁵⁶ All of this, needless to say, provided a solid foundation for evidential learning to develop and flourish in the Qing period.

The Resonance

Indeed, as observed by Zhu Xizu (朱希祖1877-1944) in the early 20th century, there was a broadly based restorationist movement from the mid-Ming onward, for though there were differences in evidential learning, literary learning and others, they were intrinsically connected and were aimed at the same goal. Whether literary scholars wanted to revive the ancient style of writing, or evidential and antiquarian scholars wanted to restore the integrity of ancient texts, they all had to come to a clear understanding of ancient books. And in order to understand ancient books, they had to acquire the knowledge of paleography, phonology and so on. All this, Zhu concluded, paved the way for the prosperity of evidential learning in the Qing.⁵⁷

From a cross-cultural perspective, prior to the proliferation of evidential scholarship in Qing China, the restorationist project initiated by Ming scholars in their attempt to challenge the Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy had already taken root in Japan and been nurtured and developed by Itō Jinsai and Ogyū Sorai. Like Ming scholars, such as those in the Wang Yangming School, they began as devout students of the Cheng-Zhu School, only to rebel against it after discovering its deficiencies. They also took the restorationist approach to address these deficiencies in Cheng-Zhu learning. As Wang Yangming pointed out that the Cheng-Zhu School failed to transmit the true spirit of Confucian teaching, Jinsai charged that it misinterpreted and misrepresented the original meaning of

56 Benjamin Elman, *From philosophy to philology : intellectual and social aspects of change in late Imperial China*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian Pacific Monograph Series, 2001), pp. 76-77.

57 Quoted in Ching-Chang Lin, *Mingdai kaojuxue*, p. 25.

Confucian canons. To be sure, the schools Wang and Jinsai developed as alternatives to Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism were distinctly different. But this difference should not surprise us because, ultimately, they conceived, launched and pursued their projects in a different social and cultural milieu. If the decline and transformation of Chan Buddhism in the Ming allowed Wang Yangming to borrow and blend more freely Buddhist practices in advancing and promoting his Mind-Heart Learning, Jinsai's turn to and call for Ancient Learning had a good deal to do with the fact that Chan/Zen Buddhism had commingled with Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism from the very beginning when the latter was first introduced to Japan. As this mirrored the practice of Ming Neo-Confucianism, it also raised Jinsai's suspicion about the authenticity of *Shushigaku* and prompted him to search for a more authentic, or the original, form of Confucianism.

After the fall of the Ming, the restorationist interest intensified among Qing scholars because many of them attributed the collapse of the Ming and the establishment of the Manchu rule to the decline of Confucian scholarship, resulting from the neglect of book learning by the Wang Yangming School. Though the Qing rulers soon restored the orthodoxy of Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, it failed by and large to appeal to many scholars, especially to such intellectual leaders as Gu Yanwu (顧炎武1613-82), Huang Zongxi (黃宗羲1610-95) and Wang Fuzhi (王夫之1619-92) in the early Qing. Clung to their status as "left-over subjects" (*yimin* 遺民), they retained their loyalty to the previous Ming Dynasty and devoted their lives to preserving and extending the Ming cultural tradition. Huang Zongxi's writing of the *Mingru xue'an* (Cases on Ming Confucianism 明儒學案) was a salient example. This high devotion to pure scholarship was exemplary and necessary for evidential studies to flourish from the mid-Qing period onward.⁵⁸ In addition, Qing scholars made their conscious

58 In her *MingQing zhiji shidafu yanjiu* (A study of the literati group of the Ming and Qing periods 明清之際士大夫研究) (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 1999), Zhao Yuan 趙圓 thinks that the mentality of the "surviving people" paved the way for the professionalization of Qing learning, which is described by Benjamin Elman in his *From Philosophy to Philology*.

choice with regard to the Ming heritage in scholarship. Since they regarded the popularity of Wang Yangming's Mind-Heart Learning as a cause for the Ming's fall, they concentrated on developing Ming evidential scholarship. Gu Yanwu's study of the classics via the method of phonology, for instance, expanded on Chen Di's works. All in all, they called for resuming the battle against the intrusion of Buddhism and Daoism into mainstream Confucian learning. The Wang Yangming School thus became their natural target. This was all quite understandable. As China was again placed under the rule of an alien dynasty, the Han Chinese became more prone to the classical form of their culture in hopes of preserving their cultural and ethnical identity.

During the mid-Qing, however, noticeable changes took place in the intellectual arena. First of all, as is well known, the status of "left-over subjects" is not hereditary. While Gu Yanwu, Huang Zongxi and other early Qing scholars refused to collaborate with the Qing, their descendents and students opted to take part in the civil service examinations resumed by the Qing and consequently entered the Qing officialdom.⁵⁹ Second, the Cheng-Zhu orthodoxy sanctioned by the Qing experienced some important changes. It underwent a transition from the traditional emphasis on speculating and analyzing the *li* to more practical aspects, which made it more correspondent with real life.⁶⁰ Third, having consolidated its power for several decades, the Qing rulers by then also felt more and more comfortable assuming their role as leaders of China in both political and cultural terms. This was attested to by the stupendous bibliographical projects Emperor Kangxi (康熙r. 1661-1722) and Emperor Qianlong (乾隆r. 1736-95) each launched in their respective reigns.

59 Qi Yongxiang 漆永祥, *Qianjia kaojuxue yanjiu* (A study of evidential learning under the Qianlong and Jiaqing reigns 乾嘉考據學研究) (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1998), pp. 32-33.

60 See Wing-Tsit Chan, "The *Hsing-li ching-i* and the Ch'eng-Chu School of the Seventeenth Century," in William Theodore de Bary (ed.) *The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), pp. 543-580. Also a more recent study by On-cho Ng, *Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism in the Early Qing: Li Guangdi (1642-1718) and Qing Learning* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2001).

All this, the waning of the metaphysical influence associated with Cheng-Zhu Neo-Confucianism, especially with Wang Yangming's Mind-Heart Learning, the willingness and easiness of the scholars in working with their new ruler, the high level of cultural and commercial development achieved by the peace established in the Kangxi and Qianlong eras, gave rise to the proliferation and advancement of evidential scholarship. This environment resembled that of 17th century Japan in which Jinsai launched his search for Ancient Meaning. And this resemblance probably explained why some of Jinsai's views, such as his egalitarian sympathy for the commoners and his philosophical justification for *qing* (情 feelings) and *yu* (欲 desires) of the humans, resonated well with such Qing scholars as Dai Zhen who shared the same merchant background. Though motivated by similar concerns, Ancient Meaning School and Qing evidential learning differed notably in methodology. Expanding on Ming scholars' previous works, Hamaguchi Fujio 濱口富士雄 argues, Qing evidential scholars employed principally the methods of phonology and phonetics in their study of the classics.⁶¹ By contrast, Jinsai's attention, as well as Ogyū Sorai's, was focused on paleography and syntax. Qing evidential learning, or *kōkyogaku* 考拠学 / *kōshōgaku* 考証学, would also exert its influence in Japan, but not until the 19th century.^{62*}

61 Hamaguchi Fujio, *Shindai kōkyogaku no shisō shi teki kenkyū* (A study of the intellectual history of Qing evidential learning 清代考拠学の思想史的研究) (Tokyo: Kokusho kankōkai, 1994).

62 Yoshikawa Kōjirō stated that Sorai's approach, while seemingly similar, actually differed from that of Qing evidential learning, see his *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 124-125. Naitō Konan 内藤湖南 concurred it in his *Sentetsu no gakumon* (The Wisdom of Earlier Thinkers 先哲の学問) by stating that Japanese learning was usually behind Chinese learning for over a century and that Jinsai and Sorai's Ancient Learning had followed the work of Ming scholars. Naitō's view is cited in Lian Qingji 連清吉, "Ribei kaozheng xuejia de kaozheng fangfa" (The evidential research methods of Japanese evidential scholars 日本考証學家的考証方法), in Chiu-Hua Chiang 蔣秋華 (ed.) *Qianjia xuejia de zhijing fangfa* (The methods of Qing evidential scholars in classical study 乾嘉學者的治經方法) (Taipei: Zhongyanyuan wenzhesuo, 2000), vol. 2, p. 787, note 1. Naitō Konan's similar views are discussed by Joshua A. Fogel in his *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866-1934)* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. 107-108. For a recent study of how Qing evidential learning reached Japan, see Benjamin Elman, "The Search for Evidence from China: Qing Learning and Kōshōgaku in

Bibliography

Mencius (孟子)

1970 *The Works of Mencius*, James Legge (trans.) (New York, Dover Publications, 1970)

[宋] 朱熹 (Zhu Xi)

1986 《朱子語類》，[宋] 黎靖德 (編) (北京：中華書局，1986 年)

[宋] 陳淳 (CHEN Chun)

1983 《北溪字義》(北京：中華書局，1983 年)

[明] 王守仁 (WANG Yangming)

1972 《王陽明全集》(臺北：文友書店，1972 年)

BACKUS, Robert

1979 "The Kansei Prohibition of Heterodoxy and Its Effects on Education," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 39, 1 (Jun., 1979)

BLOOM, Irene

1979 "On the 'Abstraction' of Ming Thought: Some Concrete Evidence from the Philosophy of Lo Ch'in-shun," in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (eds.) *Principle and Practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)

BROWNLEE, John S.

1990 "Pei-Hsi's Tzu-I and the Rise of Tokugawa Philosophical Lexicography." Ph. D. dissertation (Columbia University, 1990)

1998 *Japanese Historians and the National Myths, 1600-1945* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1998)

CHAN, Wing-Tsit (陳榮捷) (ed. and tran.)

1975 "The *Hsing-li ching-i* and the Ch'eng-Chu School of the Seventeenth Century," in William Theodore de Bary (ed.) *The Unfolding of Neo-Confucianism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975)

1986 *Neo-Confucian Terms Explained (The Pei-hsi tzu-i)* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986)

Tokugawa Japan," in Joshua A. Fogel (ed.) *Sagacious Monks and Bloodthirsty Warriors: Chinese Views of Japan in the Ming-Qing Period* (Norwalk: EastBridge, 2002), pp.158-182.

◆ Responsible editor: Yu-Shu Chen (陳玉書).

CHING, Julia (秦家懿)

- 1979 "The Practical Learning of Chu Shun-shui (1600-1682)," in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (eds.) *Principle and Practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)

DE BARY, William Theodore

- 1959 "Some Common Tendencies in Neo-Confucianism," in David Nivison and Arthur Wright (eds.) *Confucianism in Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959)
- 1979 "Sagehood as a Secular and Spiritual Ideal in Tokugawa Neo-Confucianism," in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (eds.) *Principle and Practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)
- 1981 *Neo-Confucian Orthodoxy and the Learning of the Mind-and-Heart* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981)

DE BARY, William Theodore (ed.)

- 1970 *Self and Society in Ming Thought*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970)

ELMAN, Benjamin

- 2001 *From philosophy to philology : intellectual and social aspects of change in late Imperial China*, 2nd ed. (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian Pacific Monograph Series, 2001)
- 2002 "The Search for Evidence from China: Qing Learning and Kōshōgaku in Tokugawa Japan," in Joshua A. Fogel (ed.) *Sagacious Monks and Bloodthirsty Warriors: Chinese Views of Japan in the Ming-Qing Period* (Norwalk: EastBridge, 2002), pp.158-182.

FOGEL, Joshua A.

- 1984 *Politics and Sinology: The Case of Naitō Konan (1866-1934)* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1984)

HALL, John W.

- 1959 "The Confucian Teacher in Tokugawa Japan," in David S. Nivison and Arthur F. Wright (eds.) *Confucianism in Action* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), pp. 268-301

JANSEN, Marius

- 1992 *China in the Tokugawa World* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992)

NOSCO, Peter (ed.)

- 1984 *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984)

- OKADA, Takehiko (岡田武彦)
 1979 "Practical Learning in the Chu Hsi School: Yamazaki Ansai and Kaibara Ekken," in William Theodore de Bary and Irene Bloom (eds.) *Principle and Practicality: Essays in Neo-Confucianism and Practical Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979)
- TUCKER, John A.
 1998 *Itō Jinsai's Gomō jigi and the Philosophical Definition of Early Modern Japan* (Leiden: Brill, 1998)
- YANG, Key P. and Gregory Henderson
 1958-1959 "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," *Journal of Asian Studies*, 18, 1-2 (1958-1959), pp. 81-101; 259-276
- 大庭脩 (ŌBA Osamu)
 1995 〈清時代の日中文化交流〉，收於大庭脩、王曉秋（編）《歷史》，《日中文化交流史叢書》，第 1 冊（東京，大修館書店，1995 年）
- 山井涌 (YAMANOI Yū)
 1951 〈明清時代における「氣」の哲学〉，《哲学雜誌》，第 46 卷，第 711 期（1951）
- 中山久四郎 (NAKAYAMA Kyūshirō)
 1939 〈考證學概說〉，收於德川公繼宗七十年祝賀記念會（編）《近世日本の儒學》（東京：岩波書店，1939 年）
- 井上哲次郎 (INOUE Tetsujirō)
 1902 《日本古學派之哲學》（東京：富山房，1902 年）
- 井上哲次郎 (INOUE Tetsujirō)、蟹江義丸 (KANIE Yoshimaru)（編）
 1901 《日本倫理彙編》（東京：育成會，1901 年）
- 内藤湖南 (NAITŌ Konan)
 1987 《先哲の学問》（東京：筑摩書房，1987 年）
- 吉川幸次郎 (YOSHIKAWA Kōjirō)
 1975 《仁齋・徂徠・宣長》（東京：岩波書店，1975 年）
- 余英時 (YÜ Ying-Shih)
 1976a 《論戴震與章學誠——清代中期學術思想史研究》（香港：龍門書店，1976 年）
 1976b 《歷史與思想》（臺北：聯經，1976 年）
 2003 《朱熹的歷史世界：宋代士大夫政治文化的研究》（臺北，允晨文化，2003）

李甦平 (LI Suping)

1992 《聖人與武士——中國傳統文化與現代化比較》(北京：中國人民大學出版社，1992年)

1998 《朱之瑜評傳》(南京：南京大學出版社，1998年)

林慶彰 (Ching-Chang LIN)

1986 《明代考據學研究》，修訂再版(臺北：台灣學生書局，1986年)

1994 《明代經學研究論集》(臺北：文史哲出版社，1994年)

阿部吉雄 (ABE Yoshio)

1970 "Development of Neo-Confucianism in Japan, Korea and China: A Comparative Study," *Acta Asiatica*, no. 19 (1970)

1971 《日本朱子學と朝鮮》(東京：東京大學出版會，1978年)

青木晦藏 (AOKI Kaizō)

1926-1927 〈伊藤仁齋と戴東原〉，《斯文》，第8卷第1、2、4、8期、第9卷第1、2期

連清吉 (LIAN Qingji)

2000 〈日本考證學家的考證方法〉，收於蔣秋華(主編)《乾嘉學者的治經方法》，下冊(臺北：中央研究院中國文哲研究所籌備處，2000年)

陳來 (CHEN Lai)

1991 《宋明理學》(瀋陽：遼寧教育出版社，1991年)

童長義 (Chang-Yi TUNG)

2005 〈從十七世紀中日交流情勢看朱舜水與日本古學派〉，收於高明士(編)《東亞文化圈的形成與發展：儒家思想篇》(臺北：臺灣大學出版中心，2005年)

黃俊傑 (Chun-Chien HUANG) (編)

2001 *Mencian Hermeneutics: A History of Interpretations in China* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2001)

2004 《中日《四書》詮釋傳統初探》(臺北：臺灣大學出版中心，2004年)

漆永祥 (QI Yongxiang)

1998 《乾嘉考據學研究》(北京：中國社科出版社，1998年)

趙園 (ZHAO Yuan)

1999 《明清之際士大夫研究》(北京：北京大學出版社，1999年)

濱口富士雄 (HAMAGUCHI Fujio)

1994 《清代考據學の思想史的研究》(東京：國書刊行會，1994年)